

CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

The present study tries to understand the parenting styles and parental support among Higher Secondary School students at Government and Private institutions in Lawngtlai.

Families are social institutions that play a crucial role in individual's lives and society as a whole. Family is considered the first Institution for children because it is the place where they start learning and develop their initial education and social interactions. Parenting style refers to a set of actions, attitudes, and techniques that parents implement when parenting their children. It relates to how parents engage with, discipline, communicate, and act on their children's behaviours.

Parenting styles and parental support play a vital role in shaping adolescents' academic, social, and psychological development. Adolescence, particularly the higher secondary school period, is a critical phase marked by various changes, including cognitive, emotional, and social growth. During this period, students face increased academic demands, social challenges, and identity formation, all of which can significantly impact their overall well-being and future success. In this context, parental involvement becomes essential, as it can either facilitate or hinder students' developmental progress.

Parenting has a big impact on how teenagers, especially those in higher secondary school, grow and develop. During this stage, students face more academic pressure, social challenges, and changes in their identity. How parents support and interact with them during this time can either help or hinder their development.

Supportive parents often provide an environment where students feel safe, valued, and motivated to achieve. Parenting styles and support aim to understand how these factors shape higher secondary students' lives.

This study explores the different parenting styles and the level of parental support among higher secondary school students. By examining how various parenting approaches such as authoritative, authoritarian, and neglectful affect students' academic performance and social adjustment, the research aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role parents play in shaping adolescent outcomes.

1.1 CONCEPT OF PARENTING STYLE:

Parenting styles are methods that parents use to interact with and guide their children as they grow up. This can include areas like discipline, emotional well-being, and communication.

Parenting styles are the various methods and strategies that parents use to raise their children, influencing their development, conduct, and relationships. Each style represents an individual combination of values, beliefs, and behaviours.

CORE TYPES OF PARENTING STYLE:

1. Authoritative.

1.2 CONCEPT OF PARENTAL SUPPORT:

Parental support is a range of behaviours and actions that parents take to show their children that they are loved and accepted. Parental support refers to the involvement and assistance provided by parents in their children's education and overall development. It includes activities such as supporting school performance, communicating with children, and participating in their education

Parents who provide high levels of support are often caring, warm, and open to discussion with their children. Studies have shown that parental support can be a protective factor against substance use, depression, and anxiety in adolescents.

TYPE OF PARENTAL SUPPORT:

1. Emotional Support.
2. Esteem Support.
3. Informational Support.
4. Tangible Support.

CHAPTER-II

OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE

An overview of literature is a written summary of key texts and other materials on a certain topic. The review's sources may include scholarly journal articles, books, government papers, websites, and so on. The literature review describes, summarizes, and evaluates each source.

2.1 PARENTING STYLE

Family education generally includes parent-child relationships, parental involvement, parental education expectations and other aspects, all of which are closely related to academic achievement (Weiser & Riggio, 2010). The factor that plays a potential role in family education is parenting style, which is an important factor affecting the academic achievement of adolescents (Masud, Thurasamy, & Ahmad, 2015).

Parenting style matters for children's academic performance. The authoritative parenting style was found to be the best among all types of parenting styles. Particularly, relative to uninvolved parents' children, authoritatively reared children were predicted to have 1.1 more years of schooling and be 18.5, 13.6, and 16.3 percentage points more likely to obtain at least a bachelor's degree, associate's degree, and high school diploma, respectively. Also, they had 5.5 percentage points less likelihood of being high school dropouts than children reared by uninvolved parents.

Parenting styles are one of the significant factors in academic performance. However, there is a lack of research that integrates and systemizes the relationship between parenting styles and academic performance. The unit of analysis of this research was studies that were previously conducted on parenting styles and academic performance of young children. Parenting styles and academic performance. It was analyzed that the authoritative parenting style is the most effective in enhancing the academic performance of young children.

studies have examined whether parenting styles also affect children's behavioural problems indirectly, mediated through children's academic self-concept (ASC).

Malsawmchhungi's "Parenting Style in Ramthar Community" (2016) study reveals that family play a very important role in society or even in the community. The parents or the caretaker of the children needs to understand their problem as it has many impacts on society. If the children are taken care of with careful planning and the right approach, it helps them to develop positive life skills which help them to function effectively in a positive way within the society.

Oligo (2008) discovered the influence parenting styles and parental involvement have on student academic achievement. The research was conducted at a high school in a rural section of Tennessee. The study analyzed parenting styles and parental involvement to determine if there was a relationship with student academic achievement. A quantitative research approach was used in this study. Analysis of the data was presented through the use of correlational statistics. The results of the study found inconclusive evidence that parents at the researched high school influenced student academic achievement (Olige, 2008).

Majumder (2016) examines the causal link between parenting style and children's educational outcomes in an attempt to mitigate these shortcomings. It applied the maximum simulated likelihood approach to get rid of endogeneity, thereby isolating the causal impact of parenting style on children's educational outcomes. Findings suggested that parenting style mattered for children's academic performance. Authoritative parenting style was found to be the best among all types of parenting styles (Majumder, 2016).

Parenting styles and children's academic performance were studied by (Yang & Zhao, 2020) in middle schools in China. Based on a large sample survey of middle-school students in China, this study applies factor analysis and cluster analysis to categorize parenting styles as authoritative, permissive, authoritarian and neglectful. The findings show that the parenting styles of Chinese parents are predominantly authoritarian and neglectful; parents of higher social classes tend to adopt the permissive parenting style; the authoritative parenting style is more conducive to improving children's academic performance; parenting style has a greater effect on children from disadvantaged backgrounds; and the parenting styles of mothers play a more vital role in their children's academic performance than do the parenting styles of fathers (Yang & Zhao, 2020).

Correlations between authoritarian parenting and adjustment were either small or non-significant. Regression analyses indicated that authoritative parenting was more predictive of children's competence than maladaptation (22% versus 10% of variance). The effects of parenting style on adjustment were not moderated by demographic variables, such as the child's gender, grade level, ethnicity, and family income. (Ellis Gesten et, al., 2021)

Parenting styles and their dimensions and also to determine the relationship between self-esteem and perceived parenting style between two groups of adolescents: orphan single-parent families supported by a widowed mother and two-parent nuclear families. (Ali Alami et, al., 2014)

Parents happen to be the most powerful catalysts in promoting good mental health in their children's lives. Parents' upbringing and child-rearing styles are important factors in

parenting style and children's mental health and self-esteem and how different parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, permissive & uninvolved) affect children's mental health and self-esteem. (Singh, S, 2017)

2.2 PARENTAL SUPPORT

Parental support factors significantly contribute to the development of good self-esteem, which is statistically associated with kids' academic accomplishments. The findings of the research showed that parental involvement in their kids' education consistently and positively impacts both academic performance and self-image. (Khan Masrur Rehana et, al., 2010)

Parental support could help counter such negative developmental processes. Parental support may work differently for various teenagers based on their level of ability self-concepts; therefore, it is necessary to investigate how adolescents' ability self-concepts influence parental support. (Lee, G. et, al., 2021)

Parental support and parental involvement would each predict unique variance in both self-esteem and academic self-efficacy. These results suggest that both parental support and parental involvement are equally important to a student's academic well-being. (Gore, K et, al., 2015)

Parental support plays a crucial role in facilitating children's development. However, some parents do not support their children's cognitive development enough, which impacts their learning outcomes. (A'yun, I, M, et, al., 2024)

It shows that parental support, namely, emotional support, and family functioning are influenced by parents' gender and age. Parental emotional support is better explained by the positive association with control attempts, family cohesion and commitment, and parent's perception of quality of life, and the negative association to gender (male), rejection and coping strategies. Implications for research, prevention, and psychological intervention concerning parental skills and family functioning are presented to promote children's quality of life and health development. (Gasper, T, et, al., 2022)

Parental support within recently resettled families with a refugee background. First, there is informational support, which consists of parents giving their children advice or information to help them solve a problem or deal with an issue, such as educational challenges or difficulties in general. The second type of support is emotional support, which involves displaying love and empathy (Dagevos, J, 2024)

2.1. Statement of the Problem:

Parents are the most crucial influences on their children's lives and growth. To help their children, parents may be more concerned with their children's education than with their own. Parents must be involved and supportive in their children's daily lives. Children also want to understand how parenting styles influence their academic success, behaviours, actions and well-being. Studying the parenting style and parental support among the students will give insights into the parenting style adopted by the family.

2.2. Objectives:

2. To access the mean score of parental support.
3. To study the relationship between parenting style and parental support.
4. To assess the differences in Parenting style and Support across genders and types of institutions.

CHAPTER-III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design:

The study was conducted in a descriptive research design.

3.2. Sampling:

A multistage sampling procedure was followed to select district, school and respondents. The district, Lawngtlai was chosen as the sampling area for this study on parenting styles and parental support due to its unique cultural and socio-economic setting, which may influence parenting practices. The community in Lawngtlai provides a rich context for examining the interplay between traditional values and modern parenting approaches. Additionally, focusing on this area can highlight specific challenges and strengths in parental support, offering insights that can inform locally relevant interventions and policies.

3.3 Tools of data collection:

Primary data was collected using the quantitative method through a Semi-structured interview schedule.

3.4. Data processing and analysis

The collected data was processed using MS Word and Excel files, data analysis was done with SPSS.

3.5 Field Settings:

Lawngtlai is a town located in the southern part of Mizoram, India. The distance between Lawngtlai and Lungeli is 78.0km from Lunglei, and 296km from the State Capital Aizawl. Lawngtlai was established by Haihmunga Hlawncheu, a Lai Chief, in 1880 at present Vengpui. Later it was declared a district on 18th September 1998. The current estimated population of Lawngtlai Town in 2024 is approximately 35,200. There are 7556 households and 56 churches. In Lawngtlai there are 3 Hospitals, 5 Banks, 5 NGOs, 1 Postal, 1 Police Station, 1 College and a total of 7 Private and Government Higher Secondary Schools.

There are 169 villages in Lawngtlai district. Lawngtlai District covers an area of 2557 sq. km and has Autonomous District Council, viz. Lai Autonomous District Council. The Lai Autonomous District Council takes up the Education sector within the district up to the Elementary level and in addition to the general subjects taught at other schools, the schools within Lawngtlai District have Laica as a subject up to Middle School (VIII standard) to study and better understand the Lai language. The pin code of Lawngtlai is 796891.

The unit of the study was conducted among the Lawngtlai Government school and private school students.

To select schools both government and private settings were chosen as the focus for this study on parenting styles and parental support in Lawngtlai due to their significant role in shaping children's academic, social, and emotional development. These institutions act as a bridge between parents and children, providing a valuable environment to observe and analyse the level of parental support. Including both government and private schools ensures that the study captures a diverse range of socio-economic, cultural, and institutional factors that may impact parenting practices. This approach allows for a comparative analysis between the two settings, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of how parental support varies.

The respondents are selected from Higher Secondary Schools in Government and Private settings in Lawngtlai. Disproportionate Stratified random sampling method was used to select respondents. The sample size is 40 respondents, 20 respondents from Government Schools and 20 respondents from Private Schools.

CHAPTER-IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses a study of parenting styles and parental support among Higher Secondary School students in Lawngtlai in various aspects.

4.1 Profile of the respondents:

1. Age: From the total number of 40 respondents, the average age of the respondents in the present study is 18.05.

2. Gender: It is observed from Table 4.1 SL/no-2 that the total number of 40 respondents in the present study, half of the respondents are male (50%), and the other half of the respondents are female (50%).

3. Education Standard: Regarding Educational qualification, table 4.1 SL/No.-3 shows that all the respondents are from class 12 standards.

4. Academic Performance: The academic performance in the HSLC in this study is classified into Distinction, I Division, II Division and III Division. It is observed that two-fifths of the respondents (40%) reported that they passed HSLC in III Division, constituting the highest followed by a little more than one-fourth of the respondents(27%) passed in II Division, one-fourth of the respondents(25%) passed in I Division and the remaining a little less than tenth of the respondents(7%) had passed their HSLC in Distinction.

5. Types of Institution: The type of institution in the present study is classified into Government and Private Institutions. Table 4.1 SL/No-5 shows that out of the total respondents, half of the respondents (50%) are from Government institutions and the other half of the respondents (50%) are from Private Institutions.

Table 4.1 Profile of the Respondents

Particulars

Mean

1.

Age

Average age

18.05

SL/No.

Particulars

Frequency

Per cent

2.

Gender

Male

20

50

Female

20

50

3.

Education Standard

Class XII

40

100.0

Class XI

40

0

4.

Distinction

3

7.5

I Division

10

25.0

II Division

11

27.5

III Division

16

40.0

5.

Types of Institution

Government

20

50.0

Private

20

50.0

(Source: Computed)

4.2. Socio-Economic Status:

1. Socio-Economic Status: The socio-economic status of the family was classified into three categories such as Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY), Private Household (PHH) and non-National Food Security Act (non-NFSA). Table 4.2 SL/No-1 shows that out of the total respondents, more than two-fifths of the respondents (45%) belong to Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY), followed by a little less than one-third of the respondents (32%) belonging to non-NFSA and the remaining a little more than one-fifth of the respondents (22%) belongs to PHH.

2. Father's Occupation: The father's occupation in the present study is classified into

one-third of the respondents(17%) choosing the category others which are drivers and mechanics, more than a tenth of the respondent's fathers(15%) works as a Farmer, a little higher than a tenth are Businessmen (12%), and the remaining less than a tenth of the respondent's fathers(5%) works as a Labor.

3. Mother's Occupation: The mother's occupation in the present study is classified into Government Job, Business, Housewife, Labor, Farmer, Unemployed and Others. From the total participants, more than one-fourth of the respondent's mothers (32.5%) are housewives, which is followed by Farmer (17%), and more than a tenth are in the category of Others (15%) such as beauticians and staff an NGO, tenth of the respondent's mothers (10%) involved in Business, another tenth works as Government Job (10%) and tenth of the respondent's mothers (10%) works as a Labor and the remaining less than tenth respondent's mothers (5%) were unemployed.

Table 4.2 Socio-Economic Status

SL/no

Particulars

Frequency

Per cent

1.

Socio-Economic Status

AAY

18

45.0

PHH

9

22.5

non-NFSA

13

32.5

2.

No. of Working Member

1

7

2

27

67.5

3

4

10.0

4

2

5.0

3.

Father's Occupation

Government Job

16

40.0

Business

5

12.5

Labour

2

5.0

Farmer

6

15.0

Others

7

17.5

4.

Government Job

4

10.0

Business

4

10.0

Labour

4

10.0

Farmer

7

17.5

Housewife

13

32.5

Unemployed

2

5.0

Others

6

15.0

(Source: Computed)

1. Family Details

1. Size of the Family Member: The size of the family of the respondent in the present study is categorized into four categories i.e., small family (below 3), Medium family (4-6), and large family (7 above). It is observed that a little less than half of the respondents (47%) belong to large family size, two-fifths of the respondents (40%) are in the category of medium family size, followed by the remaining a little more than a tenth are in the category of small family size.

2. Family Income: The Family Income of the respondent is categorized into four categories i.e., small family (below 3), Medium family (4-6), and large family (7 above). It is observed that a little less than half of the respondents (47%) belong to large family size, two-fifths of the respondents (40%) are in the category of medium family size, followed by the remaining a little more than a tenth are in the category of small family size.

to the nuclear family whereas the remaining one-fifth of respondents (20%) belong to the joint family.

3. Forms of Family: The forms of the family of the respondents in the present study are categorised into stable, broken and reconstituted. It is found that a great majority of the respondents (85%) are from a stable family, followed by a broken family with little more than a tenth (12.5%), and the remaining a bit less than a tenth of the respondents (2.5%) are from reconstitute family.

4. Mother's Qualification: In terms of mother's qualification, it is seen that half of the respondent's mothers have the qualification of High School Standard (HSLC), followed by the qualification of HSSLC with little more than one-fifth of respondents (22.5%), and a little more than a tenth have the qualification of Middle school standard(12%) and the remaining tenth respondents (10%) are Under-Graduate (UG).

5. Father's Qualification: With regards to father's qualification, the largest number of a little more than one-third of the respondents claim that their father's educational qualification is high school (35%) followed by a little less than one-third having their educational qualification is HSSLC (32%). There is an equivalent number of respondent's fathers whose educational qualification is Primary School (12%) and Graduate (12%). While very few respondents said that their Father's Educational Qualification is Intermediate or diploma (10%) and Professional or Honours level (3%), none of the respondent's Fathers are illiterate.

Table 4.3 Family Details

SL/no	Particulars	Frequency
	Per cent	
1.	Family Size	
	Small family (Below 3)	
5		
12.5		
	Medium family (4-6)	
16		
40.0		
	Large family (7 Above)	

47.5

2.

Types of Family

Nuclear

32

80.0

Joint

8

20.0

3.

Form of Family

Stable

34

85.0

Broken

5

12.5

Reconstitute

1

2.5

4.

Mother's Qualification

Middle School

5

12.5

HSLC

22

HSSLC

9

22.5

Undergraduate degree and above

4

10.0

5.

Father's Qualification

Middle School

2

5.0

HSLC

14

35.0

HSSLC

13

32.5

Under Graduate and above

10

25.0

(Source: Computed)

4.4 Type of Parenting Styles

Parenting style refers to the way parents interact with and raise their children. It encompasses the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours that parents use to guide and nurture their children's development. Different parenting styles can have varying impacts on children's emotional, social, and cognitive development. The type of parenting style is measured in three different styles namely authoritative, authoritarian and Neglectful styles. The survey results indicate that authoritative parenting (1.41) is slightly more prevalent, while authoritarian (1.07) and neglectful parenting (1.04) are rarely practised or perceived.

4.4 Type of Parenting Styles

Particulars

Mean

Std. Deviation

1.

Authoritative

1.41

0.37482

2.

Authoritarian

1.07

0.30064

3.

Neglectful

1.04

0.39455

(Source: Computed)

4.5 Mean Score of Parental Support

The mean scores for emotional support (1.01), informational support (1.18), tangible support (1.07), and esteem support (1.00) reflect low levels of perceived parental support in these areas among the respondents.

4.5 Level of parental support

SL/NO.

Particulars

Mean

Std. Deviation

1.

Emotional support

1.01

2.

Informational support

1.18

0.35437

3.

Tangible support

1.07

0.22313

4.

Esteem support

1.00

0.24529

(Source: Computed)

4.6 Independent Sample T-test:

4.6.1 Parenting style based on gender

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the Authoritative Parenting style for males and females among higher secondary school students. The mean score for males ($m=1.41$, $SD=0.35$) was higher than for females ($m=1.40$, $SD=0.41$). There was an insignificant difference ($t= 0.083$, $p=0.934$) in the perception of the Authoritative Parenting style between male and female higher secondary school students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Authoritarian Parenting styles for males and females among higher secondary school students. The mean score for males ($m=0.981$, $SD=0.240$) was lower than for females ($m=1.17$, $SD=0.33$). There is a significant difference ($t=2.113$, $p=0.041$) in the perception of the Authoritarian Parenting style between male and female higher secondary school students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the Neglectful Parenting style for males and females among higher secondary school students. The mean score for males ($m=1.03$, $SD=0.44$) was lower than for females ($m=1.04$, $SD=0.36$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.079$, $p=0.937$) in the perception of the Neglectful Parenting style between male and female higher secondary school students.

Table 4.6.1 Independent Sample T-test based on Gender:

Parenting Style

Gender

Mean

Std. Deviation

t

df

Sig. (2-tailed)

Authoritative

Male

1.41

0.35

-0.083

38

0.934

Female

1.40

0.41

Authoritarian

Male

0.981

0.240

2.113

38

0.041

Female

1.17

0.33

Neglectful

Female

0.36

-0.079

38

0.937

Male

1.03

0.44

(Source: Computed)

4.6.2 Parenting Styles based on Institution settings

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the Authoritative Parenting style in government and private among higher secondary school students. The mean score for government ($m=1.3$, $SD=0.34641$) was lower than for private ($p=1.51$, $SD=0.381$). There was insignificant difference ($t=0.083$, $p=0.076$) in the perception on the Authoritative Parenting style between government and private higher secondary school student.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the Authoritarian Parenting style in government and private among higher secondary school students. The mean score for government ($m=1.09$, $SD=0.26338$) was higher than for private institutions ($p=1.0575$, $SD=0.34$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.338$, $p=0.737$) in the perception of the Authoritarian Parenting style between government and private higher secondary school students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Neglectful Parenting styles in government and private among higher secondary school students. The mean score for the government ($m=1.19$, $SD=0.31439$) was lower than for private ($p=0.88$, $SD=0.41244$). There is a significant difference ($t=2.673$, $p=0.011$) in the perception of the Neglectful Parenting style between government and private higher secondary school students.

Table 4.6.2 Independent Sample T-test based on Institution:

Parenting Style

Institution

Mean

Std. Deviation

t

df

Sig. (2-tailed)

Government

1.3

0.34641

-1.824

38

0.076

Private

1.51

0.381

Authoritarian

Government

1.09

0.26338

0.338

38

0.737

Private

1.0575

0.34

Neglectful

Government

1.19

0.31439

2.673

38

0.011

Private

(Source: Computed)

4.6.3 Parental Support Based on Gender

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Emotional support of Parental support in females and males among higher secondary school students. The mean score for females ($m=20$, $SD=.9500$) was higher than for males ($m=20$, $SD=1.0625$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=-1.308$, $p=.199$) in the perception of Emotional support between female and male higher secondary school students.

To compare Informational support of Parental support in females and males among higher secondary school students An independent sample t-test was conducted. The mean score for females ($m=20$, $SD=1.1357$.) was higher than for males ($m=20$, $SD=1.2286$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=.825$, $p=.414$) in the perception of Parental support between female and male higher secondary school students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Tangible support of Parental support in females and males among higher secondary school students. The mean score for females ($m=20$, $SD=1.0757$.) was higher than for males ($m=20$, $SD=1.0757$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=.000$, $p=1.000$) in the perception of Parental support between female and male higher secondary school students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Esteem support of Parental support in females and males among higher secondary school students. The mean score for females ($m=20$, $SD=.8857$.) was lower than for males ($m=20$, $SD=1.1071$). There is a significant difference ($t=-3.168$, $p=.003$) in the perception of Parental support between female and male higher secondary school students.

Table 4.6.3 Independent Sample T-test based on Gender:

Parental Support

Gender

N

Mean

t

df

Sig. (2tailed)

Emotional support

Female

-1.308

38

.199

Male

20

1.0625

36.392

Informational support

Female

20

1.1357

-.825

38

.414

Male

20

1.2286

37.676

Tangible support

Female

20

1.0750

.000

38

1.000

Male

20

33.993

Esteem support

Female

20

.8857

-3.168

38

.003

Male

20

1.1071

37.667

(Source: Computed)

4.6.4 Parental Support based on Institution settings

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Emotional support of Parental support in government and private among higher secondary school students. The mean score for government (m=20, SD=1.0000) was higher than males (m=20, SD=1.0125). There was an insignificant difference ($t=-.142$, $p=.888$) in the perception of Emotional support between government and private higher secondary school students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Informational support of Parental support in government and private among higher secondary school students. The mean score for the government (m=20, SD=1.0571) was lower than males (m=20, SD=1.3071). There is a significant difference ($t=-2.358$, $p=.025$) in the perception of Informational support between government and private higher secondary school students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Tangible support of Parental support in government and private among higher secondary school students. The mean score for the government (m=20, SD=1.0083) was higher than males (m=20, SD=1.1417). There was an insignificant difference ($t=-1.957$, $p=.059$) in the perception of the Tangible support between the government and private higher secondary school students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Esteem support of Parental support in government and private among higher secondary school students. The mean score for the government (m=20, SD=.9714) was higher than males (m=20, SD=1.0214). There was an insignificant difference ($t=-.640$, $p=.526$) in the perception of Esteem support between government and private higher secondary school students.

Parental support

Institution

N

Mean

t

df

Sig. (2-tailed)

Emotional support

Government

20

1.0000

-.142

38

.888

Private

20

1.0125

37.981

Informational support

Government

20

1.0571

-2.358

38

.025

Private

20

31.821

Tangible support

Government

20

1.0083

-1.957

38

.059

Private

20

1.1417

32.400

Esteem support

Government

20

.9714

-.640

38

.526

Private

20

1.0214

37.536

(Source: Computed)

Table 4.7 Correlation

The correlation matrix revealed that there is a significant relationship between emotional support and authoritative parenting styles ($r = .324, p < .05$), further indicating that when the levels of Authoritative parenting styles increase or decrease, the level of emotional support will increase or decrease at the same pattern.

Table 4.7.1 Correlation:

Authoritative	
authoritarian	
Neglectful	
Emotional support	
Informational support	
tangible	
support	
Esteem	
support	
authoritative	
1	
authoritarian	
0.024	
1	
Neglectful	
-0.001	
-0.251	
1	
Emotional	
Support	
.324*	
0.073	
0.05	
1	
Informational	
support	

-.364*

-0.241

-0.01

1

Tangible

support

0.31

0.228

-0.293

-0.004

0.239

1

Esteem

support

0.151

-.314*

-0.109

.584**

.526**

0.13

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

(Source: Computed)

CHAPTER-5

CONCLUSION

The present study attempts to identify the parenting style and parental support among the Higher Secondary School students at Government and Private schools in Lawngtlai.

1. MAJOR FINDINGS

family details, Parenting style and Parental Support.

5.1.1 Personal Details:

- Most of the respondents are 15-20 years old, the mean age is 18.05
- There is a balanced gender distribution, with an equal number of males and females.
- The majority of the respondents are currently pursuing standard 12.
- Half of the respondents are from Government and the other half of the respondents are from Private Institutions.
- All the individual respondents in the dataset belong to the "Mizo" tribe.

5.1.2 Socio-economic Status

- The majority of the respondent's socio-economic status is found to be Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY).
- The majority of the respondent's father's occupation was Government Job and the majority of the respondent's mother's occupation was Housewife.

5.1.3 Family Profile

- It is found that the most common size of the respondents is large size (Above 7 family members)
- The majority of the respondent's family types are nuclear families and the majority of the respondent's forms of family are stable families.

5.1.4 Independent Sample T-test

The parametric t-test was used to determine the differences in parenting styles and parental support between Gender and Institution:

In the Authoritative Parenting style t-test based on Gender, there was an insignificant difference between males and females. Compared to males in the Authoritarian Parenting style, there is a significant difference in females. In Neglectful Parenting style, there was an insignificant difference between males and females.

In the Authoritative Parenting style based on Institution, there was an insignificant difference between government and private institutions. In the Authoritarian Parenting style, there was an insignificant difference between government and private institutions. In Neglectful Parenting style, there is a significant difference in government compared to private schools.

In Emotional Support, there were insignificant differences based on Gender between males and females. There were insignificant differences in Informational Support between males and females. In Tangible Support, there were insignificant differences based on Gender. There is a significant difference between males and females in terms of Esteem support.

In Emotional Support, there were insignificant differences based on Institution between males and females. Compared to private Informational Support, there is a significant difference in government. In terms of Tangible Support, there were insignificant differences based on Institution. There were insignificant differences in Esteem Support between government and private.

the relationship between Informational support, Tangible support and Esteem support was insignificant and only emotional support was significant. In the Authoritarian parenting style, the relationship between Emotional support, Informational support, Tangible support and Esteem support was insignificant. In the Neglectful parenting style, there was an insignificant relationship between Emotional support, Informational support, Tangible support and Esteem support.

5.2 CONCLUSION

The study aims to perceive the parenting style and parental support among the students in Mizo families.

Based on the results of these studies, it was concluded that support given by the parents is poor. So, they need to strengthen their parental support systems. The respondents are between the ages of 15 and 20 years, and any respondent is pursuing standard 12. A majority of respondents were from the nuclear family, which was followed by a stable family. The major objective of this research was to find out the prevalence of different parenting styles, to assess the mean score of parental support, to study the relationship between parenting style and parental support and to assess the differences between Parenting style and Support across gender and type of institution.

5.3 SUGGESTION

The parental support provided by the parents in Lawngtlai is poor. Thus, parents must focus on or strengthen their support systems to provide their children with the necessary support, love, treatment, and assistance. To support the children, parents must actively encourage the children to do their best with school, their hobbies and interests. Listening without judgment and seeking to understand their concerns and challenges.

Micro Level:

At the micro level, parents can strengthen their support system through supportive relationships within their immediate circle. Building trust and open communication with partners, family members, and close friends provides a direct network of support where parents can share concerns, seek advice, and find emotional relief.

Parents can develop intimate and trusted connections with their spouses, children, and close family members. Creating open communication and helpful relationships at home may provide daily encouragement and trust. Parents can benefit from one-on-one counselling or parental coaching, where they receive personalized guidance on effective parenting techniques and coping strategies.

Mezzo Level:

Parental support at the mezzo level, awareness programs and group discussions can play a pivotal role. Community centres, schools, or local organizations can organize awareness about common parenting challenges and effective strategies. These sessions prepare parents with valuable information on topics like child development, managing behaviour, or supporting children's mental health.

Group discussions within these settings allow parents to connect and share personal

issues, parents gain diverse perspectives and feel less isolated in their struggles.

Macro Level:

At the macro level, Community leaders and family welfare programs play an essential role in providing family guidance and support. Family welfare services, often organized by community centres, social service agencies, or local government, offer resources that help families navigate various challenges, such as parenting, financial difficulties, and mental health needs.

Community leaders, including social workers, counsellors, and family advocates, work within these programs to provide support, education, and counselling. These leaders often conduct workshops, counselling sessions, and group activities focused on strengthening family bonds, improving parenting skills, and promoting overall well-being. Through their support, families gain access to essential services, such as child development education, financial literacy, and emotional resilience training.

REFERENCES:

Usakli, H, (2020). Comparison of Single and Two Parents Children in terms of Behaviour Tendency. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*.

Gesten, E, (2021). The Relationship Between Parenting Style and Children's Adjustment: The Parents' Perspective. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*.

Saroshe, S, (2019). A Study Compare Various Aspects of Members of Joint and Nuclear Family. *Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences*.

Yang, J, (2020). Parenting styles and children's academic performance: Evidence from middle schools in China. *Children and Youth Services Review*.

Adams, J, (2016). The impact of parenting styles on children's developmental outcomes: The role of academic self-concept as a mediator. *International Journal of Psychology*.

Majumder, A, Md (2016). The impact of Parenting Styles on Children's educational Outcomes in the United States. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*.

Thursday, R, (2015). Parenting styles and academic achievement of young adolescents: A systematic literature review. *Quality and Quantity*.

Khan, M, (2010). Impact of Parental Support on the Academic Performance and Self Concept of the Student. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education*.

Lee, G, (2021). Ability self-concepts and Parental Support may protect adolescents when they experience low support from their math teachers. *Journal of Adolescence*

Wang, Y, (2021). The influence of parental support and perceived usefulness on students learning motivation and flow experience in visual programming: Investigation from a parent perspective. *British Journal of Educational Technology*.

Gore, J, (2015). Is Parental Support or Parental Involvement More Important for Adolescents. *Undergraduate Journal of Psychology*.

A'yun, I, M, (2024). Parental Support in Piaget's Psychological Concept in Primary School Children. *Journal of Islamic Elementary Education*.

Singh, S, (2017). Mental Health; Parenting; Behaviour disorders in children; Self-Esteem; Child psychology. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*.

Dagevos, J, (2024). Parents and children in resettled refugee families: What are determinants of informational parental support. *International Migration*.

Appendices

A STUDY OF PARENTING STYLES AND PARENTAL SUPPORT AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN LAWNGTLAI

Researcher Research Supervisor:

Stephanie Lalrinhlui Lalmangaihawnveli

V SEMESTER, BSW (Asst. Prof. HATIM)

HATIM

(Dear respondent Please give us your valuable time for this questionnaire; it is strictly academic and confidential for research purposes only. Thanking you in anticipation.)

I. PERSONAL INFORMATION:

1. Age: Years
1. Gender: Female Male
1. Educational Qualification: Class 11 Class 12
2. Academic performance: HSLC

I DIVISION II DIVISION

III DIVISION

II. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS:

1. AAY PHH non-NFSA
2. No. of family members below the poverty line

Unemployed

1. Mother's occupation: Gov't job Business Labour Farmer

Housewife Unemployed

III. FAMILY DETAILS:

1. Size of the Family Member: Number
2. Types of Family: Nuclear Joint
3. Form of Family: Stable Broken Reconstitute
4. [Mother's Qualification](#)
5. Father's Qualification

IV. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR PARENT' DISCIPLINE STYLE

[SI/No](#)

PARENTING STYLE

NEVER

SOMETIMES

OFTEN

1.

My parents respect my opinions and encourage me to express them

2.

My parents provide comfort and understand me when I am upset

3.

They explain to me how they feel about my good/bad behaviour

4.

My parents encourage me to talk about my feelings and problems

5.

They compliment me

6.

My parents remind me of all the things they are doing and have done for me

7.

My parents yell at me when they disapprove of my behaviour

My parents used to punish me by taking privileges (e.g., TV, games, visiting friends)

9.

My parents feel the need to point out my past behavioural problems to make sure I will not do them again

10.

My parents explode in anger towards me

11.

My parents ignore my bad behaviour

12.

My parents seem more like a friend rather than a parent

13.

My parents find it difficult to discipline me

14.

My parent ignores my bad grades

15.

Watching TV, computer, Mobile phone, etc whenever I want

V. DESCRIBE A TYPE OF PARENTAL SUPPORT YOU RECEIVED

SI/No

PARENTAL SUPPORT

NEVER

SOMETIMES

OFTEN

1. 1.

My parents gave me opportunities to make my own decisions about what I was doing.

1. 2.

When my parents asked me to do something, they explained why they wanted me to do it.

1. 3.

When I refused to do something, my parents threatened to take away certain privileges to

1.

My point of view was very important to my parents when they made important decisions concerning me.

1.

My parents refused to accept that I could want simply to have fun without trying to be the best.

1.

When my parents wanted me to do something differently, they made me feel guilty.

1.

My parents encouraged me to be myself

1.

Within certain limits, my parents allowed me the freedom to choose my activities.

1.

When I was not allowed to do something, I usually knew why

1.

I always had to do what my parents wanted me to do, if not, they would threaten to take away privileges.

1.

My parents believed that to succeed, I always had to be the best at what I did.

1.

My parents made me feel guilty for anything and everything

1.

My parents were able to put themselves in my shoes and understand my feelings.

1.

My parents hoped that I would make choices that corresponded to my interests and preferences regardless of what theirs were

1.

When my parents wanted me to do something. I had to obey or else I used to be punished

1.

theirs

1. 2.

My parents listened to my opinion and point of view when I disagreed with them

1. 3.

When I asked why I had to do, or not do, something, my parents gave me good reasons.

1. 3.

My parents insisted that I always be better than others.

1. 4.

My parents used guilt to control me.

1. 5.

As soon as I didn't do exactly what my parents wanted, they threatened to punish me.

1. 5.

My parents made sure that I understood why they forbid certain things.

1. 6.

When my parents wanted me to act differently, they made me feel ashamed to make me change

1. 7.

For my parents to be proud of me, I had to be the best.