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 Aims: To study the role of EI and parenting style in predicting psychological well-being among adolescents in an Indian scenario. Materials and Methods: This cross-sectional, analytical study was carried out on 75 boys and 75 girls in the age range of 15–18 years and attending school. They were assessed with the sociodemographic data sheet, trait EI questionnaire, psychological well-being inventory, and parental authority questionnaire. After the administration on different scales, the scoring was done and data were analyzed with SPSS. Results: There were no gender differences in the scores of EI, psychological well-being, and self-reported parenting style scores. There was a significant positive co-relation between well being and authoritative, authoritarian and autonomy, positive relationship, and self acceptance. Authoritarian parenting style is highly correlated with EI in comparison to authoritative and permissive parenting styles. Conclusion: Authoritarian parenting style is most suitable for the development of EI and on the other hand, permissive parenting style has the least role in the development of EI. EI and parenting style are found to predict the psychological well-being in adolescents.
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 Adolescence is the transitional phase of growth and development between childhood and adulthood. The World Health Organization defines an adolescent as any person between ages 10 and 19. Adolescence is a period of life with specific health and developmental needs and rights. It is also a period when knowledge and skills are developed and the adolescent learns to manage emotions and relationships. He also acquires attributes and abilities that will be important for enjoying the adolescent years and assuming adult roles. In everyone’s life, emotions play an important role. Similarly, emotional intelligence (EI) is also very important component to lead a successful life.

 EI is defined as the ability to identify, assess, and control one’s own emotions, the emotions of others, and that of groups.¹] Emotional quotient (EQ) is a term used in psychometry to identify EI. EI is the ability to recognize, evaluate and regulate your own emotions, emotions of those around us and groups of people. Just like the intelligence quotient (IQ), EQ is measured by EQ test. Earlier, it was thought that IQ is the most important factor determining the academic achievement of a student, but many studies indicate that EI also plays an equal or strong role in this regard.

 Materials and Methods:

 This cross-sectional, analytical study was carried out on 75 boys and 75 girls in the age range of 15–18 years and attending school. They were assessed with the sociodemographic data sheet, trait EI questionnaire, psychological well-being inventory, and parental authority questionnaire. After the administration on different scales, the scoring was done and data were analyzed with SPSS. Results:

 There were no gender differences in the scores of EI, psychological well-being, and self-reported parenting style scores. There was a significant positive co-relation between well being and authoritative, authoritarian and autonomy, positive relationship, and self acceptance. Authoritarian parenting style is highly correlated with EI in comparison to authoritative and permissive parenting styles.

 Conclusion:

 Authoritarian parenting style is most suitable for the development of EI and on the other hand, permissive parenting style has the least role in the development of EI. EI and parenting style are found to predict the psychological well-being in adolescents.

 Keywords: Adolescence, emotional intelligence, parenting styles
role in the student life process. Emotionally proficient adolescents identify, and react efficiently to the emotions of others, handle their own feelings well, better tolerate their frustration, and are less impulsive and more attentive during the adolescent transition period. In many studies, it is concluded that appropriate parenting style is an essential factor which play a vital role in the development of children’s EI.

Psychological well-being (PWB) is a theory propounded by Carol Ryff.[2] During periods of crisis, the most dominant influence point for cultivating positive emotions is to find positive meaning.[3] PWB is a dynamic concept that includes subjective, social, and psychological dimensions as well as health-related behaviors. People higher on PWB show greater flexibility and originality, respond better to unfavorable feedback, make more positive judgments about others, have higher levels of “engagement,” are more productive, are likely to live longer, be sick less often and have happier work and home life.[4]

Perceived parenting styles are the views of adolescents or children about styles of parental behaviors during their childhood. Since Baumrind’s[5] and Maccoby and Martin’s[6] seminal work, four styles of parenting have been identified: Authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful. Authoritative parents make developmentally appropriate claims, control their children when necessary, but are receptive, loving, and converse effectively with their children. Authoritarian parents are excessively demanding, are overbearing, show little love and do not communicate often. Permissive parents make few demands, exercise little control, and are very responsive and affectionate.[7] Neglectful or uninvolved parents make few claims, fail to regulate, show little love, and do not converse often. Because EI seems to have positive effects and because it seems to be sensitive to environmental influences, it is important to study how children can develop greater EI. While abilities can be trained, personality dispositions may need subtler nurturing through human interaction. The most important human interactions of children happen with their parents. Therefore, the present study was conducted with adolescent participants to assess the correlation between perceived parenting style and EI.

Sample size
Based on the purposive sampling technique a sample consisting of 150 adolescents (75 boys and 75 girls) falling in the age range of 15–18 years were included based on the following inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion criteria
- Age range 15–18 years
- Participants of either sex were taken for the study
- Students who were in class 11th
- Participants who were cooperative and gave informed consent to participate in the study.

Exclusion criteria
- Participants below the age of 15 and above the age of 18 years
- Uncooperative participants.

Tools
Socio demographic datasheet
It was a semi-structured pro forma, especially designed for this study. It contains information about sociodemographic variables such as age, sex, religion, education, family type, and family income.

Trait emotional intelligence questionnaire
This is a 30-item questionnaire designed to measure global trait EI. It is based on the long form of the trait emotional intelligence questionnaire (TEIQue).[1] Participants were asked to rate items using a 7-point Likert scale. The TEIQue has been constructed with the aim of providing comprehensive coverage of the trait EI domain. Internal consistency and test-retest reliability of the TEIQue were 0.71 and 0.76, respectively.[9]

The psychological well-being scale
The scale consists of 42 questions consisting of a series of statements reflecting the six areas of PWB, namely, autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. Respondents rate statements on a scale of 1–6, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 6 indicating strong agreement. Reliability of the test was found to be 0.80.[2]

Parental authority questionnaire
For identifying the parenting style perceived by participants parental authority questionnaire was used. This scale consists of 30 statements. The items of the scale have to rate on a 5 point rating ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal consistencies for permissiveness, authoritarian and authoritative scales are 0.75, 0.85, and 0.82, respectively, and test-retest reliability for the scales are 0.81, 0.86, and 0.78, respectively.[9]
Procedure
First, informed consent was taken from the participants who were cooperative. Information about sociodemographic variables was collected using the sociodemographic datasheet from the drawn sample selected according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The data were collected in groups comprising four to five respondents studying in various English medium (CBSE) schools of Lucknow and Kanpur. Permission for collecting data was taken prior from principals of schools. Self-administered scales were used for data collection with proper instructions. After the administration on different scales, the scoring was done. After data collection, appropriate statistical analysis was performed using SPSS (IBM, Atlanta, USA).

RESULTS

On the scores of trait EI, parenting style, and PWB there was no significant difference between males and females [Table 1].

There exists a significant positive co-relation between well being and authoritative, authoritarian and autonomy, positive relationship and self acceptance [Table 2]. This means that individual who have better PWB will also have better sense of autonomy in thought and action, will perceive to be reared by authoritative parenting style, and also have positive relation with others while accepting oneself. Results also show that there exists significant positive co-relation between self control and autonomy, positive relationship, purpose in life and self acceptance. This mean that individuals who have better self control will also be having better sense of autonomy in thought and action, will also have positive relation with others while accepting oneself. Results also show that there exists significant positive co-relation between emotionality and authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting style. Sociability is positively co-relates with autonomy, personal growth, and purpose in life it means that individuals who are more sociable also have a better sense of thought and action, and continued growth and development as a person.

The authoritative parenting style is positively co-related with environmental mastery and personal growth. It shows that individuals who are reared with authoritative parenting style have a better ability to manage complex environments to suit personal needs and values, for example, they are quite good at managing the many responsibilities of their daily life. Results show that there exists significant positive co-relation between sociability and autonomy, personal growth, and purpose in life. This mean that individual who have better sociability will also be having better sense of autonomy in thought and action, and continued growth and development as a person and the pursuit of meaningful goals and sense of purpose in life.

Results show that there exists significant positive co-relation between authoritative and environmental mastery and positive relations. This mean that individuals who have better authoritative parenting style will also be having better ability to manage complex environments to suit personal needs and values also establishment of quality ties to other. The results also reveal a significant positive correlation between EI and PWB. This indicates that an individual who has better emotional understanding is good in managing emotions and will have a higher psychological well-being.

Multiple regression analyses were run to predict PWB (autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) from various parenting styles and EI. From Table 3, it is seen that autonomy is predicted by well being and sociability among adolescents. Well being was found to contribute 27.9% variability in autonomy, whereas sociability was found to predict 18.7% variability in autonomy. Both the variables are found to be positively correlated with autonomy. This means that when an individual is more autonomous, the person will have better well-being and will be more sociable.

From Table 3, it is seen that environmental mastery is predicted by authoritative parenting style among adolescents. Authoritative parenting style found to contribute 31.5% variability in environmental mastery. Authoritative parenting styles found to be positively correlated with the environmental mastery. This means that when an individual is more able to manage complex environments to suit personal needs and values, they have been reared by authoritative parenting style, in general, the individuals are incharge of the situation in which they live.

From Table 3, it is observed that personal growth is predicted by sociability among adolescents. Sociability was found to contribute 22.4% variability in personal growth. Hence, personal growth is positively correlated with sociability.

From the Table 3, it is clear that positive relations is predicted by well being and permissive parenting style among adolescents. Well-being was found to contribute 36.2% variability in positive relations whereas permissive parenting style was found to predict 20.1% variability in positive co-relations. Both the variables are positively correlated with positive relationship. This indicates that when an individual is having a good well-being than they are likely to be more upbeat and
fulfilled than most people. Such individuals are found to be reared through permissive parenting style and are found to have more positive relationships with others, for example, most of the people see them as loving and affectionate person.

Purpose in life is predicted by sociability and self control among adolescents [Table 3]. Sociability was found to contribute 17.9% variability in purpose in life whereas self control was found to predict 17.7% variability in purpose in life. Both the variables are positively correlated with purpose in life. This indicates that if an individual wants to have a better purpose in life, then he/she needs to be more capable of influencing other people’s feelings. Capable of with standing pressure and regulating stress these types of individuals enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality. Furthermore, they are clear about their future goals as well.

On the other hand, self acceptance is predicted by self control and well-being among adolescents [Table 3]. Self control was found to contribute 26.0% variability in self acceptance whereas well being was found to predict 19.8% variability in self acceptance. Both the variables are positively correlated with self acceptance. This mean that individuals who are high on self acceptance are more capable to controlling their emotions, reflective and less likely to give into their urges and more capable of standing pressure and regulating stress and also more upbeat and fulfilled than most people.

**DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between perceived parenting style EI and psychological well-being among adolescents. Moreover, find the gender difference on perceived parenting style, psychological well-being and EI.

Table 1: Participants responses on emotional intelligence, perceived parenting style, and psychological well-being

| Table 1. Participants responses on emotional intelligence, perceived parenting style, and psychological well-being |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Gender** | **n** | **Mean** | **SD** | **SEM** | **t** |
|---------------------------------|
| **Emotional intelligence** | | | |
| WB | Males | 75 | 29.3014 | 5.54698 | 0.64923 | -1.188 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 30.4675 | 6.41459 | 0.73101 | 1.666 (NS) |
| SC | Males | 75 | 28.4795 | 5.43423 | 0.63603 | -0.976 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 27.0130 | 5.34222 | 0.60880 | 1.243 (NS) |
| EMO | Males | 75 | 36.6757 | 7.54103 | 0.88612 | -0.0976 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 37.7532 | 6.16901 | 0.70302 | 1.106 (NS) |
| SOCI | Males | 75 | 23.3699 | 3.29246 | 0.45935 | 0.418 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 22.5195 | 4.42068 | 0.50378 | -0.498 (NS) |
| GTEI | Males | 75 | 24.3270 | 4.35034 | 0.50911 | 1.400 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 23.3506 | 4.35517 | 0.49632 | 1.106 (NS) |
| **Parenting style** | | | |
| ATARI | Males | 75 | 38.3562 | 5.99854 | 0.70208 | 0.428 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 37.9481 | 5.94312 | 0.67796 | -0.498 (NS) |
| ATATI | Males | 75 | 39.0959 | 5.26935 | 0.62158 | 1.243 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 39.5325 | 5.45338 | 0.62125 | 1.106 (NS) |
| PER | Males | 75 | 37.3014 | 6.89495 | 0.80752 | 0.400 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 36.8701 | 6.29609 | 0.71751 | 1.106 (NS) |
| **Psychological well being** | | | |
| AUTO | Males | 75 | 28.3031 | 5.88396 | 0.68843 | -0.356 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 28.9610 | 5.50464 | 0.62731 | 0.418 (NS) |
| EM | Males | 75 | 28.4932 | 5.21516 | 0.61039 | -0.498 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 29.2468 | 4.29523 | 0.48952 | 0.400 (NS) |
| PG | Males | 75 | 28.3370 | 5.19165 | 0.60764 | -0.241 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 28.3506 | 5.63767 | 0.64247 | 1.106 (NS) |
| PR | Males | 75 | 35.1781 | 6.06296 | 0.70962 | -0.198 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 35.3456 | 5.44128 | 0.61700 | 1.106 (NS) |
| P_IN_L | Males | 75 | 29.2740 | 5.36258 | 0.62674 | 1.576 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 27.8961 | 5.34244 | 0.60883 | 0.418 (NS) |
| SA | Males | 75 | 30.1918 | 5.53187 | 0.64746 | 0.525 (NS) |
| | Females | 75 | 29.7143 | 5.60277 | 0.63849 | 0.418 (NS) |

NS – Not significant; SD – Standard deviation; SEM – Standard error of mean; WB – Well-being; SC – Self-control; EMO – Emotionality; SOCI – Sociability global-trait-EI; ATARI – Authoritarian; ATATI – Authoritative; PER – Permissive; AUTO – Autonomy; EM – Environmental-mastery; PG – Personal-growth; PR – Positive-relations; P_IN_L – Purpose-in-life; SA – Self acceptance
Table 2: Correlation coefficients between emotional intelligence, parenting style, and emotional well-being

|                          | Emotional intelligence | Parenting style | Psychological well being |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|                          | WB SC EMO SOCI GTEI ATARI ATATI PER AUTO EM PG PR P_IN_ SA |
| Emotional intelligence   |                        |                |                         |
| WB                       | 1 0.372** 0.325** 0.215** 0.270** 0.248** 0.256** 0.092 0.319** 0.116 0.115 0.381** 0.155 0.295** |
| SC                       | 1 0.394** 0.206* 0.311** 0.135 0.293* 0.088 0.257** 0.157 0.185* 0.238** 0.214** 0.334** |
| EMO                      | 1 0.071 0.363* 0.299** 0.370** 0.253** 0.050 0.145 0.036 0.205* 0.182* 0.118 |
| SOCI                     | 1 0.062 0.084 0.071 0.022 0.247** 0.153 0.224** 0.146 0.215** 0.181* |
| GTEI                     | 1 0.258** 0.273** 0.131 0.132 0.155 0.136 0.223** 0.177* 0.242** |
| Parenting style          |                        |                |                         |
| ATARI                    | 1 0.517** 0.503** 0.066 0.217** -0.052 0.132 0.068 0.070 |
| ATATI                    | 1 0.679** 0.126 0.315** 0.090 0.229** 0.102 0.204* |
| PER                      | 1 0.121 0.172* 0.015 0.235** 0.008 0.080 |
| Psychological well being |                        |                |                         |
| AUTO                     | 1 0.391** 0.393** 0.520** 0.469** 0.538** |
| EM                       | 1 0.387** 0.395** 0.423** 0.464** |
| PG                       | 1 0.362** 0.352** 0.439** |
| PR                       | 1 0.369** 0.464 |
| P_IN_L                   | 1 0.468** |
| SA                       | 1 0.389** |

*Significant at 0.05 levels; **Significant at 0.01 levels. WB – Well-being; SC – Self-control; EMO – Emotionality; SOCI – Sociability; GTEI – Global-trait EI; ATARI – Authoritarian; ATATI – Authoritative; PER – Permissive; AUTO – Autonomy; EM – Environmental-mastery; PG – Personal-growth; PR – Positive-relations; P_IN_L – Purpose-in-life; SA – Self acceptance.
Our study showed that there is no gender difference in EI, psychological well-being, and perceived parenting style among adolescents which is consistent with a study done in Shimla[19] and also another study done in Hyderabad.[11]

The findings of the present study are also consistent with the study done by Hyde.[12] According to him man and woman are more like than being psychologically different. This similarity among genders is hypothesized as “gender similarity hypothesis” despite the biological differences, similarity in the way individuals perceive and process emotional information is similar across genders. However, many studies were there which showed that there is a significant difference between genders in the case of EI.[13,14]

The findings of the present study also revealed positive correlations between parenting style and EI. We found that EI is positively associated with authoritative parenting in comparison of the other two parenting styles. Findings are consistent with the findings of Liau et al.[15] In their study of 203 Malaysian secondary school students; Liau et al.[15] found a positive correlation between parental monitoring and EI.

The result of this study revealed that authoritarian parenting style has the strongest association with EI among adolescents. Previous studies consistently returned strong relationships between parenting style and children and adolescents’ behavior.[16,17] Wang and Sheikh-Khalil[18] found that parental involvement helped to boost emotional functioning among children and mental health both directly and indirectly through behavioral and emotional engagement. Stack et al.[19] in a longitudinal study established parenting style significantly influenced either the development of competent emotional functioning or problematic emotional functioning in children as they grow older and across generations.

We also found in this study that the authoritative domain of parenting style is also correlated with EI among adolescents. This research finding is in agreement with most previous studies which found authoritative parenting as being associated with positive behavioral outcomes such as increased competence, autonomy, and self-esteem as well as better problem-solving skills, better academic performance, more self-reliance, less deviance, and better peer relations.[20,21]

Our research finding revealed that permissive parenting style has a weak correlated with EI is consistent with previous studies.[22] The permissive parent indulges the child-placing little or no demand on obedience to authorities, respect for self and others and shy away from confrontation with the child on negative and maladaptive behaviors.[6]

In the present study, it was found that autonomy is predicted by well being and sociability [Table 3]. This is in agreement with the observation that when parent’s believe that their children have the required abilities, potentialities, and skills to deal effectively with various situations, this belief of parent’s, in turn, shapes adolescent’s beliefs in themselves thereby encouraging them to cope with the impending challenges.

**CONCLUSION**

The authoritarian parenting style is most suitable for the development of EI and on the other hand permissive parenting style has least role in the development of EI. Significant positive correlations exist between EI and PWB and authoritative parenting style. EI and parenting style are found to predict the psychological well-being among adolescents.
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