



Parent-Adolescent Relationship in Context of Gender of Adolescents and Social Class of Families: A Case Study of GBPUAT, Uttarakhand

Arti Kumari¹, Ritu Singh^{1*}, Manisha Mehra¹ and Amit Kumar Mishra²

¹*Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Home Science, G.B.P.U.A.T., Pantnagar, India.*

²*Amity School of Business, Amity University, Noida, India.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author AK designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors AK and RS managed the analyses of the study. Author RS managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/CJAST/2019/v36i230226

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Ana Pedro, Professor, Department of Education, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal.

Reviewers:

(1) Oribhabor Chinelo Blessing, University of Africa Toru-Orua, Nigeria.

(2) Alan Garfield, University of Dubuque, USA.

(3) Gaurav Sankalp, Uttar Pradesh Rajarshi Tandon Open University, India.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/49839>

Original Research Article

Received 05 April 2019

Accepted 24 June 2019

Published 01 July 2019

ABSTRACT

The present study investigated gender differences in adolescents' perceptions of parent-adolescent relationship among families (Class I, Class II, Class III, and Class IV) of G.B Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand across their gender. Families falling under social class I of the university had parent(s) working as Professor and Associate Professor in the university; those falling under social class II had parent(s) working as Assistant Professor or equivalent and Doctor in the university; those falling under social class III had parent(s) working as Accountant, Supervisor, Lab Technician and Clerk in the university and those falling under social class IV had parent(s) working as Attendant, Driver, Peon, CRC laborer, Gardner and Sweeper. In the present study, forty adolescents were randomly selected from each social class of which 63 were girls and 97 boys making a total of 160 respondents. Respondents from each socio- economic class were split across gender to analyze difference in perception of

*Corresponding author: E-mail: ritu.singh07@gmail.com;

their relationship with parents. Parent-child Relationship Scale (PCRS) by Dr Nalini Rao (1989) was administered with the adolescents. The present findings revealed interesting gender variations in parent-adolescent relationship across four social classes of families under study. Boys and girls both, from all the social classes reported no gender difference in their parents' practice of symbolic punishment. On the contrary, in comparison to boys, girls from all the social classes of families reported their parents, mother and father both, to be significantly more protecting. Second striking observation was that boys and girls from social class I, II and III reported no gender based parental (mother and father) differential attitude on symbolic reward, loving, object reward, rejecting, object punishment, demanding, indifferent and neglecting domains of parent-adolescent relationship. However, girls from social class IV perceived their parents to be significantly more rejecting, indifferent and neglecting and mothers in particular to be more demanding and practicing object punishment. Whereas, boys from social class IV reported parents to be significantly more symbolically rewarding, loving and object rewarding and fathers in particular to be more demanding and practicing object punishment.

Keywords: Demanding; object reward; protecting; symbolic punishment; symbolic reward.

1. INTRODUCTION

Parents play a remarkable role in holistic development of the child. The emotional tie and intimacy between parents and their children give a sense of security to the children and help in the development of a positive reciprocative relationship. Parent-adolescent relationship plays a key role in determining mental health and psychological well being of the adolescent. However, this impact has been largely overlooked as compared to other influential sources [1]. Adolescence is a very critical stage in human life span. The process of developing autonomy and independence begins with the infant's discovery of self, continues throughout childhood and becomes the spotlight of adolescence. This leads to changes in parent-adolescent relationships. At the same time, a certain level of parent-child disagree in families with adolescents is seen as a necessary part of the process of establishing independence, and the occurrence of parent-child conflict might not necessarily be defined as creating a negative socialization environment [2]. Adolescents spend less time with their parent, they focus increasingly on peers and activities outside the family [3]. Many theories, such as neo-psychoanalytic outlooks, evolutionary viewpoints, and socio-cognitive viewpoints, suggest that the increasing autonomy and individuation during adolescence lead to an impermanent decrease in closeness, an increase in conflicts, and gradually more equal authority [4;5].

There are various ways in which parenting styles have been conceptualized and understood on the basis of love, responsiveness, demand, neglect and control [6]. Sons in contrast to daughters

perceived parents to be more demanding and giving more object punishment [7]. On the other hand, daughters in contrast to sons perceived their fathers to be more protecting and mothers to be more loving and symbolic reward giving. It has been reported that boys perceived their parents to be over protective whereas girls reported high parental acceptance [8]. Fathers were reported to be significantly higher in favor of punishment to their sons as compared to their daughters and the mothers were reported to be more loving towards their son [9]. Mothers distribute a close relationship with their children, where as father child relationships are oriented more toward freedom activities [1]. It was observed that boys perceived their mothers to be authoritarian whereas girls perceived their mothers to be permissive. In case of value orientation boys perceived mothers approach as permissive while girls perceived mothers to be dictatorial [10]. It was revealed that boys reported significantly more negative responses from father as compared to girls and girls showed significantly better emotional tenderness in comparison to boys. The boys and girls reported no significant difference in over protection and support with father. No reliable difference was determined between boys and girls in rejection, emotional warmth, over protection and support with mother [11]. Parental behaviors were most likely to produce desired outcomes if and when they were perceived similarly by children and parents [12]. It was reported that adolescents who perceived parental behavior as loving developed good personality and good social contact more outgoing, more intelligent, emotionally stable, tender minded, competitive whereas who perceived parental behavior as rejecting/neglecting developed personality like

reserved, less intelligent, shy in nature, serious, timid etc [13]. Verbal communication is gendered with parents tending to talk differently to girls and boys [14]. However, there are also a large number of recent studies that do not find evidence for parents' gender-differentiated use of control [15;16]. It was indicated that mothers were more protective than fathers towards adolescent boys [17].

Above discussion clearly reflects contrasting findings on parent-adolescent relationship with gender. Secondly, how gender differentiation in parent-adolescent relationship varies with social classes is least studied. Thus, present study has been taken up with following objectives:

- To explore gender differences in adolescents' perception of their relationship with mother in families from different social classes of G.B.P.U.A&T., Pantnagar.
- To assess gender differences in adolescents' perception of their relationship with father in families from different social classes of G.B.P.U.A&T., Pantnagar.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Locale

The present research study was carried out exclusively in G.B Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar. Out of the eight schools running in the university, only five schools viz; Campus School, Government Girls Inter College (GGIC), Pantnagar Inter College (PIC), Balnilyam Junior School, Saraswati Shishu Mandir were purposively selected as a research base for the present study since they provided education up to intermediate.

2.2 Sample

Adolescents studying in 7-9 standards of the selected schools were listed and categorized under four groups on the basis of their family social class namely Class I, Class II, Class III, and Class IV. Social class of a family was based on parents' working status in the university namely Social Class I: - Professor and Associate Professor; Social Class II:-Assistant Professor or equivalent, Doctor; Social Class III:-Accountant, Supervisor, Lab Technician, Clerk; Social Class IV:-Attendant, Driver, Peon, CRC labourer,

Gardner, Sweeper. In the present study, forty adolescents were randomly selected from each social class of which 63 were girls and 97 boys making a total of 160 respondents.

2.3 Research Tools

Parent-adolescent interaction was analyzed using the "Parent Child Relationship Scale" (PCRS) by Dr Nalini Rao (1989).The tool contains 100 items categorized into ten dimension relation namely: Protective (PR), Symbolic punishment (SP), Rejecting (REJ), Object punishment (OP), Demanding (DEM), Indifferent (IND), Symbolic reward (SR), Loving (LOV), Objects reward (OR) and Neglecting (NEG).

2.4 Data Collection

Prior permission to contact respondents of the present study in the school itself was sought from principals of the selected schools. Thereafter, randomly selected respondents were approached and their consent for participation in the study was obtained. Respondents were administered research tools assuring confidentiality of their responses and expectation of their honest response on it.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present findings revealed interesting gender variations in parent-adolescent relationship across four social classes of families under study. Boys and girls both, from all the social classes reported no gender difference in their parents' practice of symbolic punishment. On the contrary, in comparison to boys, girls from all the social classes of families reported their parents, mother and father both, to be significantly more protecting. Second striking observation was that boys and girls from social class I, II and III reported no gender based parental (mother and father) differential attitude on symbolic reward, loving, object reward, rejecting, object punishment, demanding, indifferent and neglecting domains of parent-adolescent relationship. However, girls from social class IV perceived their parents to be significantly more rejecting, indifferent and neglecting and mothers in particular to be more demanding and practicing object punishment. Whereas, boys from social class IV reported parents to be significantly more symbolically rewarding, loving and object rewarding and fathers in particular to

be more demanding and practicing object punishment.

Protecting means safeguarding or shielding someone against damage, injury, criticism, hurt or danger. The parents are more protective of their daughters than sons in all social classes. The probable reason for this might be that the parents consider sons to be biologically stronger and capable of defending themselves in adverse situations than their daughters. Girls in contrast to boys are more tender minded, sensitive and thus are perceived as more vulnerable to getting easily hurt. Moreover in recent times, the incidences of assaults, shaming and so on against girls have increased which adds to parental fear for their daughters to be subject to such crimes. It was reported that parenting by both fathers as well as mothers varied significantly according to the sex of their adolescent, as with daughters they were more protecting but with sons they were more punishing and strict [18]. Earlier research has shown that parents are generally more worried about their daughters than about their sons, and this has been disagreed to be an essential reason why girls are also more controlled by parents [19]. It was reported no significant difference was found when protecting dimension was compared to the gender of the adolescent [20].

Symbolic Punishment is achieved through labeling or stigmatizing certain actions or qualities as unsociable, deviant or objectionable. The concept of time out is a major example of symbolic punishment. No gender difference was seen in this domain of parent-adolescent relationship. The probable reason for this might be that the parents from social classes I,II and III know ways to acknowledge child's feelings. The parents of these social classes are comparatively much educated with broader intellect to use symbolic punishment as opportunity to the child to help him regulate his emotions and reconnect with positive state of mind. However, in social class IV, no gender difference seen on this component might be because the culture is more of object punishment not symbolic punishment. The parents of this social class juggling over fulfilling day to day requirements of the family do not have energy and patience to understand that misconduct by children may sometimes be acts of expression of lack of connect in parent-child relationship. They sometimes fail to understand that strong parent-child bonding instead of blaming and judging is the key to help children

follow parental lead. It was indicated that girls and boys differ significantly in their symbolic punishment and object punishment areas of the mother-child relationship. Boys in contrast to girls reported mothers to be significantly more symbolically punitive and object punitive [21].

Symbolic Reward is expression of appreciation in the form of love, care, affection and acceptance towards the child for acting in an adequate socially approved manner. Appreciation is acknowledgment not based on evaluation, but based on the intrinsic trait of the person. No gender difference was seen in social class I,II and III in this domain of parent-adolescent relationship. However, in social class IV, boys in contrast to girls reported parents to be more symbolically rewarding. The probable reason for this might be that parents of social class IV have more acceptance for boys because they consider girls a burden. Therefore, modest achievement of boys is cherished whereas, accomplishment of girls in any field is not duly acknowledged.

Love refers to the degree of expression of fondness, trust, devoted attachment and care shown to the child. Girls and boys of social classes I, II and III reported no gender difference in love from parents. This is probably because parents of these social classes value and are appreciative of distinctive qualities of both the genders. Whereas, boys in comparison to girls of social class IV reported parents to be more loving probably because of preference for boys over girls. It was reported that lower-SES families show more gender-differentiated parenting than middle-class families [22]. It was concluded that girls are satisfied with parent-child relationship than boys [23]. It was mentioned that upper middle class mothers were warmer and demonstrative and children revealed positive attitude towards their parental treatment [24].

Object Reward refers to physical, tangible, concrete action of warmth for emotional, psychological security of a child. It indicates the parent's acceptance of the child. Girls and boys of social class I, II and III reported no gender difference in object reward by parents. The probable reason might be that parents of these social classes try to put equal efforts and investments in terms of material, time, energy and so on irrespective of gender so that the children might not feel resentment and jealousy with one another. This is one example of effective parenting. Whereas, in social class IV boys in comparison to girls reported parents to

Table 1. Gender differences in adolescents' perception of their relationship with mother in families from different social classes of G.B.P.U.A&T., Pantnagar

Mother-adolescent relationship	Social class I (n ₁ =40)			Social class II (n ₂ =40)			Social class III (n ₃ =40)			Social class IV (n ₄ =40)		
	Girls (n _{1a} =20)	Boys (n _{2a} =20)	Z	Girls (n _{1b} =18)	Boys (n _{2b} =22)	Z	Girls (n _{1c} =11)	Boys (n _{2c} =29)	Z	Girls (n _{1d} =14)	Boys (n _{2d} =26)	Z
	Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D)		Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D)		Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D)		Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D)	
Positive domains												
Protecting	45.35 (24.04)	41.95 (24.20)	2.97*	45.26 (26.86)	41.92 (20.57)	2.90**	41.37 (20.08)	38.00 (18.90)	1.98*	37.64 (18.81)	35.77 (17.08)	1.96*
Symbolic Punishment	33.85 (17.90)	34.57 (17.57)	1.36	33.45 (17.57)	35.50 (18.07)	1.69	28.00 (14.08)	30.00 (15.05)	1.09	26.50 (12.98)	27.33 (15.08)	1.79
Symbolic Reward	43.20 (23.05)	43.80 (21.06)	1.88	45.03 (22.86)	45.52 (22.96)	0.93	33.90 (16.98)	34.02 (17.97)	1.76	17.14 (8.08)	27.55 (13.22)	2.93**
Loving	39.75 (19.87)	39.99 (20.41)	1.27	39.38 (19.06)	40.12 (21.86)	1.03	36.35 (18.08)	37.10 (20.98)	1.50	36.21 (19.48)	45.67 (22.37)	3.43**
Object Reward	37.95 (18.26)	38.70 (19.03)	1.24	37.22 (18.33)	38.65 (19.97)	1.51	29.45 (14.98)	30.65 (15.02)	1.08	14.50 (7.28)	20.25 (10.08)	3.17**
Negative domains												
Rejecting	17.40 (8.98)	18.48 (9.79)	1.82	17.45 (8.78)	18.50 (9.26)	1.89	19.52 (9.81)	20.00 (11.08)	1.67	37.00 (18.89)	31.00 (15.84)	3.72**
Object punishment	18.75 (9.02)	19.90 (12.06)	1.41	18.77 (9.31)	19.90 (10.87)	1.29	19.14 (9.41)	20.72 (11.90)	1.13	39.36 (18.39)	33.30 (16.41)	3.29**
Demanding	34.94 (16.50)	35.18 (17.10)	1.09	33.87 (16.90)	34.15 (17.10)	1.38	29.45 (15.90)	30.74 (16.38)	1.72	28.34 (13.20)	22.55 (11.25)	3.99**
Indifferent	23.45 (12.80)	22.40 (11.22)	1.27	28.85 (14.40)	27.53 (13.25)	1.13	38.27 (19.10)	37.79 (17.40)	1.07	38.37 (19.18)	32.92 (15.42)	3.09**
Neglecting	25.80 (12.90)	26.46 (13.20)	1.49	25.83 (12.89)	26.58 (14.27)	1.53	29.17 (15.08)	30.82 (16.05)	1.47	35.50 (17.30)	23.00 (11.90)	4.09**

Significance at **p<0.01 and *p<.05 level of significance

Table 2. Gender differences in adolescents' perception of their relationship with father in families from different social classes of G.B.P.U.A&T., Pantnagar

Father-adolescent relationship	Social class I (n ₁ =40)			Social class II (n ₂ =40)			Social class III (n ₃ =40)			Social class IV (n ₄ =40)		
	Girls (n _{1a} =20)	Boys (n _{2a} =20)	Z	Girls (n _{1b} =18)	Boys (n _{2b} =22)	Z	Girls (n _{1c} =11)	Boys (n _{2c} =29)	Z	Girls (n _{1d} =14)	Boys (n _{2d} =26)	Z
	Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D)		Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D)		Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D)		Mean (S.D)	Mean (S.D)	
Positive domains												
Protecting	47.54 (21.08)	41.90 (20.98)	2.09**	47.50 (23.57)	41.81 (21.83)	2.71**	40.95 (20.57)	37.10 (18.03)	2.06**	36.35 (18.97)	34.00 (17.07)	1.99*
Symbolic Punishment	41.50 (20.90)	42.90 (21.97)	1.14	41.21 (20.56)	43.90 (21.96)	1.09	37.17 (18.99)	37.90 (19.94)	1.69	16.33 (8.26)	17.45 (9.23)	1.08
Symbolic Reward	40.85 (20.89)	41.63 (21.36)	0.93	40.59 (20.31)	41.10 (21.01)	1.24	34.58 (17.42)	35.38 (17.29)	1.09	15.38 (7.40)	18.42 (9.21)	2.05**
Loving	39.95 (19.47)	40.09 (20.04)	1.07	39.75 (19.37)	40.15 (21.33)	0.43	39.74 (19.37)	40.01 (21.89)	1.07	38.31 (19.15)	40.07 (20.87)	1.97*
Object Reward	36.25 (18.13)	37.70 (18.86)	0.94	40.59 (20.08)	41.10 (20.91)	1.24	34.58 (17.28)	35.38 (17.11)	1.06	25.38 (12.22)	34.42 (17.29)	5.05**
Negative domains												
Rejecting	20.00 (10.48)	19.98 (8.96)	0.75	21.58 (10.35)	20.44 (9.23)	1.09	31.00 (16.05)	30.90 (14.46)	1.36	39.00 (19.95)	31.00 (15.58)	5.04**
Object punishment	18.85 (9.01)	19.85 (9.99)	1.24	18.88 (9.91)	19.88 (10.54)	1.70	25.98 (12.98)	26.78 (13.91)	1.08	28.30 (14.01)	33.30 (16.90)	4.84**
Demanding	34.95 (16.99)	35.45 (17.81)	1.36	34.82 (17.49)	35.98 (18.05)	1.02	27.31 (13.95)	28.31 (14.05)	1.19	21.65 (11.49)	28.55 (15.25)	3.05**
Indifferent	21.84 (10.15)	20.63 (9.59)	1.28	24.99 (13.25)	24.08 (12.91)	1.39	32.84 (17.95)	32.00 (16.05)	1.46	34.92 (17.45)	32.92 (16.59)	1.99*
Neglecting	18.50 (9.44)	18.80 (9.93)	1.05	18.46 (9.26)	18.66 (9.47)	1.31	22.00 (11.06)	19.17 (9.66)	1.71	29.00 (15.56)	23.00 (11.99)	2.71**

Significance at **p<0.01 and *p<.05 level of significance

be more object rewarding probably because parents of this social class perceive boys to be their rightful heir, carry forward family's name and is expected to care for them in their old age.

Object punishment refers to the act by which parents show their temporary annoyance and anger with the child by using physical means. Girls and boys of social class I, II and III reported no gender difference in object punishment by parents probably because in these classes parents don't deem corporal punishment as necessary for disciplining the child. It was reported that girls of middle class families are more obedient as compared to upper class families [25]. Over the past 30 years, public support for corporal punishment has declined sharply in terms of parents' actual use of physical discipline [26]. On the contrary, in social class IV boys in contrast to girls reported fathers to be more object punitive and girls in contrast to boys reported mothers to be objectively punitive. Usually, in social class IV fathers exert more control over boys because they do not recognize girls as permanent family asset. Whereas, mothers are objectively more punitive towards girls because in this social class, mothers are often singled out as being solely responsible for transferring values, customs, and so on to girls. It was reported that lower socioeconomic status (SES) parents spank and use other forms of physical discipline more often than higher SES parents [27], whereas higher SES families are more likely than their lower SES counterparts to use discipline strategies that include reasoning and promote child autonomy [28]. Biosocial theory proposes that parental control of girls is characterized by kindness, consideration of others' perspectives, empathy, and interpersonal closeness (e.g., using autonomy-supportive strategies), whereas parental control of boys is characterized by power, assertiveness, aggressiveness, and dominance (e.g., using controlling strategies) [29]. Results revealed that sons in contrast to daughters perceived parents to be more demanding and giving more object punishment. On the other hand, daughters in contrast to sons perceived their fathers to be more protecting and mothers to be more loving and symbolic reward giving. Adolescents perceived their mothers more symbolically punitive as well as more loving towards them than their fathers. Also, sons perceived their mothers to be more protecting and less neglecting than their fathers [30]. In the lower socioeconomic status, the level of warmth is lower and degree of control is reported as higher

by children [31]. Boys scored significantly higher on object punishment than girls [21].

Demanding the behavior of making others work hard or meet high standards, not easily satisfied and self is focused more. Girls and boys of social classes I, II and III reported no difference in demanding domain of their parent-adolescent relationship. Parents of these social classes put equal efforts in proving for developmental needs of children of both genders, so they are equally demanding, and responsive towards their needs. On the contrary, in social class IV boys in contrast to girls reported fathers to be more demanding and girls in comparison to boys reported mothers to be more demanding. The probable reason behind this is related to accomplishing expected gender roles. Either parent is demanding of meeting expected standards of their respective chores.

Indifferent is having no preference or being uninterested. Neglect is the expression of avoidance, rude behavior and less concern shown to the person. Neglect encompasses desertion, lack of adequate guidance and direction, unable to cater essential developmental needs; and failure to provide necessary education, medical care, nourishment, shelter, and/or clothing. The probable reason for neglect and indifference in parental attitude towards girls in social class IV might be lack of education, awareness and parenting skills. The parents of this social class have deep rooted gender stereotypes in their minds affecting their ways of dealing with emotional and psychological needs of the girl child. The girls are often denied of the right to have a voice and speak up for themselves, and be recognized. Rejecting is behavior evident in rejecting the child in aversion. This nature indicated in being disdainful and in outright refusal of the child. Parental acceptance was positively related with control, intimacy and admiration whereas rejection was positively related with conflict [32]. The probable reason for parents of social class IV to be rejecting towards girls might be that they consider the girl child a burden rather than responsibility. This social class has a cultural preference for boys. Parents of this social class might posit that as girls grow up, their rearing requires additional responsibilities of care and safeguarding thereby causing financial burden to the family reserves which could have been used for something which is considered an investment. It was concluded that girls report that they have more conflicts with their parents than boys, although having conflicts

with parents was only found to be associated with offending for boys [4]. Further, the girls reported being more closely monitored than the boys. It was revealed that the lower middle class children have higher scores on maternal indifference / neglect aggression and control than middle class children [33].

4. CONCLUSION

Gender differences were more prominently seen in social class IV where girls in contrast to boys perceived their parents to be significantly more neglecting, rejecting, and indifferent towards them. On the contrary, boys from this social class reported parents to be significantly more symbolically rewarding, loving and object rewarding. It is evident that social class plays a major role in moderating the effect of adolescent's gender in parental attitude. The most obvious reason behind it might be that in families with low SES boys are much more celebrated than girls. Socio economic status serves as an intervening variable that contributes to unique influences on gender based differences in parent-adolescent relationship.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Wood W, Eagly AH. Biosocial construction of sex differences and similarities in behavior. In Olson JM, Zanna MP, editors. *Advances in experimental social Psychology*. Burlington: Academic Press. 2012;46:55–123.
2. Videon T. Parent-child relations and children's psychological well-being. *J Family Issues*. 2005;26:55-78.
3. Collins WA, Laursen B. Changing relationships, changing youth: Interpersonal contexts of adolescent development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. 2004;24:55-62.
4. Coolahan K, McWayne C, Fantuzzo J. Validation of multidimensional assessment of parenting styles for low-income African-American families with preschool children. *Early Childhood Res Quarterly*. 2002;17: 356-373.
5. Sharma M. Effect of gender and academic achievement on mother child relationship. *Internat. J. Soc. Sci. & Interdisciplinary Res*. 2012;1:39-51.
6. Sangwan S. Adolescents' perception of parental attitude. *Psycho-lingua*. 2002; 32:47-49.
7. Singh S, Moorjhani JD, Purohit S, Geryani M, Tanwar P. Perceived parental behavior in relation to personality patterns among XI and XII grade adolescents. *Indian Psychol Rev*. 2007;68:195-206.
8. Shaban S, Mattoo NH. A comparative study on adolescent-parent relationship among boys and girls in a rural setting. *Stud Home Com Sci*. 2012;6(2):121-125.
9. Leaper C, Anderson KJ, Sanders P. Moderators of gender effects on parents' talk to their children: a meta-analysis. *Dev Psychol*. 1998;34(1):3-27.
10. Junger-Tas J, Ribeaud D, Cruyff MJLF. Juvenile delinquency and gender. *European Journal of Criminology*. 2004;1: 333–375.
11. Manhas S, Kour G. Perceived parenting during adolescence in context of parents and adolescents sex. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*. 2014;4:8.
12. Steinberg L, Mounts N, Lamborn S, Dornbusch S. Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment across various ecological niches. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 1991:19-36.
13. Meraj S. Intelligence, social competence and parental attitudes in normal and deviant children. Ph.D. Dissertation, ICSSRA, India; 1983.
14. Chen X, Wu H, Chen H, Wang L, Chen G. Parenting practices and aggressive behavior in Chinese children. *Parent Sci Pract*. 2001;1:159–184.
15. Youniss J, Smollar J. *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers and friends*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; 1985.
16. Kaur H, Kalaram A. To assess the level of parent-child relationship (Father and mother) of adolescent by age and sex. *J. Hum. Ecol*. 2004;15(3):203-206.
17. Formoso D, Gonzales NA, Aiken LS. Family conflict and children's internalizing and externalizing behavior: Protective factors. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2000;28:175–199
18. Eddy JM, Leve LD, Fagot BI. Coercive family processes: A replication and extension of Patterson's coercion model. *Aggress Behav*. 2001;27:14–25.
19. Tein JY, Roosa MW, Michaels M. Agreement between parent and child

- reports on parental behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*.1994;56(2):341–355.
20. Serbin LA, Zerkowitz P, Doyle AB, Gold D, Wheaton B. The socialization of sex-differentiated skills and academic performance: A meditational model. *Sex Roles*. 1990;23:613–628.
 21. Wadkar AJ, Palasane MN. Sex-differences in child's perception of Parent-child relations. *Journal of psychological researches*.1987;31(3):160-165.
 22. Sharma M. Effect of gender and academic achievement on mother child relationship. *Internat. J. Soc. Sci. & Interdisciplinary Res*. 2012;1:39-51.
 23. Bagga I, Saini S. An analysis of parent-child relationship as perceived by adolescents. *Advance Research Journal of Social Science*. 2017;8(2):188-193.
 24. Bhaskar R, Komal, M. Influence of socioeconomic status on protecting behavior of parents. *Internattional Journal of Multidisciplinary Res. Dev*. 2015;2:648-651.
 25. Ravi P, Rayalu TR. Parenting styles as perceived by parents and adolescents. *Indian Psychol. Rev. Special Issue*. 2007;69:249-252.
 26. Sinha S, Mishra RC. Do parenting behavior patterns contribute to parent-child relationship? *Psychol. Stud*. 2007;52:37-44.
 27. Straus MA, Stewart JH. Corporal punishment by American parents: National data on prevalence, chronicity, severity, and duration, in relation to child and family characteristics. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*. 1999;2(2):55-70.
 28. Zolotor AJ, Theodore AD, Runyan DK, Chang JJ, Laskey AL. Corporal punishment and physical abuse: population-based trends for threeto-11-year-old children in the United States. *Child Abuse Rev*. 2011;20(1):57–66.
 29. Jahangir SF, Tahir SA. Parental acceptance-rejection and schooling status: Contributory factors to self-concept development of a Child. *Pakistan Journal of Psychology Research*. 1999;14(3):105-114.
 30. Videon T. Parent-child relations and children's psychological well-being. *J Family Issues*. 2005;26:55-78.
 31. Rai RN, Pandey RC, Kumar K. Perceived parental rearing style and personality among khasi adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*. 2009;35:57-60.
 32. Imam F. Perceived maternal warmth and personality disposition of high and low achieving girls in Karachi. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*. 2004;19(1): 51-60.
 33. Brown BB. Adolescents' relationships with peers. In RM Lerner and L Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. Hoboken NJ: Wiley. 2004; 363-394.

© 2019 Kumari et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/49839>