

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

- Purpose of the Study
- The Family
- Research on the Family
- Role of the Family in the
Development of the Adolescent
- Emotional Climate of the Home

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

" In human relations, ends depend on means and outcome depends on process and development can flourish only when parents and parent-child interaction, that is, the means and the process, create sensitivity to feelings and responsiveness to needs in the challenging relationship between parent and child. "

(Dr. Haim G. Ginott, 1965)

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Family Relationships are built up on interactions between the family members and what makes interaction possible is communication, since it is the means by which one person influences another and is in turn influenced by him.

The adolescent span of development is marked by a so-called "generation gap" between parents and children which can be bridged, or at best understood only through interpersonal communication. The goal of this communication is not merely to avoid or to resolve conflicts but to bring about the personal growth of each of the family members and of the family as a unit.

The purpose of the present study is to gain a deeper insight into the nature of interpersonal communication as it exists between parents and adolescents, so as to be able to work out programs of training and education for them.

Interpersonal communication has, in recent years, gained the attention of social psychologists as well as of counselling psychologists. The counselling experience of the present investigator, as well as the current theories on the subject, show that the counselling relationship which is growth stimulating can be used in other life situations as well. Research done by Carl Rogers and Robert Carkhuff in this line has made this fact very evident. Their studies have been confirmed by the promising outcome of training groups conducted by counsellors and psychologists in our country too. Hence it was felt that a model for communication from a counselling situation could be re-adapted to suit family relationships and could be tested out by being used in families.

As already mentioned, experience of the present investigator in the counselling relationship, has confirmed

the idea that the helping relationship in a counselling situation, is only an example of interpersonal relationships in everyday life. Hence the same principles hold good in both cases. The desire of every parent is the full flowering of his child's personality and of his satisfactory adjustment to life. Helpful communication, as theory, research and practice have proved, fosters personal growth. With a minimum of conditions, individuals can be trained in this type of communication. Carkhuff's Scale for measuring communication has been used, with some modification, to measure interpersonal communication in counselling situation, on Indian subjects. The present investigation is an attempt to adapt the scale to measure the communication level of Indian parents in order to get a picture of the existing pattern of communication in them. India is a land of many religions and languages, and of varied cultural backgrounds. Do cultural differences enter the communication pattern? This is another question that the present study attempts to answer.

The problem of the present investigation is to study the pattern of communication between parents and adolescents in four communities of Greater Bombay city - Christians, Hindus, Zoroastrians and Muslims. It also attempts to see whether interpersonal communication as measured by Carkhuff's Scale is related to the total Adjustment of adolescent boys and girls. If, as has been found in Europe and America, parental communication is related positively to adolescent

growth and adjustment, then it is worthwhile training parents in small groups, using Carkhuff's Model of Counselling, for their own personal growth and for improved interpersonal communication with their offspring.

In order to place this study in its proper context, there is need to review the role of the family in the modern world, especially in an urban setting. Chapter I, the present chapter, dwells on the importance of the family, with special reference to the emotional climate in the home and the role of the family in the development of the adolescent.

Chapter II presents the theoretical background on which the study is based. An overview of the theories of Carl Rogers and of Robert Carkhuff is presented, with the relevance that they have to the present research. The emphasis, in this chapter, is on the meaning of the helping relationship, of growth-stimulating interpersonal communication, the criteria by which these may be evaluated as well as the effects they have on the personality and behaviour of the persons involved in the relationship.

Chapter III reviews the related literature in the field of interpersonal communication and of parent-child relationships.

Chapter IV is devoted to the Problem and the Procedure used in conducting the study.

Chapter V gives the Analysis of Data and Discussion of Results.

Chapter VI gives a summary of the whole study and the conclusions and recommendations that may be deduced from the study.

THE FAMILY

It is in primary groups that the self evolves ; these are the springs of life for both the individual and larger units of social organisation. Characterised by intimacy, face-to-face association and co-operation, these groups are primary in that they give the individual his earliest and completest experience of social unity and in that they are the continual source of more elaborate relationships. The family, the play group and the neighborhood group are the most important of primary groups since they are ascendent in the open and plastic time of childhood.

Ernest W. Burgess (1926) describes the family as a unity of interacting personalities. By a unity of interacting personalities is meant a living, changing growing thing. The actual unity of family life has its existence not in any legal conception, nor in any formal contract, but in the interaction of its members. For the family does not depend for its survival on the harmonious relations of its members, nor does it necessarily disintegrate as a result of conflicts between its members. The family lives as long as interaction is taking place and only dies when it ceases.

The family as a group of interacting personalities differs from most primary groups in its age and sex composition. Its members, being of different ages, differ in their desires and needs, grow at different rates of speed, and differ in their levels of comprehension of how to handle together the problems of living together in a family. At any moment, children are striving to meet their growth needs, parents to reconcile their own inner desires with their parental urges to serve their young. At rare times during the family life cycle, the family members are sufficiently reciprocal in their need to love and be loved, for example, to mutually support and sustain one another. Quite as naturally upon occasion, goals, needs and strivings of family members are in conflict. Thus, each family may be seen as an arena of interacting personalities, each striving to obtain the satisfaction of his own basic desires. Limited and supported by the pattern of family life which has evolved in interaction with the larger society of which it is a part, each family achieves its own tempos and rhythm of living. Parents who themselves have urgent needs, make most of the adjustments in building complementary roles between themselves and their children. They are often patient and understanding with the infant, but once he graduates from infancy to childhood, he is recognised as expressing a will, and parents insist that he too must make his quota of adjustments.

If we hold the entire family in focus, we see that many of the clashes between members during the family's life cycle are due to the incompatibility of the diverse developmental strivings of family members at critical points of growth. By the same token, much of the unity and cohesion between family members is a product of the mutual meeting of needs within the family sphere. (Waller and Hill, 1951)

Parents have difficulty in adjusting to their maturing children, in part because of the rewards parents receive for habits of protection, guidance and direction of their children, through preschool and school ages, in part because playing parental roles represents fulfillment of years of anticipatory socialisation and in part because the roles of their children through this period reinforce the habitual patterns of the parent.

But parents are trained in roles which are pertinent only through this period ; they are not trained for roles which permit decreasing intensity of relationships with children. Moreover, both parents have difficult problems of role transition at a point when children are experiencing such problems as well.

The teenager seeks independence i.e. to leave his dependent childhood role. The mother has built a role which assumes a dependent other, and is likely to find it painful to release her child to the world precisely because of this. Her problem is accentuated under contemporary circumstances - coming earlier and in more vigorous condition to this launching

stage and a more abrupt transition given fewer children relatively close in age. The father's reaction is affected to some extent by the mother's, reflecting the intimate connection of their roles. Further, he must face the evidence of unrealized and unrealizable ambitions, and of lessened virility, both of which represent threats to the male role in a society such as our own. In this situation, the parents need to be needed, at a point in time when their offspring are least likely to appear to need them. Thus the consequence of the differential phasing of life-cycle requirements is the incompatibility of family members.

As Simon Meyerson (1975) says : " The shock of adolescent change produces vibrations which resonate with the 'adolescence' inside parents, muffled perhaps by the intervening years but nevertheless pulsating. The tune or cacophany produced does not stop at the front door but strikes chords in the community at large. Society's response impinges back on each family, increasing either harmony or dissonance as the case may be."

RESEARCH ON THE FAMILY

In the late 19th century, when family sociology was just beginning, social Darwinism dominated the field of interest, for example, on structures of family, whether they were promiscuous or monogamous, matriarchal or patriarchal. The rapid social changes of the time called attention to the problems of the contemporary family, particularly the problems

of poverty and suffering as a result of industrialisation. Early in the 20th century, other problems like divorce and separation began to be investigated. Research was focused on individual adjustment to the family. The central concept of this research was Burgess's definition of the family as a "unity of interacting personalities." The importance of social structure was minimized in order to concentrate on the attitudes of the family members. Recently there have been a number of family studies concerned with the relationships between the family's structure and functioning and external systems on the one hand, and between the family and the individual on the other hand. (Bell and Vogel, 1960)

Although the belongingness of individual to family is universal, we have thus far been unable to pin down in any specific, meaningful way the exact relation between the two. Research is concerned with the expansion of knowledge, but the primary source of knowledge is not research but experience. However, research is one way of testing knowledge.

In the field of family life much of what we now know derives from a vast accretion of human experience, which is the cumulative product of direct observations of the phenomena of family life : family interaction in its endlessly changing forms and the processes of child development. Both, lay persons and professionals have contributed to this aggregate of empirical knowledge. However, only a small fraction of these ideas has

really been put to the test. Much of what is handed down from one generation to the next represents a kind of shared mythology of family life.

Family processes by their very nature are extremely complex. They are almost global in scope. There is the question of assuring correct interpretation of the balanced relations of the parts to the whole. There is the need to describe, define and classify whole families on a single continuum, rather than describe parts on many continua. The variables are extremely numerous, interdependent and overlapping. One cannot establish simple one-to-one relationships because they do not exist. Therefore, a central challenge in this type of study is that of selecting the more significant variables and respecting the essential interdependence of these variables.

It is extremely difficult to categorize or type families. The network of complex emotional processes within the group, between group and community, and within each person belonging to the group, creates a uniqueness which we must learn to pin down. Each family must be thoroughly investigated as an entity.

In family study there is also the need to define explicitly the bases for judgment in the analysis of the data. It is necessary to indicate in a definitive way how the evaluation of individual and family performance is measured according to the family's own expectations and also according to the dynamic model of ideal performance in a defined culture.

The ideal of individual and family performance against which deviations are measured must vary from one culture to the next in accordance with differences in social structure, human relations patterns and value orientation. Also to be taken into account is the element of bias which may be introduced by the cultural position of the observer and analyst of the data.

The area of research is huge and must be divided in appropriate ways depending on the nature of the problem, the interests, preferences and capacities of the individual researcher. In establishing correlations of individual and family behavior, four levels need to be kept in mind : intrapsychic processes, interaction among family members, the dynamics of the family group as a whole and the relations of the family with the larger culture.

The vicissitudes of family living expressed in these differences of psychological identity, interpersonal climate and value orientation, influence profoundly the family's capacity for maintaining effective emotional equilibrium, fulfilling essential family functions and promoting the growth and welfare of its members. Such patterns determine the potentials for achieving complementarity in family relationships, effective solutions to conflict, support of the self-image of individual family members and support for needed forms of defense against anxiety.

ROLE OF THE FAMILY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ADOLESCENT

The role of the family in society and in the lives of its members has changed enormously since the turn of the century, and it is continuing to change, at an ever faster pace. Increasing urbanization and geographic mobility have been altering the face of the country and the nature of our social institutions, including the family, at a rather astonishing rate. These changes have weakened the stability and interdependence of communities, impaired communication between the family and other social and political institutions, and shrunk the size of the family.

John Janeway Congar (1973) says : " Despite romantic or hostile assertions to the contrary, an increasing body of empirical data suggests that the single most important external influence in aiding or hindering the average adolescent in the accomplishment of his developmental tasks, is his parents." Paul H. Landis (1952) reaffirms this same fact when he says, "The modern family, inspite of supposed weakness, especially in the urban environment, still has more to do with shaping the child's personality to fit group life in our society than any other social group." The child's sense of security, of belongingness is a product of intimate contacts with the mother during the first two years of life. This sense of security, which is a requisite to a sense of belonging in our society where intimate personal attachments are customary, seems to come primarily from intimacy of personal relationship.

With parental affection, the children who suffer are both those who have too little and those who have too much. The parent who gives too much in the way of attention, emotional response and anxiety to the care of the child develops what is known as the "overprotected" child. The parent who gives too little in the way of emotional response, supervision and care is responsible for the "rejected" child. In helping the child accomplish his developmental tasks what is important is parental models. - models who will prepare the child and the adolescent to cope with the largely unpredictable world of tomorrow. In the case of adolescents, the childhood interactions with his parents affect his present behavior and adjustment.

Because of the rapid rate of change, today's adolescents and their parents have grown up in markedly different worlds. As the sociologist Kingsley Davis observed more than 30 years ago, and as Kenneth Keniston has emphasized again recently, when the developmental experiences that shape our personalities and the social changes that must be confronted vary markedly from adults to young people, from parents to their children, generational differences in cultural values, and outlook, even in knowledge, tend to be magnified. Points of friction between adolescents and parents reflect clearly the experiences and values of our culture. The amount of disagreement with parents reported by adolescents depends on the age of the group questioned, the way they are questioned, and the particular questions asked.

The Purdue Opinion Poll for Young People, from a nationwide sample of high-school young people, concludes that generally speaking there is comparatively little clash between the older and the younger generation. They do find, however, that, approximately one-fifth of all students report some home problems. Areas where there is a lack of full rapport between parents and youth are illustrated by the following : " I can't discuss things with my parents," 20 % say ; "I'am afraid to tell my parents when I've done wrong." 19 % say ; "There is a barrier between me and my parents." 10 % say. (Paul Landis, 1952)

In 1957, both boys and girls significantly ranked problems of interpersonal relationships, love and marriage as higher than in the thirties. The dominant concern of modern teenagers with home and family problems was evident too in the poll in which 6,181 youth participated following the White House Conference on Children and Youth. They reported as follows as very important problems.

56 % Unhappy relationship between mother and father.

48 % Being misunderstood by parents.

32 % Lack of good home suitable for friends.

Elias's study of 5,500 high-school seniors in Washington in the spring of 1947 to determine closeness of adolescents and their parents asked with five alternatives to check : "If I had a personal problem, I would talk it over with one or both." The results showed that the majority of both boys and girls 41 % of them would consult with their parents.

The average parent today is better informed concerning his job as a parent than were his grandparents, but even at that, he is probably less prepared to cope with the problems of the adolescent in the family because of the increased complexities of the problems of child rearing induced by a rapidly changing, urban, industrial, technologically oriented social order.

In spite of the best efforts of parents, the family lacks many desirable qualities as a place in which adolescents and youths can grow to full maturity. Parents almost invariably view the situation from the standpoint of affectionate concern and unwittingly throw protective devices around them which are restrictive. Often too, they fail to appreciate the adolescent's awkward gestures in attempting to imitate adulthood.

Influences of the parental home are lifelong in their effects on the adjustments of the child. Satisfactory home life is the key to good adjustment ; unsatisfactory home life is likely to carry over into the later adjustments of the child. The White House Conference rated 1,957 urban children of native fathers on the basis of 33 indices of home influences. In concluding their findings, they report :

" There is almost no possibility that children from homes which rank low on the scale of home influences will have well-adjusted social and emotional attitudes as measured by the personality test or that they will rank high on teachers' ratings of moral habits. "

" The good home is not to be measured in terms merely of necessities, neatness, size, parental conditions, and parental supervision, as one scale of home conditions provides. Rather, the home is to be defined in terms of human relationships. Does the child have affection and reassurance in the family ? Has he secured a satisfying role in family life ? Is family life stimulating and enriching ? Is control in the home based upon full and equal participation in the family council and in familial objectives or does it rest upon formal and arbitrary discipline ? Do the relations of husband and wife, of parents and children, and of children with each other promote or impede the personality development of the members of the family ?

EMOTIONAL CLIMATE OF THE HOME

The emotional climate or the "psychological atmosphere" of the home directly influences the person's characteristic pattern of behavior and his characteristic adjustment to life. If the home climate is favourable, the individual will react to personal problems and frustrations in a calm, philosophical manner and to people in a tolerant, happy and co-operative way. If the home climate is frictional, he will develop the habit of reacting to family members and outsiders as well, in a hostile and antagonistic way.

Just as better social relationships outside the home are achieved when one is able to understand the feelings, thoughts, emotions, and motives of others, so it is in the home.

The individual who is capable of empathy makes far better social adjustments than the individual who lacks empathic ability.

When family members are capable of empathy, they behave in such a way as to make family relationships pleasant and harmonious. As Lee has explained : "If you can learn a simple trick, you'll get along a lot better with all kinds of folks. You'll never really understand a person until you consider things from his point of view until you climb into his skin and walk around in it."

Empathy is greatly aided by communication between family members. The breakdown in communication between parents and adolescent children contributes heavily to home friction. Duvall (1965) writes : " Communication has its advantages. It ventilates feelings, fosters mental health, encourages active interaction between members of different generations, and gives the individuals a sense of being heard and understood. The danger of a policy of open candid communication is that it allows teenagers to express unpleasant, seemingly disrespectful attitudes and feelings Today the emphasis is on freer expression of real feelings in the family. This paves the way for the closer companionship that is so highly valued. But it also makes for more overt unpleasantness and expressed hostility between family members. The problem is shall they be allowed to criticize their parents and air their real feelings or should they be silenced for the sake of peace and quiet around the house ? "

There are two aids to mutual understanding among family members : communication and shared experiences. Through

communication, an individual is able to understand another's point of view and to present his own point of view so that the other can understand him. Without communication, misunderstanding is common. Parents who feel that laying down the law to their children is sufficient, get poorer co-operation than parents who feel that their children are entitled to know the reasons for restrictions.

Understanding is also improved by sharing experiences with others, by doing things with them. For parent-child communication to be successful, willingness to communicate must be accompanied by parental respect for the child's opinion. Even though there may still be differences of opinion, the home climate will be happier. Adolescents who do things with their families just "for fun" get along with them better than adolescents who spend most of their leisure time with their peers, using the home primarily as a place to eat, sleep and study. Spending family leisure time together fosters a feeling of mutual understanding. There is evidence that understanding and togetherness go hand in hand. A study by C.L. Stone (1963) shows that families where adolescents do things with the family for fun more than once a week, 70 % of the parents understand all or most problems of young people. Families where adolescents never do things together with parents, only 34 % parents understand most problems of young people.

The breakdown in communication between the adolescent and his parents is more often due to lack of understanding than

to lack of shared experiences. The most common causes of the breakdown according to Hurlock (1973) are the following :-

1. Because of rapid social and cultural change, the adolescent has experiences which his parents did not have and are unable to understand.
2. The adolescent may feel that his parents do not try to understand or sympathise with his problems.
3. Generally unsatisfactory relationships with people - by either the adolescent or some of his family members - may create barriers within the family which discourage communication.
4. Lack of shared experiences results in few common interests.

While togetherness may produce a good home climate when children are young, this does not necessarily mean that it will when the children become more mature. One of the most important tasks for adolescents is gaining their autonomy. Normally young adolescents spend more time doing things with and for the members of their families than do older adolescents. At every age, boys spend more time with their peers and less time with their families than girls. Adolescents from large families break away from the togetherness philosophy sooner than those from small families because parents of large families put less pressure on their children to be at home. The breakdown

of togetherness also makes the adolescent feel that he no longer needs his parents as he did when he was younger. As he comes to realize that he is capable of being independent, economically as well as socially, he often becomes casual in his treatment of his parents, showing them less consideration, respect and affection than previously.

Smart and Smart (1972) while discussing this point further say that any human relationship is enhanced by mutual understanding. Conflicts are stimulated and increased by not seeing one another's point of view. Sometimes it is hard for parents and children to put themselves in each other's shoes, but having lived together for between one and two decades, a parent and child know many ways of letting each other know what they are thinking and feeling. Talking together is necessary even though nonverbal communication may be quite meaningful. Foremost among problems cited by one sample of teenagers was parents not listening to what children wanted to tell them about important matters. One would expect adolescents to be able to express themselves better than children, since they have more words at their command and a greater flexibility of thought. Why, then, do some parents and adolescents have great difficulty in understanding each other through talking? This question was approached with 100 college students, 99 of whom said that lack of words had nothing to do with any difficulties they experienced in talking with parents. When asked which subject was hardest to discuss with mothers as well as with fathers, girls had

trouble talking with mothers about marriage and about misbehavior. Boys found it especially hard to talk about mis-behavior and about failures and defeats. When asked why they found it hard to talk about these topics, the girls indicated that they often did not get enough opportunities to talk to their mothers or to their fathers. Guilt too held them back. Both boys and girls were affected by fear of mothers nagging and fear that their mothers might not keep secrets. Respect for privacy is very important to adolescents and yet many parents pry too much. Teenagers object to their parents listening to their telephone conversations and asking their friends what they do on dates.

Children's understanding of parents' motives was considered in a study of 656 Swedish boys and girls, ages 11 through 15. As the children grew older, they were less acceptant of parental restriction that stemmed from authoritarian attitude and more acceptant of rationally or altruistically motivated restrictions. As the children increased in verbal intelligence, with age factor eliminated, they also were less acceptant of authoritarian-motivated restrictions. This study may indicate either that greater maturity brings understanding of parents' motivations, or greater maturity brings less tolerance for authoritarian restrictions, or both.

Searching for broad, general conditions which would lead to good communication in a family, parents' satisfactions with their children were compared with the ways in which children perceived the parents' satisfactions. The subjects were boys

and girls between 11 and 16 and their parents. A high level of accuracy in communication between parent and adolescent was found to exist in families where husband and wife communicated well with each other. High socio-economic status was associated with good communication between parent and adolescent.

The practical significance of these research results is varied. It does not help parents and children much to know that high socio-economic status predicts good communication. Nor can children do a great deal about the clarity with which their parents understand each other. Parents can, of course, work to build a sound marriage which will serve as a foundation for communication with their children. Some of the more detailed research results could prove worthwhile in day-to-day family relationships. Realizing that their children may feel they have not enough chances to talk, parents could plan their time so as to make regular and frequent opportunities. Adolescents, too, could point out to their parents that they need more time together in order to understand one another. If mothers realized how important it is to keep confidences in order to continue to receive them, then surely they would be more reluctant to gossip and to share private information with friends. Both parents might try to be more acceptant and less critical of their children as persons, while still making clear their own values and standards of behavior. Can a parent change in the direction of being more rational and understanding with his child? Yes indeed, according to results from a study on changing attitudes

through group discussion. Not only did these parents change their attitudes toward their children, but the children also changed their behavior.

According to Evelyn Duvall (1962), although a few teenagers are found to report all their difficulties to their mothers and fathers, most of them have trouble confiding in their parents. Sex and petting are the two subjects ranked by both boys and girls as most difficult to discuss with their parents. In the light of the developmental tasks of adolescents it may well be that parents' silence in such matters of critical concern accounts for some of the mutual alienation and suspicion that exists between teenagers and their parents.

Little children can be openly dependent. Teenagers frequently find irritating, evidences of their continuing need for their parents. Parents who have been considered perfect by little children, come in for criticism as these same children reach adolescence. It is evidence of the young person's struggle to free from his close emotional attachment to his parents and to mature in his relationship to them.

There is some normal slackering off of telling parents everything as children get into their teens. Then it is normal for intimate confidences to be shared first with close friends within the peer group and only secondarily with parents and other significant adults. Adults who recognise how normal it is for young people to identify with their own age group in order

to emerge as full-fledged adults, restrain from the prying pressures that only serve to alienate them further from their teenagers.

Wise parents guide their adolescents with a loose rein letting them have their needs, knowing that they will not stray too far from the fold if they are not driven from it. Being available for companionable chats now and then is better than letting loose a barrage of questions as soon as the teenager sets foot inside the door. Adolescents need parents and go to them willingly in families where communication systems are kept in good working order.

Some families experience more alienation between generations than do others. In general, middle class and upper class families maintain more democratic patterns of interaction and have fewer problems with their adolescent youth than do lower class families.

Youth is ever more explorative, daring and "up to the minute" than are parents. Young people enjoy that contrast. They want to be out ahead. But it is also exceedingly important to the adolescent for Dad and Mom not to get too far behind. They take pride in their parents' progressive point of view and in their social and civic activities and interests. For parents to possess some social grace and an interest in cultural activities and events gives the younger person the needed sense of pride in them that makes communication free and full.

The stresses of adolescence that so often shake families to their roots often grow out of conflicting value systems of the old and the new generations. The developmental tasks for the family involve holding fast to those verities that have continuing meaning while venturing forth into wider, broader orientations that new levels of development and experiences require.

Family life with its potentials for promoting human growth becomes complicated and often threatened by the strivings of individual family members. It is nevertheless the area of life from which come some of the deepest satisfactions in human experience. Fulfillment comes from adequate functioning. Those forms of functioning involved in human interaction can be the most satisfying of all.

Adults and youth in the family group are constantly striving towards their goals as persons and as family members. Many of the growth tasks and needs in terms of which the teenager strives to function are consistent ~~x~~ and harmonious with the desires and felt responsibilities of the parents. But usually some yielding and a lot of accepting may be necessary on both sides. It is in the very process of arriving at an integration of purposes that both grow and experience deep satisfaction.

The young person senses any resistance the parent may have to his strivings and awkward attempts at independence. He resents that resistance. But if he also senses in his parents'

behavior a genuine interest in his problems and some evidence of an understanding acceptance of him, he is able to yield a bit, eventually to accept the advice and counsel of his parent. Each grows through understanding the other. They both grow in their ability to accept others as they are.

The smallness of the modern family limits the personal sources from which the child can draw for security and a sense of belonging. If his parents are secure and growing individuals, they are the greatest source of inner security a youngster can have. They not only provide a home atmosphere in which he can feel secure, but they also set the pattern of attitudes and interpersonal relationships which is conducive to human growth and adjustment.

In most respects, the home that is good for the adolescent is the home that is good for the child at any age. What Taylor says of the adolescent can be said of children of all ages: "Only as the adolescent feels that he is loved, enjoyed and respected as a separate individual, and that his parents really believe in him, will he feel free to become himself." Affection is one of the marks of a good home.

Since democracy implies that the rights of every individual are respected and the growth of each is given consideration, it follows that democracy is the best medium for the development of each person. In a democratic home there is seldom a condition of subservience to the will of someone else and no

feeling that one counts for little in the home organization. There the child learns self-respect because he is respected. He develops self-confidence because he is aware of the fact that he does count as someone who contributes to the group's happiness. There he learns social responsibility because he is a part of a group organization and must recognise the needs of others as well as his own and help supply them.

In any home there will be differences of opinion, but in the good home, particularly as the children get older, there will seldom, if ever, be strong, unpleasant emotions arising over conflicting view points or desires. An atmosphere of quarrelling, bitterness, and vindictiveness not only makes the home unpleasant and breeds further, unpleasant emotional states but also teaches the child the wrong way of interacting with others.

A spirit of comradeship in the home puts the home activity on a friendly, pleasant, agreeable basis. The parents come to know their children better ; the children take joy in doing things with their parents and learn from the ways of adulthood. This spirit should first exist between parents. When parents are maladjusted, it is almost inevitable that the children, who learn so much from the parents, will develop some maladjustments too. In the good home the parents are not only well adjusted but they grow with their children. One cannot expect confidence and comradeship between parents and children if the parents are living according to ideas of what is proper,

right or wrong, which the children cannot in their best judgment accept.

The psychological atmosphere in which the adolescent grows up has a marked effect on his personal and social adjustments. How the parental relationships affects the child is shown in the results of Robert and Fleming's intensive study of 100 college women who are divided into two classifications, those who came from happy childhood homes and those who came from unhappy childhood homes - the happiness or unhappiness being explained largely in terms of good or bad relationships with parents. They found the following differences : The happy childhood group : Better adjusted socially, more understanding attitude toward parents, fewer religious conflicts, more church participation, more insight in regard to others, happier, less feeling of inferiority, better coordinated physically. The unhappy childhood group : Accept criticism better, feel the need for more money regardless of the actual size of the income.

The home climate directly influences the adolescent's characteristic patterns of behavior. If it is happy, he will react to people and things in a happy, positive manner. If it is frictional, he will carry the frictional patterns of behavior learned in the home to situations outside the home and react to them as he habitually reacts to similar situations in the home.

Indirectly, the home climate influences the adolescent by the effect it has on his attitudes. If he learns to resent

the authority of his parents, because he perceives it as tyrannical and unfair, he will develop attitudes of resentment against all in authority. This often leads to radical, nonconforming behavior. A happy home climate, by contrast, will encourage a favourable attitude toward people in authority.

Which of the many conditions within the family has the greatest influence on the adolescent ? The answer depends largely on the kind of person the adolescent is. As a general rule, the parent-child relationship is the most important single influence in determining the psychological climate of the home and the effect of the home climate on the adolescent. Peck and Havighurst (1963) have written : " Each adolescent is just about the kind of person that would be predicted from a knowledge of the way his parents treated him. Indeed, it seems reasonable to say that, to an almost startling degree, each child learns to feel and act, psychologically and morally, as just the kind of person his father and mother have been in their relationships with him."

While the home climate affects all areas of the adolescent's life, certain areas are especially influenced by family relationships. When the home climate is characterized by affection, respect, co-operation, and tolerance, the adolescent will develop a wholesome self-concept ; this will be reflected in good adjustments in life. When the home climate is marked by friction stemming from conflict and destructive competition, it will militate against the development of a wholesome self-concept, especially if the adolescent is directly involved in the conflict.

The need and desire of the modern youth for a happy and healthy family is expressed very well in a report of the Asiatic Symposium held at New Delhi in 1973 :

" It has been rightly said that every man is built up through relations and his human itinerary could never be understood by considering him as an isolated individual. Social life is not superimposed but is the very essence of man. The need to live socially, the desire for the other, spring from the very depths of the human being and express itself in love which culminates in generosity.

Young people revolt against a society which does not leave them the possibility of communicating on a personal level even in the family circle. Often it is said that the only link left between parents and children is money.

In our modern consumer's society, the family is becoming a weak and vulnerable group. Faced with this, inspite of this, the youth demand a family. The family that they want must assure them of communication, of a communion which is more free and more intense, a welcoming family, not a hurried family, but an environment fostering the boldest and the most beautiful aspirations.

The young are not at home with their parents. The family is not an association, but a new entity where each one is himself but where all are one. The role of the family in the education of youth consists in the establishment of relations which permit the personal fulfillment of its members and the success of the whole. "

-- XXX --