

Impact of home environment on late adolescent boys belonging to nuclear and joint families : A study

■ L. SATI AND S. GIR

Received: 19.06.2013; Revised: 10.09.2013; Accepted: 08.10.2013

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to :

L. SATI

Department of Human
Development and Family Studies,
College of Home Science,
Maharana Pratap University of
Agriculture and Technology,
UDAIPUR (RAJASTHAN) INDIA
Email: latasati90@gmail.com

■ **ABSTRACT** : The present study was an attempt to assess and compare the home environment of late adolescence residing in nuclear and joint family. The total sample for the present study consisted of 120 late adolescent boys. The sample was selected from 3 non-coeducational government schools of Udaipur city. A preliminary survey was conducted among 11th and 12th class students to select the sample as per the delimitation of the study. To assess home environment, inventory developed by Mishra (1989) was administered. The data were collected, coded and analyzed. Frequency and percentage were computed for each category.

■ **KEY WORDS** : Home environment, Nuclear family, Joint family, Adolescents

■ **HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER** : Sati, L. and Gir, S. (2013). Impact of home environment on late adolescent boys belonging to nuclear and joint families : A study. *Asian J. Home Sci.*, 8 (2): 550-552.

Adolescence is a transitional period in the human life span linking childhood and adulthood. It is often described as a period of flux: a time when previously well-adjusted and happy child can become distressed. Adolescence is a period of marked change in the person's cognitive, physical, psychological and social development and in the individual's relations with the people and institutions of the social world. Family offers affection and security and operates as a role defining agency central to promoting the maturity of an adolescent and determines his future adjustment as an adult. Family is typically a context that reinforces adult values, promotes school success and supports emotional security. So, a great degree of family interaction especially with the adolescent is developmentally beneficial (Larson and Richard, 1991). Recent changes in family structure due to globalization, liberalization, migration etc. giving rise to a growing concern on well beings of children especially adolescence. Decline in the prevalence of the traditional family is frequently cited as a potential cause of many of the current problems that plague adolescents such as poor educational outcome, drug abuse, juvenile delinquency, frustration, depression etc. along with this today's media also serve as a highly influential factor in

moulding sensitivity of adolescents. It is playing a major role in changing the attitudes, perceptions and beliefs. Home is the best place for the satisfaction of the physical, mental and emotional needs. Among the various social groups, home occupies the first and most important place for the development of the individual. Home is the person's primary environment from the time he is born until the day he dies; hence its effect on the individual is also most significant and enduring. Home environment is the most important institution for the existence and continuance of human life and the development of various personality traits.

■ RESEARCH METHODS

The present study was an attempt to assess and compare the home environment of late adolescence boys belonging to nuclear and joint family. The total sample for the present study consisted of 120 unmarried adolescent boys between the age range of 16 to 18 years, who were studying as a regular student in non-co-educational government schools. The sample was selected from 3 non - co-educational government schools of Udaipur city. A preliminary survey was conducted among 11th and 12th class students to select sample as per the delimitation of the study. For the purpose of assessment,

home environment inventory developed by Mishra (1989) was administered. The data were collected, coded and analyzed by using frequency and percentage.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In joint and nuclear family structure it was pointed out that in joint families the difference in the availability of the

Table 1: Percentage distribution of sample for the their perception of positive parental childrearing behavior in the context of type of family (n=120)

Positive parenting behaviour	Categories	Type of family		Positive parenting behaviour	Categories	Type of family	
		Nuclear family (n=60)	Joint family (n=60)			Nuclear family (n=60)	Joint family (n=60)
Protectiveness	A	4 (6.66%)	5 (8.33%)	Reward	A	3 (5.00%)	6 (10.00%)
	B	10 (16.66%)	8 (13.33%)		B	12 (20.00%)	8 (13.00%)
	C	14 (23.33%)	13 (21.66%)		C	11 (18.00%)	15 (25.00%)
	D	17 (28.33%)	18 (30.00%)		D	19 (31.66%)	15 (25.00%)
	E	10 (16.66%)	10 (16.66%)		E	10 (16.66%)	10 (16.66%)
	F	5 (8.33%)	6 (10.0%)		F	5 (8.33%)	6 (10.00%)
Conformity	A	2 (3.33%)	4 (6.66%)	Nurturance	A	6 (10.00%)	4 (6.66%)
	B	11 (18.33%)	11 (18.33%)		B	9 (15.00%)	6 (10.00%)
	C	16 (26.66%)	15 (25.00%)		C	15 (25.00%)	19 (31.66%)
	D	16 (26.66%)	15 (25.00%)		D	15 (25.00%)	14 (23.33%)
	E	10 (16.66%)	9 (15.00%)		E	10 (16.66%)	11 (18.33%)
	F	5 (8.33%)	6 (10.00%)		F	5 (8.33%)	6 (10.00%)

A= Excellent, B=Good, C= Fair, D= Average, E= Poor, F= Very low

Table 2: Percentage distribution of sample for the their perception of negative parental childrearing behaviour in the context of type of family (n=120)

Negative parenting behaviour	Categories	Type of family		Positive parenting behaviour	Categories	Type of family	
		Nuclear family	Joint family			Nuclear family	Joint family
Punishment	A	6 (10.00%)	6 (10.00%)	Deprivation of privileges	A	6 (10.00%)	5 (8.33%)
	B	8 (13.33%)	9 (15.00%)		B	7 (11.66%)	8 (13.33%)
	C	14 (23.33%)	15 (25.00%)		C	15 (25.00%)	15 (25.00%)
	D	16 (26.66%)	11 (18.33%)		D	17 (28.33%)	13 (21.66%)
	E	10 (16.66%)	13 (21.66%)		E	9 (15.00%)	14 (23.33%)
	F	6 (10.00%)	6 (10.00%)		F	6 (10.00%)	5 (8.33%)
Social isolation	A	3 (5.00%)	6 (10.00%)	Rejection	A	6 (10.00%)	6 (10.00%)
	B	11 (18.33%)	8 (13.33%)		B	5 (8.33%)	7 (11.66%)
	C	16 (26.66%)	16 (26.66%)		C	18 (30.00%)	17 (28.33%)
	D	14 (23.33%)	13 (21.66%)		D	15 (25.00%)	14 (23.33%)
	E	10 (16.66%)	12 (20.00%)		E	12 (20.00%)	10 (16.66%)
	F	6 (10.00%)	5 (8.33%)		F	4 (6.66%)	6 (10.00%)

A= Excellent, B=Good, C= Fair, D= Average, E= Poor, F= Very poor

Table 3: Percentage distribution of sample for their perception of neutral parental childrearing behavior in the context of type of family (n=120)

Neutral Parenting Behavior	Categories	Type of family		Neutral parenting behaviour	Categories	Type of family	
		Nuclear family (boys) n=60	Joint family (boys) n=60			Nuclear family (boys) n=60	Joint family (boys) n=60
Control	A	4 (6.66%)	4 (6.66%)	Permissiveness	A	6 (10.00%)	6 (10.00%)
	B	11 (18.33%)	9 (15.00%)		B	7 (11.66%)	8 (13.33%)
	C	11 (18.33%)	17 (28.33%)		C	16 (26.66%)	12 (20.00%)
	D	19 (31.66%)	13 (21.66%)		D	11 (18.33%)	19 (31.66%)
	E	10 (16.66%)	11 (18.33%)		E	14 (23.33%)	9 (15.00%)
	F	5 (8.33%)	6 (10.00%)		F	6 (10.00%)	4 (10.00%)

A= Excellent, B=Good, C= Fair, D= Average, E= Poor, F= Very poor

family resources, the availability of parental time, energy, and attention, the quality of the relationship with parents, and other family members who have influence on adolescents development (Cicirelli, 1994; Lu and Treiman, 2008). In fact, larger families having larger number of children and/or extended relatives living with them are thought to dilute family resources by spreading themselves among several children. These limit the quantity and quality of the interactions between the children and their parents, and they may affect some adolescents' characters. In industrialized nations, having more siblings may reduce their opportunities of quality education (Lu and Treiman, 2008).

From Table 1 it can be concluded that as far as positive parenting behaviours are concerned, it was found that protectiveness, reward, and nurturance was found to be more for nuclear family boys as compared to joint family boys while the level of conformity was found to be almost same for boys in both the type of family structure. This may be because as parents are the only caregiver in nuclear family who have to focus only on their children. Their attention is not towards many, so may be the quality of protectiveness, reward, and nurturance is better. At the same time as the background profile of sample showed that single child in nuclear family are generally more as compare to joint family.

From Table 2 it can be inferred that as far as negative parenting behaviour is concerned, punishment, social isolation, and deprivation of privilege was found to be more in case of nuclear family as compared to joint family while level of rejection was found to be almost same in both the type of family structure. This may be because in joint family generally elderly figure protect or save the child from punishment. Adolescent boys are generally very adventurous, risk taking and feel that nothing bad can happen to them. So, it is very necessary to protect them against negative sanctions, in order to manage their behaviour and protect them against any type of risky and life taking events. Profile information of subjects depicted that educational level of parents in joint families was better. So, they may feel that deprivation from love, care and respect etc. is not the solution for controlling or managing their behaviour. So, it can be the reason that deprivation of privilege is less in joint family as compared to nuclear family.

In nuclear family, control for boys was found to be more

as compared to joint family while in joint family level of permissiveness was more in joint family as compared to nuclear family as shown in Table 3. The profile showed that majority of the respondents among them were the eldest child of their family hence were able to express themselves and at the same time educational level of parents was better. So, they listen to their children carefully, the communication is healthy and open between the parents and their children.

Conclusion:

So, the present study found that there is some difference in the home environment as per the structure of family *i.e.* nuclear and joint family. It was found that home environment of nuclear family boys was found to be better as compared to joint family boys. The parenting style adopted parents in nuclear families was found to be much better. The nuclear family boys gained high score in dimensions of home environment like protectiveness, reward, nurturance and control which shows that parents take care of their wards well. The nuclear family boys gained high score in other dimensions like punishment, social isolation, and deprivation of privileges. Though these behaviours seem to be negative but they are necessary to keep a check on adolescents behaviour so as to protect them from any type of risky behaviour.

Authors' affiliations:

S. GIR, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Home Science, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, UDAIPUR (RAJASTHAN) INDIA

■ REFERENCES

- Cicirelli, V.G.** (1994). Sibling relationship in cross cultural perspective. *J. Marriage & Family*, **56** (1) :7-20.
- Larson, R. and Richards, M.H.** (1991). Daily companion in childhood and adolescence changing development contexts. *Child Develop.*, **62**(2): 284-300.
- Lu, Yao and Treiman Donald, J.** (2008). The effect of family size on educational attainment in china: Period variations. *American Sociol. Rev.*, **73** (5) : 813-834.
- Mishra, S.K.** (1989). *Manual of home environment inventory*. National Psychological Corporation. Agra (U.P.) INDIA.

8th
Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★