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Abstract
Parental bonding is a critical factor in personality, emotional, and behavior development. The objectives of the present research were to study the socio-demographic profile and parental bonding of the students in Madurai Corporation Schools. The design of the study is descriptive, and 115 samples were selected using stratified random sampling. The present research focuses on the socio-demographic profile and parental bonding of male students in the age group from 14 to 17 years. The study included other factors like religion, caste, education of father and mother, the employment status of father and mother, family income, family type, and birth order of respondents. Further parental bonding, which includes father bonding and mother bonding was studied. Parental bonding was the outcome variable which included four subtypes (viz) a) affectionate constraint b) optimal parenting, c) affectionless control and d) neglectful parenting. The study results show that both fathers and mothers showed affectionless power. Following this, optimal parenting, affectionate constraint, and neglectful parenting occupied successive percentage for fathers as well as mothers.
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Introduction
The researcher went through Bureau of justice crime reports which revealed that the adolescent boys who were under the age group of 14 – 17 were undergoing antisocial behaviors such as murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, theft, violation of law such as underage drinking, truancy, running away from home and carrying handgun. They also mentioned that these antisocial behaviors were due to a low level of parental involvement or severe punishments from parents as one of the reason. Hence the research got an interest to study parental bonding.

Among different relationships which were formed throughout the life span, the relationship between parent and child is among the most important (Steinberg, 2001). Many studies on child development have devoted considerable attention to parental bonding, to understand how it develops and functions over the lifespan their children. Research has found that a responsive, loving, helpful family who is always available for their child serves the program of binding the child to them and contributes to the reciprocal dynamics of that binding (Bowlby, 1988). Parental bonding is a critical factor to developed and shape the behavior pattern of the children; the researchers wanted to conduct the study about the nature of bonding prevent among boys studying in Corporation schools.
Review of literature

The researchers reviewed articles relating to parental bonding. Some of the findings of some of the studies are presented here for understanding the importance of parental bonding.

Brody et al (1999) studied that the specific contributions that family processes (high levels of monitoring with a supportive, involved mother-child relationship) and classroom processes (high levels of institution, rule clarity, and student involvement) make to children’s self-regulation and adjustment were inspected with a sample of 277 single-parent African American families. Multi-Informant design associate mothers, teachers, and 7- to 15-year-old children were used. Structural equation modeling designated that parenting and classroom alter contributed uniquely to children’s adjustment through the children’s development of self-regulation. Additional analyses suggested that classroom processes can serve a protective-stabilizing function when parenting processes are compromised, and vice versa.

Elizabeth, C. (1999) said that sub-threshold neglect is defined as the absence of positive parenting behaviors that eventually results in delayed child development. Their findings suggested that the effects of early subthreshold neglect were immediate, but that early-appearing problems resulting from subthreshold negligence may lead to trajectories of adverse child development over time.

Hoffenkamp et al (2012) studied the development of an affectionate parent-infant bond is essential for a newborn infant’s survival and growth. However, from evolutionary theory, it can be borrowed that parental connect is not an automatic convert, but dependent on infants’ cues to reproductive potential and parents’ access to resources. The purpose of the present study was to examine the process of connecting in a sample of Dutch mothers (n= 200) and fathers (n = 193) of full-term (n = 69), moderately premature (n = 68), and very premature infants (n = 63). During the first month, post mortem parents completed the Pictorial depiction of Attachment Measure (PRAM) and Postpartum Bonding Questionnaire (PBQ). Longitudinal investigation acknowledges that mothers’ PRAM scores decreased after moderately preterm delivery, whereas decreases in PRAM scores appear in both parents after very preterm birth. As lower PRAM scores perform stronger feelings of parent-infant connectedness, our findings suggest a higher degree of connecting after premature childbirth. Results of the PBQ analysis were in line with PRAM outcomes, as parents of preterm kid reported less connecting problems compared to parents of full-terms. These findings support the hypothesis that in prosperous countries with adequate resources, connecting in parents of a preterm child on average may be higher than in parents of full-term infants.

Lung, FW and Lee, TH (2012) conducted a study to describe the style of parental connecting and the personality characteristics that might increase the risk of gasp and adjustment disorder. Although some patients with hyperventilation syndrome demonstrated symptoms of adjustment disorder, there were different predisposing factors between the two groups in terms of parental bonding and personality characteristics.

Meites and Ingram, TM (2012) had found a cooperative between parental connecting and abjection and anxiety. Specifically, low levels of care and high levels of overprotecting have been associated with increased risk for developing depression. Lower levels of maternal care were related to negative beliefs about the self, negative interactions with others and fatigue; more moderate levels of maternal and paternal care were associated with generalized fear. Maternal overprotection was related to physical symptoms of concern and fear of fading, whereas paternal overprotection was a symbolic predictor of negative beliefs about the self and difficulty maintaining firmness when afraid. These findings highlight the importance of understanding the role of parenting in the development of susceptibility to affective symptomatology.

Muck-Seller D and Sapolsky RM (2011) found that Early parental bonding experiences play a role in emotion recognition, expression in later adulthood, and patients with personality disorder frequently experience inappropriate parental bonding styles the intensity of disgust. They concluded that Parenting bonding styles have an impact on the decoding process and sensitivity when recognizing facial emotions, especially in personality disorder patients.
Parker (1989) observed that depressives perceive themselves as having been exposed to insufficiency of parental care and parental overprotection was confirmed in a case-control study of 125 neurotic depressives, using a subjective measure of perceived parental characteristics, the Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI).

Mannarino, S et al (2018) studied Parental bonding and emotional regulation. Their study aimed to examine alexithymia and parental bonding in families of adolescents with psychiatric disorders through different generations. The results suggested the existence of intergenerational transmission of specific parental bonding, which might influence the emotional regulation and therefore, the demonstration of psychiatric symptoms.

Maina, AR and Kitange, K. (2018) reviews the research literature on the effects of a family relationship on student academic performance with particular reference to MFR (Mother-Father Relationship). The study is an expanding study that takes into account the social trends and economic conditions in the forecast to the future status of a family as a block. The results first present how MFR variable correlates with academic performance of students before tackling the general constructs described in the literature. At the end of this review, the finding results have been discussed in light of the different effects of mother-father relationship on child academic performance.

Balottin, L et al (2016) revealed that the attachment theory is widely used to explain anorexia nervosa origin, course, and treatment response. Nevertheless, very little literature investigated parental bonding in adolescents with anorexia, as well as the parents’ bonding and intergenerational transmission within the family. The main findings showed that the patients’ parents recalled a casual and over-controlling parental style, and in particular by the fathers. As far as the adolescents’ responses were distressed, patients with anorexia did not seem to express their parental bonding perception differently from participants of the control group.

Thus various studies reveal the importance of parental bonding in determining the behavior of the students.

Methodology

The primary objective of the present paper to study the socio-economic conditions of the boys, Parental bonding of boys, and the relationship between socio-demographic factors and parental bonding. The definitive research design was used for this study.

The researcher has applied the stratified random sampling method to select the samples. It’s one of the probability sampling designs in which the total study population is first classified into different strata, i.e., subgroup based upon a characteristic that makes each subgroup more homogeneous in terms of the classificatory variable. The sample was then selected from each subgroup by selecting an equal number of elements from each subset in the total population. Here, from the overall 10 Madurai corporation higher secondary schools (obtained records from Education department, Madurai) 3 schools were selected based on the strength (more than 70 students) of the school, and from each age group, the researcher had selected 28 boys. The samples were selected based on their interest, willingness, those who had the ability in answering. Thus 115 respondents were included in the study finally.

Results and Discussion

Personal profile of the students and the parental bonding were taken into account in this study. Data were analyzed using frequency and percentage. The results are tabulated and discussed.

| S. No | Age (Years) | No. of Respondents | %  |
|-------|-------------|-------------------|----|
| 1.    | 14          | 53                | 46.1|
| 2.    | 15          | 18                | 15.7|
| 3.    | 16          | 27                | 23.5|
| 4.    | 17          | 17                | 14.8|
| **Total** | **115**        |                   | **100**|

The above table shows that 46.1 and 15.7 percent of the boys respectively represented the age of 14 and 15 years. 23.5 and 14.8 percentage of the boys respectively represented the age of 16 and 17. Among the age categories, strength in 9th standard was more compared to higher classes and hence, more percentage of respondents were in the age of 14 years.
Table 2 Distribution of boys based on religion

| S. No | Religion | No. of Respondents | %  |
|-------|----------|--------------------|----|
| 1.    | Hindu    | 94                 | 81.7|
| 2.    | Non-Hindu| 21                 | 18.3|
| Total |          | 115                | 100|

The above table shows that 81.7 percent of boys belonged to the Hindu religion, and 18.3 percent of boys were non- Hindus. As a majority of the population from which students hail are Hindus student population also reflects the same.

Table 3 Distribution of Boys based on Caste

| S.No | Caste | No. of Respondents | %  |
|------|-------|--------------------|----|
| 1.   | BC    | 63                 | 54.8|
| 2.   | MBC   | 25                 | 21.7|
| 3.   | SC    | 27                 | 23.5|
| Total|       | 115                | 100|

The above table shows that 54.8 percent of boys belonged to Backward, while 21.7 percent of them were from Most Backward Caste. As many as 23.5 cents of boys belonged to Scheduled Caste. Majority of the students belonged to BC since the catchment area consists of backward caste. People more.

Table 4 Distribution of Boys based on their Father’s Education

| S.No | Father’s Education | No. of Respondents | %  |
|------|-------------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.   | Illiterate        | 19                 | 16.5|
| 2.   | Primary           | 16                 | 13.9|
| 3.   | Secondary         | 49                 | 42.6|
| 4.   | HSC & Above       | 31                 | 27.0|
| Total|                   | 115                | 100|

The above table shows that 16.5 percent of boys’ fathers were illiterates, while 13.9 percent of boys’ fathers had primary education. As many as 42.6 percent of boys’ fathers had completed their secondary school and 27 percent of boys’ fathers had completed their Higher secondary education and above. The fathers of respondents were qualified more in secondary and higher secondary & above education because of increased general awareness about schooling due to social change and affordability and accessibility of the people to get an education. Illiteracy generally reflects poverty, ignorance, and poor social conditions.

Table 5 Distribution of Boys based on Mother’s Education

| S.No | Mother’s Education | No. of Respondents | %  |
|------|-------------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.   | Illiterate        | 22                 | 19.1|
| 2.   | Primary           | 23                 | 20.0|
| 3.   | Secondary         | 58                 | 50.4|
| 4.   | HSC & Above       | 12                 | 10.4|
| Total|                   | 115                | 100|

The above table shows that 19.1 percent of boys’ mothers were illiterates, and 20 percent of boys’ mothers had completed their primary education. More than half (50.4 percent) of boys’ mothers had completed their secondary school, and 10.4 percent of boys’ mothers had completed their Higher secondary education and above. The mothers of respondents have completed their secondary education, which indicates that general awareness about culture has increased due to social change, and affordability and accessibility have increased due to economic development. Lack of family income, ignorance, and poor social conditions are some of the factors which determine illiteracy and lack of education.

Table 6 Distribution of Boys based on Father’s Occupation

| S. No | Father’s Occupation | No. of Respondents | %  |
|-------|---------------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.    | Skilled             | 39                 | 33.9|
| 2.    | Unskilled           | 76                 | 66.1|
| Total |                     | 115                | 100|

The above table shows that 33.9 percentage and 66.1 percent of boys’ fathers represented skilled, unskilled labors, respectively. One-third of the respondents’ fathers are skilled labors

Because of the opportunities, accessibility, literacy level of parents, and desire for economic mobility.

Table 7 Distribution of Boys based on the Mother’s Occupation

| S. No | Employment of Mothers | No. of Respondents | %  |
|-------|-----------------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.    | Employed              | 40                 | 34.8|
| 2.    | Home Maker            | 75                 | 65.2|
| Total |                       | 115                | 100|
The table shows that 34.8 percent of the boys’ mothers were employed, while 65.2 percent of the boys’ mothers were homemakers. Majority of the respondents’ mothers were homemakers because their husbands were earning sufficiently to lead the family.

Table 8 Distribution of Boys based on Income

| S.No  | Income          | No. of Respondents | %  |
|-------|-----------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.    | Below Rs.5000   | 34                 | 29.6 |
| 2.    | Rs.5001 to10000 | 23                 | 20  |
| 3.    | Above Rs.10000  | 58                 | 50.4 |
| Total |                 | 115                | 100 |

The table shows that there are 29.6 percentage and 20 percentage of boys’ family income was below Rs5000 and 5001 to 10000 respectively, and 50.4 percent of boys’ family income was above Rs.10000. Majority of the respondents’ family income was above Rs10000 because even unskilled laborers are earning Rs.500 per day and so there is no surprise that more than half of the families had the income of above 10000 rupees. Others had less profit because of lower job, inconsistency in going for the job, etc.

Table 9 Distribution of Boys based on Family Type

| S.No | Family Type       | No. of Respondents | %  |
|------|-------------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.   | Joint Family      | 26                 | 22.6 |
| 2.   | Nuclear Family    | 89                 | 77.4 |
| Total|                   | 115                | 100 |

The above table shows that 22.6 percentage and 77.4 percent of the boys belonged to Joint and Nuclear families, respectively. Majority of the respondents were from a nuclear family. It reflects the fact that today, joint families have broken, resulting in the emergence of nuclear families, and hence, nuclear families are more.

Table 10 Distribution of Boys based on Birth Order

| S.No | Birth Order | No. of Respondents | %  |
|------|-------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.   | 1st         | 48                 | 41.7 |
| 2.   | 2nd         | 49                 | 42.6 |
| 3.   | 3rd         | 18                 | 15.7 |
| Total|              | 115                | 100 |

The above table shows that 41.7 percentage, 42.6 percentage and 15.7 percent of the boys represented 1st, 2nd, and 3rd child, respectively. As the families have moved towards a small family norm, there are usually two children in most of the families. Hence the third birth order is less in number, which reflects in the present study also.

Table 11 Distribution of Boys based on Father Bonding

| S. No | Father Bonding           | No. of Respondents | %  |
|-------|--------------------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.    | Affectionate Constraint  | 26                 | 22.6 |
| 2.    | Optimal Parenting        | 30                 | 26.1 |
| 3.    | Neglectful Parenting     | 55                 | 47.8 |
| 4.    | Neglectful Parenting     | 4                  | 3.5  |
| Total |                          | 115                | 100 |

The above table talks about the bonding between Father and Son. It shows that 22.6 percentage, 26 percentage, 47.8 percentage, and 3.5 percentage of boys represented Affectionate constraint, optimal parenting, Affectionless control, and Neglectful parenting with their fathers, respectively. The majority of the respondent’s father’s bonding is of affectionless control, which indicates that fathers are very overprotective and strict without affection. As their children attained the adolescent stage, they wanted to control the behavior of children.

Table 12 Distribution of Boys based on Mother Bonding

| S. No | Father Bonding           | No. of Respondents | %  |
|-------|--------------------------|--------------------|----|
| 1.    | Affectionate Constraint  | 21                 | 18.3 |
| 2.    | Optimal Parenting        | 27                 | 23.5 |
| 3.    | Neglectful Parenting     | 52                 | 45.2 |
| 4.    | Neglectful Parenting     | 15                 | 13.0 |
| Total |                          | 115                | 100 |

The above table talks about the bonding between Mother and Son; it shows that 18.3 percentage, 23.5 percentage, 45.2 percentage and 13 percentage of boys represented Affectionate constraint, optimal parenting, Affectionless control and Neglectful parenting with their Mothers respectively. The majority of the respondent’s mother’s bonding is of affectionless control, which indicates that mothers
are very overprotective and strict with lack of affection. Many mothers exhibit strict control though they have love because tight handling is necessary to control the behavior of children. Children might understand the rigorous approach as an affectionless state.

Conclusion
Parental bonding is a determinant of the behavior of students. Parental bonding scale used in this study measures four types of familial bonding. The results show that out of four kinds, affectionless control type of bonding is prevailing more, that is parents showing low care with high protection with their sons. When comparing father and mother, mothers are high in affectionless control type of bonding. So the researcher suggests that parents could listen to children’s words to understand their problems for helping them. Specific interactions with their sons call for parents to respond to feelings and emotions expressed by them to facilitate their emotional growth. Parents also could become empathetic in understanding their feelings and problems. Parents have to learn the causes of their sons’ behavior. Parents need to be taught to recognize that different levels of development cause various issues and changes in children’s needs. Positive parenting determines prosocial behavior that is the positive behavior which is learned only by positive way of parenting such as communication with their sons based on respect and skill. Parents should not overuse praise and positive reinforcement. Communication becomes more effective when physical differences are minimized between parent and children. Children can learn to take up the responsibilities for the behavior as they grow older. Parental bonding is an essential aspect to rear up and bring up the child in an appropriate way.
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