



EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN RELATION TO PARENT CHILD RELATIONSHIP OF ADOLESCENT CHILDREN OF WORKING AND NON-WORKING MOTHERS

Dr.Suprerna Khanna

B.C.M. College of Education, Ludhiana.

Introduction

Emotional Intelligence has been adopted as a relatively new concept, it has always, even if largely unacknowledged, been part of our being. Teaching adolescents about their emotions and how they deal with others as well as their own actions can be very helpful in their daily struggles and maintaining good relationships. Emotional development in children and adolescents stems from their interactions at home with parents and siblings. It is a recent area of research, especially with regard to testing Emotional Intelligence and in establishing the role of Emotional Intelligence during adolescence. It is important to acknowledge the benefits of recognizing Emotional Intelligence among adolescents and understanding how it may impact their growth and development. The latest research in psychology has shown that human beings operate from two minds- the rational mind and the primitive mind, which is purely the emotional mind. The emotional mind is the source of basic emotions, anger, sadness, fear, trust, surprise etc. the rational mind in the neo-cortex, the outer part of the brain, allows human not only to plan, learn and remember, but also to love, care and make moral and ethical decisions.. The harmony between the emotional mind and the rational is what constitutes Emotional Intelligence and is the key to a richer and more fulfilling life.

Mayer and Salovey (1990) defined Emotional Intelligence as a type of social intelligence, that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's emotions, to discriminate among them and to use the information to guide one's thinking and actions.

Mayer(1999) defines Emotional Intelligence as 'the capacity to reason with emotion in four areas: to perceive emotion, to integrate it into thought, to understand it and to manage it. Mayer further states that "Emotional Intelligence broadens EI understanding of what it means to be smart."

Goleman (1995) defined Emotional Intelligence as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face to frustrations, to control impulse and delay gratification, to regulate ones mood and keep distress from swamping the ability to think, to empathize and to hope. Emotional Intelligence is the capacity to recognizing our own feeling and those of others for motivating ourselves and with others.

Related Research

Latha, Ramaswamy&Ananthasayanam (2005) concluded that Emotional Intelligence does not influence the teacher effectiveness in general. But Emotional Intelligence does affect certain aspects of teaching process viz. teacher's sense of humour and mastery in subject.

Arunmozhi A. and Rajendran. K (2008) conducted a study "Emotional Intelligence of self-help group members." the attempt was made to assess the influence of age, marital status, type of family, community and family status on the Emotional Intelligence of self-help group and founded that the Emotional Intelligence of self help group members was based on their age marital status, type of family, community and family status.

Kaur, R. (2008) conducted a study on 'Emotional Intelligence and Family Environment as determinants of academic achievement of teacher-trainees' and found that no significant relationship is found between academic achievement and Emotional Intelligence of teacher-trainees.

Parent Child Relationship

The age of childhood is very much susceptible to influences that are caused by the parents or the family and have a long lasting effect on the development of personality of the child. Personality of a man is a reflection of his



childhood, the period in which he was with his parents. The affection given to the child by the parents affects the child's growth and personality. It is the onus of the parents to train the child to combat challenges of life with tolerance and perseverance and also to have a balanced response to different situations and to refrain them from stepping out of conformity. If parental relations are good with a child in early years, it affects the child's growth in a positive way.

The Oxford English Dictionary (1996) defines parenting as 'The single-minded, unconditional desire to provide a loving, caring home' (p. 1521). As an art of creating an environment for children parenting allows them to grow into wholesome and healthy adults. Thus, parents have an enormous responsibility to provide for all the basic needs of children who during early years are totally dependent on them. In essence parenting is the recognition by each individual of his or her responsibility to protect, care for, and nurture the young.

Bornstein (1995) has delineated its four essential functions: (a) nurturant care giving meets the physical requirements of the child, (b) material care giving constructs and organizes the child's physical world, (c) social care giving includes the variety of behaviours parents use in engaging their children in interpersonal exchanges, and (d) didactic care giving consists of the variety of strategies parents use in stimulating children to engage in and the understand the world outside the parent-child dyad. This view offers a broad perspective on parenting. First, it does not limit parenting to biological parents; other biological relations and caretakers who are unrelated to the child may also be centrally engaged in it. The assumption that mothers as primary caregivers have 'the most powerful effects on their children's development is open to question. Second, Bornstein makes the point that parenting is a relationship that unfolds over a period of time. Third, he emphasizes the responsibilities of parents to socialize children to help them become well-functioning members of the culture in which they are born and grow. Fourth, parenting is not limited to what parents believe about child rearing or how they behave toward their children but considers the question of how parents create family environments that foster children's development. Thus, the process of parenting is not confined to the relationships between an adult and his/her biological offspring, but occurs whenever an individual takes an active role in the process of helping a child to grow and develop.

JagpreetKaur (2010) revealed significant gender differences in control, protectiveness, social isolation, reward, deprivation of privileges, rejection and permissiveness components of home environment. Male adolescents perceived their home environment to be significantly more controlled, socially isolated, deprived of certain privileges, rejected and permissive whereas female adolescents perceived their home environment to be more protective and rewarding than their male counterparts.

Rivers et al (2010) found that emotional scores in adolescents were positively correlated with having healthy social relationships, high self reliance and better quality relationships with their parents.

Sandra Yu Rueger (2011) analyses support the association between parental affect and parenting behavior, and this relation was consistent across types of affect and parenting, as well as gender of parent. Significant methodological moderators of these relations include time frame match and reporter match. Child age moderated the relation between negative affect and supportive-positive parenting, but not harsh-negative parenting. Last, both negative and positive affect showed specificity in their association with parenting behavior.

Need And Significance of The Study

Although every member of the family occupies a vital position in the process of interaction but the most interaction force is the mother because it is she with whom the child makes his first contact. She is a vital source for the satisfaction of the child's physical, emotional, social and psychological needs. She is the nourisher, provider, counselor, developer and an equal sharer of joys and sorrows of the child's life.

The fast and radical changes occurring in the world at all levels have affected the life style and family pattern of Indian society. Working women has changed the seen at family level which has affected parent child relationship



and has affected the society at large. I have planned to conduct my study on the thirist area of handling adolescents for which parent child relationship plays a significant role. Adolescents are the backbone of the society so they need to be tackled in an efficient manner by parents. Their Emotional Intelligence is to be developed in a family. As are the parents so are the children. Taking up the adolescent children of working and non-working mothers I have tried to know whether parent child relationship is different at homes where mothers are working. Emotional Intelligence is an important factor in developing a harmonious personality. That is why I have taken Emotional Intelligence as dependent variables and parent child relationship as independent variable.

Statement of The Problem

Emotional Intelligence in relation to parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.

Operational Definitions

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence has been defined as the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions to discriminate among them to perceive accurately, appraise and express emotions. Parent child relationship.

Parent child relationship means parent child harmony which reflects on ten dimensions – protecting, symbolic punishment, rejecting, object punishment, demanding, symbolic reward, loving, object reward, neglecting.

Working mothers

They are defined as women employed in any gainful occupation for minimum five hours outside the home.

Non-working mothers

Mothers who stay at home and are engaged in household work.

1.8 Objectives of The Study

1. To study and compare Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
2. To study and compare Emotional Intelligence of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
3. To study and compare Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
4. To find out the difference between Emotional Intelligence of male and female adolescent children.
5. To study and compare parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
6. To study and compare parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
7. To study and compare parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
8. 8 To find out the difference between different dimensions of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children.

Hypotheses

1. There exists no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
2. There exists no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
3. There exists no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
4. There exists no significant difference in Emotional Intelligence of male and female adolescent children.



5. There exists no significant difference between parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
6. There exists no significant difference between parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
7. There exists no significant difference between parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.
8. There exists no significant difference in different dimensions of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children.

Delimitations of Study

- a. The present study was delimited to variables of the study, samples, tools, areas and techniques.
- b. Parent child relationship was taken as independent variable while social maturity and Emotional Intelligence were taken as dependent variables for the purpose of study.
- c. A sample of 1000 adolescents was taken from the private and government schools of Ludhiana city.

Tools Used

1. Emotional Intelligence Scale by Dr.Hyde, Dr. Pethe and Dr.Dhar (2001).
2. Parent Child Relationship Scale by Dr.Rao (1971).
3. Social Maturity Scale by Dr.Rao (1971).

Statistical Techniques

Measures of Central Tendency
 Product Moment Correlation
 t-test
 Analysis of Variance

Results and Discussion

Differences in Emotional Intelligence and parent child relationship of children of working and non-working mothers.

4.1 SECTION- A

Section A (Part I), Significance of Differences between Children of Working and Non-Working Mothers In Terms Of Emotional Intelligence

Working Status	N	Mean	SD	SE _D	t-ratio	Sig. Level
Working	500	142.49	25.58	1.67	5.20	0.01
Non-Working	500	151.20	27.14			

It is evident from table 4.1 that t-ratio for Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 5.20 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis H01 stating that there exists no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected.

Further, mean score of Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of non-working mothers (M=151.20, N=500) is more than Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working mothers (M=149.49, N=500). This means that Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of non-working mothers is significantly higher than Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working mothers.



Table 4.2: Significance of difference in mean scores of Emotional Intelligence of Male Adolescent children of working and non-working mothers.

Working Status	N	Mean	SD	SE _D	t-ratio	Sig.
Working	250	135.13	15.82	1.33	1.17	NS
Non-Working	250	136.70	13.96			

NS Not significant

It is evident from table 4.2 that t-ratio for Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 1.17 which is not significant. This means that the Emotional Intelligence of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers does not differ significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis H02 stating that there exists no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is not rejected.

Table 4.3: Significance of difference in mean scores of Emotional Intelligence of female Adolescent children of working and non-working mothers

Working Status	N	Mean	SD	SE _D	t-ratio	Sig. Level
Working	250	149.85	30.86	2.71	6.02	0.01
Non-Working	250	166.18	29.26			

It is evident from table 4.3 that t-ratio for Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 6.02 which is significant at .001 level. This means that the Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis H03 stating that there exists no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected.

Further, mean score of Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children of non-working mothers (M=166.18, N=500) is more than Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working mothers (M=149.85, N=500). This means that Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children of non-working mothers is significantly higher than Emotional Intelligence of adolescent children of working mothers.

Table 4.4 Significance of difference in mean scores of Emotional Intelligence of Male and Female Adolescent Children

Gender	N	Mean	SD	SE _D	t-ratio	Sig. Level
Male	500	135.91	14.92	1.59	13.53	0.01
Female	500	157.43	32.23			

It is evident from table 4.4 that t-ratio for Emotional Intelligence of male and female adolescent children is 13.53 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the Emotional Intelligence of male and female adolescent children differ significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis H04 stating that there exists no significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of male and female adolescent children is rejected.

Further, mean score of Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children (M=157.43) is more than Emotional Intelligence of male adolescent children (M=135.91). This means that Emotional Intelligence of female adolescent children is significantly higher than Emotional Intelligence of male adolescent children.



Section A (Part II)

Differences between Children of Working and Non-Working Mothers In Terms Of Parent-Child Relationship

Table 4.5: Significance of difference in mean scores of Parent child Relationships of Adolescent children of working and non-working mothers

Dimension	Working Status	N	Mean	SD	SE _D	t-ratio	Sig.
Protecting	Working	500	77.85	9.11	.582	1.81	NS
	Non-working	500	76.79	9.23			
Symbolic Punishment	Working	500	55.65	10.00	.673	5.04	0.01
	Non-working	500	59.04	11.19			
Rejecting	Working	500	77.70	9.62	.765	9.57	0.01
	Non-working	500	70.38	14.09			
Object Punishment	Working	500	76.69	10.98	.674	0.80	NS
	Non-working	500	77.23	10.22			
Demanding	Working	500	77.09	9.74	.745	5.96	0.01
	Non-working	500	72.65	13.45			
Indifferent	Working	500	77.75	9.47	.742	9.16	0.01
	Non-working	500	70.95	13.58			
Symbolic Reward	Working	500	77.56	8.94	.699	7.20	0.01
	Non-working	500	72.53	12.76			
Loving	Working	500	76.19	11.72	.689	2.19	.05
	Non-working	500	77.70	9.89			
Object Reward	Working	500	76.52	10.25	.779	14.18	0.01
	Non-working	500	65.47	14.03			
Neglecting	Working	500	76.84	9.96	.808	12.59	0.01
	Non-working	500	66.68	15.01			

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension protecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 1.81 which is not significant. This means that the dimension protecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers does not differ significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension protecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is not rejected.

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 5.04 which is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of adolescent children of non-working mothers is more than mean score of adolescent children of working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 9.57 which is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected.



Further, the mean score of adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension object punishment of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 0.80 which is not significant. This means that the dimension punishment of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers does not differ significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension punishment of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is not rejected.

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension demanding of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 5.96 which is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the dimension demanding of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension demanding of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 9.16 which is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 7.20 which is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension loving of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 2.19 which is significant at .05.level. This means that the dimension loving of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension loving of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of adolescent children of non-working mothers is more than mean score of adolescent children of working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension object reward of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 14.18 which is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the dimension object reward of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension object reward of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of adolescent children of non-working mothers.



It is evident from table 4.5 that t-ratio for dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 12.59 which is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis H09 that there exists no significant difference between dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of adolescent children of non-working mothers.

Table 4.6: Significance of difference in mean scores of Parent child Relationships of male Adolescent children of working and non-working mothers

Dimension	Working Status	N	Mean	SD	SE _D	t-ratio	Sig.
Protecting	Working	250	77.77	9.68	0.78	2.31	.05
	Non-working	250	75.96	7.72			
Symbolic Punishment	Working	250	57.97	11.22	0.95	2.92	.01
	Non-working	250	60.74	9.99			
Rejecting	Working	250	77.71	10.18	1.08	7.85	0.01
	Non-working	250	69.20	13.79			
Object Punishment	Working	250	77.52	10.28	0.91	0.31	NS
	Non-working	250	77.80	10.06			
Demanding	Working	250	76.36	10.74	0.93	1.55	NS
	Non-working	250	77.81	10.09			
Indifferent	Working	250	77.38	9.95	1.00	3.19	0.01
	Non-working	250	74.19	12.29			
Symbolic Reward	Working	250	77.78	9.11	0.93	3.67	.01
	Non-working	250	74.37	11.56			
Loving	Working	250	77.97	10.26	0.88	0.12	NS
	Non-working	250	78.08	9.31			
Object Reward	Working	250	75.53	11.53	1.04	2.91	.01
	Non-working	250	72.51	11.72			
Neglecting	Working	250	76.66	10.70	1.15	11.30	.01
	Non-working	250	63.64	14.73			

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-value for dimension protecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 2.31 which is significant at .05 level. This means that the dimension protecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis H010 that there exists no significant difference between dimension protecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected.

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 2.92 which is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of male adolescent children of non-working mothers.



It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 7.85 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children of non-working mothers is more than mean score of male adolescent children of working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension object punishment of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 0.31 which is not significant. This means that the dimension punishment of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers does not differ significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension punishment of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is not rejected.

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension demanding of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 1.55 which is not significant. This means that the dimension demanding of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers does not differ significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension demanding of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is not rejected.

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 3.19 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of male adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 73.67 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of male adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension loving of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 0.12 which is not significant. This means that the dimension loving of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers does not differ significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension loving of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is not rejected.

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension object reward of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 2.91 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension object reward of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension object reward of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-



working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of male adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.6 that t-ratio for dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 11.30 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of male adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of male adolescent children of non-working mothers.

Table 4.7: Significance of difference in mean scores of Parent child Relationships of female Adolescent children of working and non-working mothers

Dimension	Working Status	N	Mean	SD	SE _D	t-ratio	Sig.
Protecting	Working	250	77.92	8.52	0.86	0.31	NS
	Non-working	250	77.65	10.51			
Symbolic Punishment	Working	250	53.32	7.99	0.92	4.31	.01
	Non-working	250	57.29	12.07			
Rejecting	Working	250	77.70	9.05	1.08	5.67	.01
	Non-working	250	71.59	14.32			
Object Punishment	Working	250	75.85	11.60	0.99	0.78	NS
	Non-working	250	76.63	10.37			
Demanding	Working	250	77.81	8.58	1.06	9.86	.01
	Non-working	250	67.31	14.40			
Indifferent	Working	250	78.12	8.97	1.06	9.93	.01
	Non-working	250	67.60	14.06			
Symbolic Reward	Working	250	77.34	8.79	1.03	6.50	.01
	Non-working	250	70.63	13.66			
Loving	Working	250	74.41	12.80	1.06	2.74	.01
	Non-working	250	77.30	10.46			
Object Reward	Working	250	77.51	8.68	0.96	20.01	.01
	Non-working	250	58.20	12.44			
Neglecting	Working	250	77.03	9.18	1.10	6.56	.01
	Non-working	250	69.81	14.68			

It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 4.31 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of female adolescent children of non-working mothers is more than mean score of female adolescent children of working mothers.



It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 5.67 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of female adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of female adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension object punishment of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 0.78 which is not significant. This means that the dimension punishment of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers does not differ significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension punishment of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is not rejected.

It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension demanding of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 9.86 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension demanding of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension demanding of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of female adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of female adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 9.93 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of female adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of female adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 6.50 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of female adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of female adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension loving of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 2.74 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension loving of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant difference between dimension loving of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of female adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of female adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension object reward of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 22.01 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension object reward of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there exists no significant



difference between dimension object reward of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of female adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of female adolescent children of non-working mothers.

It is evident from table 4.7 that t-ratio for dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is 6.56 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers differs significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis H011 that there exists no significant difference between dimension neglecting of parent child relationship of female adolescent children of working and non-working mothers is rejected. Further, the mean score of female adolescent children of working mothers is more than mean score of female adolescent children of non-working mothers.

Table 4.8: Significance of difference in mean scores of different dimensions of parent child relationship of male and female Adolescent children

Dimension	Gender	N	Mean	SD	SE _D	t-ratio	Sig.
Protecting	Male	500	76.87	8.79	0.58	1.58	NS
	Female	500	77.79	9.54			
Symbolic Punishment	Male	500	59.36	10.70	0.67	6.10	0.01
	Female	500	55.27	10.38			
Rejecting	Male	500	73.46	12.83	0.80	1.55	NS
	Female	500	74.69	12.31			
Object Punishment	Male	500	77.66	10.16	0.67	2.13	0.05
	Female	500	76.23	11.01			
Demanding	Male	500	77.09	10.44	0.74	5.97	0.01
	Female	500	72.64	12.91			
Indifferent	Male	500	75.79	11.28	0.77	3.70	0.01
	Female	500	72.94	12.87			
Symbolic Reward	Male	500	76.07	10.54	0.71	2.85	0.01
	Female	500	74.04	11.92			
Loving	Male	500	78.03	9.79	0.69	3.19	0.01
	Female	500	75.83	11.80			
Object Reward	Male	500	74.02	11.71	0.83	7.21	0.01
	Female	500	68.01	14.41			
Neglecting	Male	500	70.15	14.42	0.86	3.86	0.01
	Female	500	73.48	12.71			

It is evident from table 4.8 that t-ratio for dimension protecting of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children is 1.58 which is not significant. This means that the dimension protecting of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children does not differ significantly.

It is evident from table 4.8 that t-ratio for dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children is 6.10 which is t significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension symbolic punishment of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children differ significantly. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children (M=59.36) is more than mean score of female adolescent children (M=55.27) which indicates that male adolescent children are punished symbolically more than their female counterparts.



It is evident from table 4.8 that t-ratio for dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children is 1.55 which is not significant this means that the dimension rejecting of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children does not differ significantly.

It is evident from table 4.8 that t-ratio for dimension object punishment of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children is 2.13 which is significant at .05 level. This means that the dimension object punishment of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children differ significantly. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children (M=77.66) is more than mean score of female adolescent children (M=76.23) which indicates that male adolescent children are given object punishment more than their female counterparts.

It is evident from table 4.8 that t-ratio for dimension demanding of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children is 5.97 which is significant at .01 level. This means that the dimension demanding of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children differ significantly. Further, the mean score of male adolescent children (M=77.09) is more than mean score of female adolescent children (M=72.64) which indicates that parents are more demanding with male adolescent children than with female adolescent children.

It is evident from table 4.8 that t-ratio for dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children is 3.70 which is significant at .01 levels. This means that the dimension indifferent of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children differs significantly. Further, the (mean score=75.79) of male adolescent children is more the (mean score=72.94) of female adolescent children of non-working mothers which indicates that parents are more indifferent towards male adolescent children than to female adolescent children.

It is evident from table 4.8 that t-ratio for dimension symbolic reward of parent child relationship of male and female adolescent children is 2.85 which is significant at .01 .

Educational Implications

Research work will not be considered complete in itself unless and until the research findings are put to some practical use, as such in the section of this chapter an attempt is made to see how the findings of the present study can be used as guidelines to pamper, to protect and to promote Emotional Intelligence, social maturity and parent child relationship of the adolescent children so that they live fantastically in all walks of life. This study has come out with certain revealing findings which if given due consideration will certainly help a lot in developing desirable attitudes in adolescent children. Secondly, the findings are of very much consideration for parents as to how they can make remarkable contribution in the lives of their children by bridging the gap between child's needs and parent's expectations from them. If suggestions are to be taken and accepted in the desired form and practiced in the true spirit can really work wonders in developing adolescent children harmoniously. In this study the effect of maternal employment on children's Emotional Intelligence, social maturity and parent child relationship has emerged as an salient feature. Children of non-working mothers are high on Emotional Intelligence. It is a hard fact that when mothers are working they cannot handle children's emotions as per their requirement. When children need them and want to share with them they don't find their mother's presence and by the time mother's are present children have had their outlet with their friends. So the working mother needs to manage her time in such a way so as to cater the emotional needs of her children. She must give a proper hearing to the child and must provide a helping hand when the child needs it. There is no substitute of a mother so a working mother should provide its due to the children which will build up a bridge of faith between the two which otherwise is endangered due to the physical absence of mother. This will definitely help the child in developing better Emotional Intelligence. Children of working mothers perceive the behaviour of their parents as neglecting, rejecting, demanding providing symbolic and object reward more than the children of non-working mothers. Adolescence is a tender age. It's a period of stress and strain, storm and strive. So working status of mother should not pressurize the adolescent children in such a way that they are disorganized in their personalities. Working mothers should try to do justice with her children and family as children are real asset for



her and they should never get spoiled at her profession's cost. Children of non-working mothers are perceiving their parents loving and providing symbolic punishment more than the children of working mothers. Love is the only area which makes a very compatible ground for healthy growth of relations and successful functioning of life. When children feels their parents loving they get more emotionally attached to them and generation gap reduces parent adolescent conflict diminishes which leads to storage of energy which can be further used in more constructive ways. It's a matter of great concern that there is significant difference in the Emotional Intelligence of male and female adolescent children. Here one has the feeling that despite the modernization and advancements we still somehow make our female child more emotional and intimate in relationships as compared to male children. Interpersonal understanding is taught to female children much earlier. Male adolescent children are not provided with any kind of education to help them verbalize their feelings about their own emotional status and those of other people. Female child is emotional and needs to be more emotional and sensitive to the needs of others is rooted in Indian values and traditions. The responsibility to change this situation rests on the shoulder of parents in general and mothers in particular. The mothers through their influence on female children can help to erase the line of demarcation between male and female children. She must treat and train the children of both genders alike so that society can have emotionally intelligent children. Not only this, boys are to be properly educated and trained to handle their emotions, to act wisely and strongly and to gain successfully in life. Only an emotionally intelligence child can bloom in life. A society where male and female children are handled and treated alike and developed equally is to shine and enrich in the world. The findings of the present research reveal that there is no significant difference in the social maturity of male and female adolescent children. In the world of globalization both the sexes are treated alike, both are provided with equal opportunities, the parents are providing same opportunities of socialization to their children. No matter what their gender is. Such kind of results give us a satisfaction that gender bias is reducing and female children are being treated equally or t par with male children.

References

1. Bar-On, R. (2000) Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the emotion quotient inventory. In: R. Bar-On and J. Parker (Ed's). The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
2. Baumrind, D. (1971) Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4, (1, part 2).
3. Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A Cowan & M.E. Hetherington (Eds.), *Family transitions: Advances in family research* (Vol. 2, pp. 111-164). Hillsdale, N.J. : Erlbaum.
4. Dunn, S. (2003) Ten signs of emotional intelligence. Retrieved In: www.selfgrowth.com.
5. Mayer, J.D. and Salovy, P. (1993) The intelligence of emotional intelligence, 17, 433-442.
6. Mayer, J.D. and Salovy, P. (1997) What is emotional intelligence? In: P. Salovey and D. Seuytar (eds.) *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: implications for educators*, New York: Basic Books.

Websites

- www.prenticehall.com
- www.mcgraw-hill.com
- www.kluwer_academic.htm
- www.wikipedia.org