

A Study On Family Climate Of Urban And Rural Adolescents

Dr. Narasimharaju.N

Associate Professor, PG Dept. of Psychology, Maharanis Arts College for women Mysore

How to cite this article: Narasimharaju.N (2024). A Study On Family Climate Of Urban And Rural Adolescents. *Library Progress International*, 44(3), 21842-21848.

Abstract

The family climate can be portrayed according to the interpersonal relationships among the family members, the directions of the personal growth which are emphasized in the system, and the family's basic organizational structure. The objective of the current study is to understand the family climate of urban and rural adolescents. The sample comprised of 120 students of age range 16 to 18 years 60 each from urban and rural areas. The tool used for the purpose of assessing Family Climate is Family Climate Inventory. The obtained results were analyzed using Two-way Analysis of Variance. The findings indicate that urban and rural adolescents differ significantly in the Family Supervision and Family Expression of love. The results also revealed that there is no significant difference between the urban and rural adolescents in their family support and family functioning. Significant gender difference has been noted in the family support received. In other areas such as family supervision, family expression of love and family functioning boys and girls did not differ significantly.

Key words: Family Climate, Family Supervision, Family Expression of love, Family Support, Family Functioning.

1.1 Introduction

Family is a constellation of subsystems defined in terms of generation, gender and role. Division of labor among family members define particular subunits and attachments define others (Minuchin, 2002). Human beings are social organisms and they need a family or someone who can accompany them in their journey of life, especially during the beginning days of their lives that is after their birth when they are completely dependent on others. Hence family is an important part in normal development of an individual from birth till death. The major influence of family occurs from childhood and extends to adolescence wherein an individual is undergoing innumerable number of physical and psychological changes. The adolescents are therefore extremely vulnerable in this phase of life, hence it is the responsibility of the parents to create a congenial atmosphere in the family so that the adolescents feel free to share their personal issues with them. Proper guidance and understanding is very much essential during this transitional period. A number of previous studies highlighted the importance of good parent-child communication during the adolescent phase of life (Deb and Chatterjee, 2008; Grych, 2002).

Adolescence is the period of development from the onset of puberty to the attainment of adulthood. The Adolescence period is categorized into three groups: Early adolescence (10-13 yrs.), Middle adolescence (14- 18 yrs.) and late adolescence (19-22 yrs.) (Arnett, 2000; Kagan & Coles, 1972). The environment of an adolescent has an effect on their cognitive, behavioral and career development. Hence family environment and parental care are crucial for positive mental, social and personality development of the children and adolescents. The parental style also contributes to the health of the adolescents as indicated in the study conducted by Anchal (2012) where adolescents brought up using authoritative parenting style had less physical health and fitness problem when compared to authoritarian and permissive parenting style. The Adolescents render great benefits when they are in families with stable and adaptively functioning parental relationships. The parents who are having a cordial marital relationship are found to be more sensitive, responsive, warm and affectionate towards their children and adolescents (Grych, 2002).

Family with Adolescence is the fourth stage in the family life cycle, in which adolescence push for autonomy and an identity. It is a lengthy process, transpiring over at least 10-15 years. The Compliant children may become non-compliant adolescence. In response, parents may either clampdown, pressuring the adolescence to conform to parental values or become more permissive giving the adolescent extensive freedom, neither of which are considered to be wise strategy for parenting. A flexible, adaptive approach is best suited for adolescence (Santrock, J.W, 2007). The Family Climate of an adolescent majorly includes Supervision by the members of the family, expression of love by the members of family, the support provided by the members of the family and the way the family functions. The supervision of the family members may be accepted by the adolescents when it is done in the authoritative style, as indicated in the study conducted by Reuter and Conger (1995) which indicates that authoritative parents establish an appropriate balance between control and autonomy, giving children and adolescents opportunities to develop independence while providing the standards, limits and guidance that children need. It is found that authoritative parenting has a positive relationship with the aspects of development (Steinberg & Silk; 2002). The child-rearing practices differ in urban and rural regions, as indicated by Seth, Saksena and Srivastava (1978) which showed that the rural mother's fostered dependency. The love expressed by the family members is very important for the adolescents, the studies indicate that the warmth and parental involvement provided by authoritative parents make the child more receptive to parental influence (Sim, 2000). The authoritative parents are more likely to engage their children in verbal give-and-take and allow children to express their views (Kuczynski & Lollis, 2002), this type of family discussion is likely to help children to understand the social relationships and to become a socially competent person.

With the above background, the present study is an attempt to understand the difference in the family climate of adolescents hailing from urban and rural families.

Method Hypothesis

H1: There is no significant difference in the Supervision, Expression of Love, Support and Functioning of families of urban and rural adolescents.

H2: Males and females do not differ significantly in the Family Supervision, Family Expression of Love, Family Support and Family Functioning.

1.2 Research Design

The 2 X 2 Factorial research design is used for the present study.

1.3 Inclusion Criteria

The late adolescents aged between 16-18 years from rural and urban families were considered for the study.

1.4 Sample

The sample comprised of 120 students belonging to the age range of 16-18 years. The purposive sampling method was used to collect data from 60 adolescents each from Mysore and Tiptur taluk representing the urban and rural population. Among the 60 adolescents representing each region, 30 were males and 30 were females.

1.5 Tool

Family Climate Inventory- Family climate inventory was developed by Kurdek, et.al in 1995. It comprises of four areas with six statements in each area. It is a seven point rating scale. In case of first three areas namely, Family Supervision, Family Expression of Love and Family Support the higher score indicates the favorable family climate, whereas for the Family Functioning area the lower score indicates good family functioning.

1.6 Procedure

The purpose of the study was explained to the participants. The participant's willingness to participate in the study was ascertained after the establishment of rapport. They were briefed about the inventory and were provided with clear instructions. After the completion of administration, the inventories were collected and were checked for any kind of omissions. Then the scoring was done based on the ratings given as responses in each of the areas and

interpreted.

Analysis of data: The statistical analysis of data was done using two-way ANOVA.

1.7 Result and Discussion:

Table 1: The summary of Two-way ANOVA for Family Supervision.

Source of Variance	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F-value	Significance
Locality	456.30	1	456.30	8.319	0.005
Gender	19.200	1	19.200	0.350	0.555
Interaction (Locality X Gender)	246.53	1	246.53	4.495	0.036

Table 2: The Mean score, Standard deviation for the Family Supervision area.

Locality	Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Urban	Males	28.70	9.22	30
	Females	26.63	7.99	30
	Total	27.67	8.62	60
Rural	Males	29.73	5.83	30
	Females	33.40	6.021	30
	Total	31.57	6.16	60
Total	Males	29.22	7.67	60
	Females	30.02	7.80	60
	Total	29.62	7.71	120

The hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the Family Supervision of urban and rural adolescents was tested using Two-way ANOVA. The obtained F value is 8.319 which is significant. The result obtained indicates that there is a significant difference between the urban and rural adolescents. The mean score indicates that the rural adolescents are supervised more by their family when compared to urban adolescents. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that there is a significant difference between urban and rural adolescents in family supervision. The hypothesis which states that there is no significant gender difference in the Family Supervision was tested using Two-way ANOVA. The obtained result (F=0.350) reveals that there is no significant difference in the family supervision for the adolescent males and

females. Thus the null hypothesis is accepted. The previous study conducted by Bhattacharyya and Deb indicates that girls experience more parental interference in personal matters when compared to boys. There is also a study by Kaur et.al (2009) which indicates that male adolescents perceived their parents significantly had more control upon them when compared to their female counterparts. There is a significant interaction effect between the locality and gender on family supervision.

Table 3: The summary of Two-way ANOVA for the Family Expression of Love area.

Source of Variance	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F- Value	Significance
Locality	343.40	1	343.40	5.865	0.017
Gender	161.008	1	161.008	2.750	0.100
Interaction (Locality X Gender)	1.875	1	1.875	0.858	0.858

Table 4: The Mean score, Standard deviation for the Family Expression of Love area.

Locality	Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Urban	Males	31.37	8.42	30
	Females	33.43	9.49	30
	Total	32.40	8.96	60
Rural	Males	34.50	5.78	30
	Females	37.07	6.29	30
	Total	35.78	6.13	60
Total	Males	32.93	7.33	60
	Females	35.25	8.19	60
	Total	34.09	7.83	120

The hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the Family Expression of Love among urban and rural adolescents was analyzed using Two-way ANOVA. The Result ($F=5.86$) indicates that there is a significant difference between the urban and rural adolescents. The adolescents hailing from rural families have higher mean score when compared to adolescents from urban families, exhibiting that the adolescents from rural families are shown more affection than the adolescents from the urban families. Therefore, the result obtained is contradictory to the null hypothesis and is in accordance to the alternate hypothesis which states that there is a significant difference in the family expression of love among urban and rural adolescents. The hypothesis stating that there is no significant gender difference in the Family Expression of Love among adolescents is accepted, as the result ($F=2.75$) indicates there is no significant difference among males and females in this area. In the study conducted

by Kaur et al. (2009) it is found that

Male adolescents felt rejected and perceived their parents to be depriving them from certain privileges such as their rights to seek love, respect and child care from parents when compared to females. The interaction between the locality (urban and rural) and the gender (males and females) are not significant. The insignificant interaction of the locality and gender indicates that the Family Expression of Love among adolescents is not affected by gender and region to which they belong.

Table 5: The summary of Two-way ANOVA for the Family Support area

Source of Variance	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F- Value	Significance
Locality	28.033	1	28.033	0.470	0.494
Gender	418.133	1	418.133	7.012	0.009
Interaction (Locality X Gender)	3.333	1	3.333	0.56	0.814

Table 6: The Mean score, Standard deviation for the Family Support area

Locality	Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Urban	Males	27.37	8.70	30
	Females	31.43	9.15	30
	Total	29.40	9.09	60
Rural	Males	28.67	6.08	30
	Females	32.07	6.47	30
	Total	30.37	6.45	60
Total	Males	28.02	7.47	60
	Females	31.75	7.86	60
	Total	29.88	7.86	120

The hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the Family Support provided to the adolescents belonging to urban and rural families was tested through Two-way ANOVA. The obtained result ($F=0.47$) revealed that there is no significant difference observed among the urban and rural adolescents, hence the null hypothesis is accepted. One of the previous studies indicate that female adolescents perceive that their parents provide significantly more material and symbolic

Rewards to strengthen or increase the probability of desired behavior expected in the social conditions when compared to males. Further it was found that male adolescents perceived an autocratic atmosphere with many

restrictions imposed on them by their parents to make them disciplined, while the female adolescents perceive that their parents are more protective when compared to their male counterparts(Kaur et al.; 2009). The Two-way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis which states that there is no significant gender difference in the Family Support provided to the adolescents. The Result ($F=7.01$) obtained in this area reveals that there is a significant gender difference among the adolescents. The mean score indicates that Females are provided with more of Family Support when compared to Male adolescents. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that there is a significant gender difference in the family support provided to the adolescents.

There is no significant interaction effect between locality and gender on family support.

Table 7: The summary of Two-way ANOVA for the Family Functioning area.

Source of Variance	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F- Value	Significance
Locality	5.63	1	5.63	0.79	0.779
Gender	28.03	1	28.03	0.39	0.532
Interaction (Locality X Gender)	28.03	1	28.03	0.39	0.532

Table 8: The Mean score, Standard deviation for the Family Functioning area.

Locality	Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Urban	Males	33.67	8.28	30
	Females	33.67	8.60	30
	Total	33.67	8.37	60
Rural	Males	33.13	9.12	30
	Females	35.07	7.74	30
	Total	34.10	8.44	60
Total	Males	33.40	8.64	60
	Females	34.37	8.14	60
	Total	33.88	8.37	120

The statistical analysis of Two-way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference in the Family Functioning of urban and rural adolescents. The obtained result ($F=0.79$) indicates that the family functioning of the adolescents is not influenced by their locality; hence the null hypothesis is accepted. The hypothesis stating that there is no significant gender difference in the Family Functioning of the adolescents is approved, as they obtained result ($F=0.39$) reveals that there is no difference in

the family functioning of adolescent males and females. There is no significant interaction in the Family Functioning of the adolescent males and females with the region they originate from. Hence, it is observed that the Family Functioning is independent of Gender and locality of an adolescent.

1.8 Conclusion

The overall findings of the present study indicate that there is a significant difference between the adolescents hailing from urban and rural families in the areas Family Supervision and Family Expression of love, wherein the adolescents from rural families have obtained higher mean score indicating that comparatively their family supervises and expresses more love towards them than the adolescents from urban families. There is no significant difference in the family support and family functioning of urban and rural adolescents.

The results also revealed that there is no significant gender difference in the way they are supervised, in the expression of love from family and also in family functioning. Significant gender difference in the family support area indicated that females are supported significantly more than the male counterpart. The study is an effort to look at the family climate of urban and rural dwelling adolescents as experienced and perceived by them. The generalization of the result can be improved by considering a large sample representing the urban and rural families.

1.9 References

- Anchal, A. (2012). Impact of Parenting Styles on Adolescent's Problem: Physical Health and Fitness. *Indian Journal of Psychology and Education*, 2: 179-182.
- Arnett, J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469-480.
- Bhattacharyya, B., & Deb, S. (July, 2012). Adolescents Perceived Family Environment and Parental Care and Support Services. *Indian Journal of Psychology and Education*, 2: 149-160.
- Bhattacharyya, S. (2012). General Conduct of the Students and Parental Attitude towards their Children as Perceived by the Teachers. *Indian Journal of Psychology and Education*, 2: 1-13.
- Grych, J.H. (2002). Marital relationships and parenting. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of Parenting* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Helgeson, V. S. (2006). *The Psychology of Gender* (2nd Ed.). India: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- Kagan, J., & Coles, R. (1972). *Twelve to sixteen: Early Adolescence*. New York: Norton.
- Kaur, J; Rana, J.S., & Kaur, R. (2009). Home Environment and Academic Achievement as correlates of self-concept among adolescents: Sex Differences in the Self-Concept in adolescence. *Studies on Home and Community Science*, 3: 13-17.
- Kuczynski, L., & Lollis, S. (2002). Four foundations for a dynamic model of parenting. In
- J.R.M. Gerris (Eds.), *Dynamics of Parenting*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Minuchin, P. (2002). Looking toward the horizon: Present and future in the study of family systems. In J.P. McHale & W.S. Grolnick (Eds.), *Retrospect and prospect in the study of families*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Reuter, M., & Conger, R. (1995). Antecedents of parent-adolescent disagreements. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 435-448.
- Santrock, J.W. *A Topical Approach To: Life-Span Development* (3rd Ed.). New Delhi: Tata McGraw- Hill Publishing Company Limited. 512-639.
- Santrock, J.W. (2007). *Adolescence* (11th Ed.). New York: Tata McGraw-Hill Edition.
- Seth, M; Saksena, N.K., & Srivastava, R. K. (1978). Child rearing attitudes of rural and urban mothers: A comparative study. *Child Psychiatry Quarterly*, 11(2), 26-30.
- Sim, T. (2000). Adolescent psychosocial competence: The important and role of regard for parents. *Journal of Research of Adolescent*, 10, 49-64.
- Steinberg, L.D., & Silk, J. S. (2002). Parenting adolescents. In M. Bornstein (Ed.),
- *Handbook of Parenting*, 2 (1).