

Effect of Family Environment on Social Maturity of Adolescents of Sultanpur District

SHWETA SINGH*¹ AND VANDANA SINGH²

¹Research Scholar and ²Reader

¹Lucknow University, Lucknow (U.P.) India

²Mahila Degree College, Lucknow (U.P.) India

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted at Sultanpur District of U.P. The purpose of the study was to assess influence of family environment on Social Maturity of adolescents. 400 adolescents of age group between 13-15 years comprised the sample. Family Environment scale (FES) and Social Maturity Scale (SMS) were administered. Data was analyzed in term of correlation- Coefficient. The statistical analysis revealed that social maturity of urban boys was positively related to active-recreation orientation only and it was negatively related to conflict and control dimensions of family environment. Social maturity of urban adolescent girls was positively related to cohesion and acceptance and caring of their families. Family environment did not exert effect on rural adolescent's social maturity.

Key Words : Adolescents, Family environment, Social maturity, Cohesion, Conflict

INTRODUCTION

Adolescents are pillar of any country's development. So researches on them are of great importance. NCERT (1999) defined adolescence as a period of physical, psychological and social maturity from childhood to adulthood. Van Sloan (1996), told that how well a person gets along with them is social maturity. Social maturity plays an important role in social adjustment of adolescents. So learning social skills is more important than having high IQ, because 33 percent of abilities deemed essential for effective performance at working place are social skills (Goleman, 1995), and unlike IQ, SQ could be improved throughout life (Cottringer, 2002).

Keith and Campbell (2000) reported that family was the most important influencing factor for the social and emotional development of the child. It is a primary socialization context and is therefore, considered to be a very important factor influencing child Development (Ozcinar, 2006). Family environment continues to be of crucial importance throughout adolescence and young

adulthood (Van Wel, 2000).

Family cohesion and supporting relationship between family members are associated with adolescent psychological adaptation and lower depression (Herman *et al.*, 2007). Research regarding level of family conflict suggests that a conflictual family environment is associated with adolescent's aggressive behavior (Wissink *et al.*, 2006).

Campbell and Spencer (1992) conducted that high conflicts between parents were negatively associated with the social competence of children and leads to antisocial behavior.

Objective of the study:

1. To find out the difference between boys and girls adolescent students in term of their social maturity.
2. To study relationship between social maturity and family environment of adolescent students.

Hypothesis:

1. There is no difference between boys and girls

adolescent students in term of their social maturity.

2. There is no difference between social maturity and family relationship of adolescent students.

METHODOLOGY

Locale:

Sultanpur district was selected as easy accessibility and rapport with respondents.

Sample:

Total 400 adolescents compressed the sample, 2 schools from urban and 2 schools from rural area were selected randomly. From each school 100 girls and 100 boys of age group 13-15 year were selected by stratified random sampling.

Tools:

FES Scale:

Family environment scale (Bhatia and Chadha, 1993) consists of three dimensions-

1. Relationship dimension (cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, acceptance and caring)
2. Personal growth dimension (independence, active recreational orientation).
3. System maintenance dimension Organization, control.

VSMS:

Social Maturity was measured by Indian adaptation

of Vineland Social Maturity Scale by Dr. A.J. Malin. It can measure social maturity up to the age of XV years.

Procedure :

The above mentioned scales were administrated on the selected sample with proper instructions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Table 1, we find out that there is no significant difference between boys and girls adolescents students in term of their social maturity. The observed result is supported by the finding of Athanimath and Ganga (2011). They also found no gender difference in social maturity in the sample of 463 students.

Correlation between adolescent girl's social maturity and their family environment is discussed in Table 2 shows that urban adolescent girl's social maturity was positively correlated with cohesion, acceptance and caring of their families whereas as social maturity of urban boys was positively correlated with family's active recreation orientation only but it was negatively correlated with conflict and control of family in the same. Other dimensions of family do not exert effect on adolescent's social maturity. Esinberg *et al.*, (1999) observed that parental responses contributed towards better social and emotional development.

It may be concluded from the above results that, social maturity of urban adolescent girl is influenced by degree of support, help and commitment in the family

Table 1 : Difference between boys and girls adolescent student in term of their social maturity

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t-Value	Level of Significance
Social Maturity	Boys	200	87.39	31.52	0.27	0.05
	Girls	200	87.63	31.02		

Table 2 : Correlation between social maturity and family environment of adolescents

Family environment	Correlation – Coefficient			
	Boy		Girl	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Cohesion	0.0143014	0.1032124	0.0943767	0.2162104*
Expressiveness	0.0213401	0.014346	0.113267	0.032123
Conflict	0.0321421	-0.226721*	0.1034217	0.113267
Acceptance and Caring	0.087672	0.0453627	0.0372671	0.2232142*
Independence	0.067287	0.0436721	0.0546372	0.0632671
Active Recreation Orientation	0.0736732	0.1402301*	0.103267	0.061245
Organization	0.0512467	0.0234676	0.0473262	0.037261
Control	0.0376781	-0.243216*	0.0261243	0.0367875

* = Significant

Probable Error = 0.0220

(cohesion), extent to which they are unconditionally accepted and the degree to which caring is expressed in the family (acceptance and caring). Social maturity of urban boys was influenced by the degree of interest in the participation in social and recreational activities (active-recreation orientation). But it was negatively influenced by the amount of anger and aggression in the family (conflict) and by the extent to which set rules are followed in the family (Control). Johnson *et al.* (2001) studied that decreased family cohesion and increased parental conflict can inadvertently provide family environments that are associated with increased feelings of loneliness, which may be associated with problems in adolescent's social interactions. Adams DYK and Benniou (1990) found that parental controls exercised in a supportive environment, is widely recognized as a facilitator of social development in adolescents. Ahmed and Nigam (2009) studied that academic achievement motivation is significantly related to favorable and unfavorable home environment of higher secondary students.

Conclusion:

From the above results it is concluded that the family environment factors still have significant effect on social maturity of adolescents.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G.R. and DYKP, Bonniou L.D. (1990). Parent-adolescent relationship and identity formation. In : BK Barber, B.C. Rollins (Eds) : Parent-Adolescent Relationships. Lanham M.D : University Press of America, pp. 1-6.
- Ahmad, S. and Nigam, R.S. (2009). A Study of academic achievement motivation as related to home environment of higher secondary students. *Indian Psychology Revision*, **72** : 109 – 116.
- Athanimath, J.S. and Ganga, Yenagi (2011). Social Maturity and Depression levels Among IIPUC science Students. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, **24**(4) : (510-512).
- Bhatia, H. and Chadha, N.K. (1993). Family Environment Scale. Lucknow Ankur Psychological Agency.
- Campbell, M. and Spencer, E.K. (1992). Psychopharmacology in child and adolescent psychiatry : A review of the past five years. *J. American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, **27** : 269-279.
- Cottringer, W. (2002). The Power of likeability. *Internat. J. Behavior Development*, **26** (2) : 167-176.
- Doll, E.A. (1935). Vineland Social Maturity Scale. In J Bharath Raj. Indian Adaptation of Vineland Social Maturity Scale. Swayamsidha Prakashan.
- Goleman, D. (1995). Working with EQ. Blackwell Publisher, pp. 53-68.
- Herman, K.C., Ostrander, R. and Tucker, C.M. (2007). Do family environments and negative cognitions of adolescents with depressive symptoms vary by ethnic group? *J. Family Psychol.*, **21** : 325 – 330.
- Johnson, H.D., Lavole J.C. and Mahoney, M. (2001). International conflict and family cohesion : Predictors of loveliness, social anxiety, and social avoidance in late adolescence. *J. Adolescent Res.*, **16** : 304.
- Keith, L. and Campbell, J. (2000). Assessment of Social emotional development in preschool children. The psycho-educational assessment of preschoolers : 3rd edition Nerdham Heights, Allyn and Becan, Inc. US. PP : 364-382.
- Ozcinar, Z. (2006). The Instructional Communicative qualifications of parents with students. *J. Educational Sci.*, **1** : 24-30.
- Sloan, V. (1996). Working with Social skills. *J. Personality & Social Psychol.*, **83** (1) : 216-230.
- Wissink, J., Dekovie, M. and Meijer, A. (2006). Parenting behaviors, quality of the parent adolescent relationship and adolescent functioning in form ethnic groups. *J. Early Adolescence*, **26** : 133-159.
- Van Wel, F. (2000). The parental bond and the well-being of adolescents and young adults. *J. Youth & Adolescence*, **28** : 307 – 318.
