SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

A CORRELATIVE STUDY ON PARENTING STYLES AND IDENTITY FORMATION AMONG YOUNG ADULTS

Anto Pearlin Peter[1]
[1]*Department of Psychology, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli-627 012*

ABSTRACT
The study's main aim is to explore perceived parenting style and examine its relationship with identity formation among young adults. The study was conducted on college and university students aged 18 to 25, the samples were selected through a convenience sampling method. The respondents completed the socio-demographic Profile, the perceived parenting style questionnaire developed by Divya T. V. & Manikandan K. in 2013, and the identity formation questionnaire developed by Stefanos Mastrotheodoros & Frosso Motti-Stefanidi in 2016. Statistical analyses, including descriptive analysis and correlation were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 23.0 . A correlational research design is adopted in the study. Findings indicated that there is a significant relationship between perceived parenting style and identity formation. Suggesting that parenting approaches play a crucial role in shaping identity development. These results underscore the importance of supportive and adaptive parenting styles to promote healthy identity formation.
KEYWORDS: *Perceived Parenting Style, Identity Formation, Young Adults.*

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important developmental stages of adolescence and early adulthood is identity formation. According to Erikson's psychosocial theory, people attempt to develop a solid understanding of who they are throughout the "identity vs. role confusion" stage (Erikson, 1968). This process includes examining one's values, beliefs, and objectives as they relate to parenting and other influences. The way people understand their parents' actions and attitudes, which affects their emotional and psychological growth, is known as perceived parenting style (Alabddi, 2023). In 1966, Baumrind divided parenting into three categories: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Maccoby and Martin (1983) added negligent parenting to this list.

Identity formation is promoted by authoritative parenting, which is defined by warmth and structure (Giri, 2020). Identity formation is promoted by authoritative parenting, which is defined by warmth and structure (Giri, 2020). Identity confusion can result from authoritarian parenting, which has rigid rules but no emotional support. Permissive parenting might affect the development of an individual's identity. Identity diffusion is associated with neglectful parenting, which is characterized by a lack of control and response (Giri, 2020).

In contrast to authoritarian and neglectful parenting styles, which can confuse, research indicates that authoritative parenting promotes the development of healthy identities (Giri, 2020). Cultural differences in parenting are still not well studies, though. To guide psychological and educational therapies, this study investigates the relationship between young adults' identity formation and their perceptions of parenting approaches.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

The primary aim of this research is to examine the relationship between perceived parenting styles and identity formation among young adults. The objective of the study includes,to examine the relationship between perceived parenting style and identity formation among young adults, to find the significant difference in family structure in perceived parenting style and to find the significant differences in family structure in identity formation. The hypotheses proposed are: H1-There would be a relationship between perceived parenting style and identity formation among young adults, H2-There would be a significant difference in family structure in perceived parenting style and H3-There would be a significant difference in family structure in identity formation. A convenient sampling method was utilized, resulting in a total of 49 participants from colleges and universities. Data collection was carried out through a Google form distributed via Whatsapp, with participants informed about the study prior to their participation.

Two inventories were employed: Perceived Parenting Style questionnaire by Divya, T. V & Manikandan. K (2013), which measures the perceived parenting style in 3 dimensions namely authoritative, authoritarian and permissive in a 5-point Likert scale. The reliability of the PPS is Authoritative style is having an Alpha coefficient of 0.79, authoritarian 0.81 and permissive 0.86. All the styles of the

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

perceived parenting style scale have an acceptable level of reliability.; and the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire-IV (AIQ-IV) developed by Jonathan M. Cheek & Stephen R. Briggs, 2002, which assesses identity formation and has 5 dimensions, showing high internal consistency reliability. The correlational research design is used to examine the extent of the relationship between two variables. SPSS (Windows version 20.0) was used for normality testing, Pearson's correlation, and independent sample T test is used to find the differences.

RESULTS

Table 1
Normality Testing of the Study Variables

Variables	N	Mean	Skewness	Kurtosis
Perceived Parenting Style	49	82.63	0.35	-0.267
Identity Formation	49	151.71	0.474	-0.451

Table 1 shows the results of normality testing for the study variables. The skewness and kurtosis values for Perceived Parenting Style are 0.35 and -0.267 respectively. The skewness and kurtosis values for identity formation are 0.474 and -0.451 subsequently. The skewness and kurtosis value lies between the acceptable range of -2 to +2 and -7 to +7 respectively, which shows that the data were normally distributed based on West et al, (1996). Hence, parametric tests for hypotheses testing were used in this study.

Table 2
Frequency Distribution of the Demographic Variables (n=49)

Demographic Variables	Category	Frequency	%
Education qualification	Under graduation	35	70
	Post graduation	15	30
Current living situation	With parents	27	54
	Hostel	4	8
	PG	2	4
	Independent	11	22
	others	6	12
Family Structure	Nuclear family	31	62
	Joint family	11	22

Table 2 shows the frequency distribution of the demographic variables such as education qualification, current living situation and family structure.

Table 3
Results of the descriptive statistics of Independent and Dependent variables(n=49)

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation
Perceived parenting style	82.63	11.06
Identity formation	151.71	28.07

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation for the study variables. The mean value for perceived parenting style is 82.63 and for identity formation is 151.71. The SD values for perceived parenting style and identity formation is 11.06 and 28.07 subsequently.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Table 4
Correlation between Perceived Parenting Style and Identity Formation

Variables	N	Mean	SD	r value
Perceived parenting style	49	82.63	11.06	0.314*
Identity formation	49	151.71	28.07	

Table 4 reveals the relationship between perceived parenting style and identity formation among young adults. It was observed that there is a positive correlation between perceived parenting style and identity formation. The r value is 0.314*, which is significant at the level of **$p < 0.01$. The result is statistically significant, suggesting that there is a meaningful relationship between perceived parenting style and identity formation. Hence, the H1 is proved.

Table 5
***Significance of Family Structure difference in Perceived Parenting style and Identity Formation.* (N=49)**

Variables	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t
Perceived parenting style	Nuclear family	30	81.81	11.11	0.921
	Joint family	11	82.18	10.51	
Identity formation	Nuclear family	30	150.97	28.64	0.533
	Joint family	11	157.82	31.37	

The t-value of perceived parenting style and identity formation are 0.921 and 0.533 respectively. It shows that there was no family structure difference in perceived parenting style and identity formation.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate a correlation between perceived parenting style and identity formation, suggesting that the way individuals perceive their parent's approach to parenting has a meaningful impact on their identity development. This aligns with Erikson's psychosocial theory, which posits that identity formation is a crucial developmental task influenced by social interactions, including parental influence. Previous research also supports the notion that authoritative parenting tends to foster strong identity development, whereas authoritarian or neglectful parenting may hinder it.

However, this study shows no differences in family structure in influencing perceived parenting style it explains that the family structure doesn't affect or shape the way an individual's parenting is perceived. Rather than the family structure the emotional responsiveness care and love given by the parental figure influence an adult's perception of parenting.

Similarly, there is no significant difference in family structure in identity formation which explains that the family structure doesn't affect identity formation instead peer relationships, personal experiences, and cultural differences may shape an individual's identity. This explains that understanding the perceived parenting style and identity formation is a complex process that extends beyond family structure alone.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights the significance of perceived parenting style in shaping identity formation, explaining that the quality of parent-child relationships matters more than the structural makeup of the family. The absence of significant differences in family structure suggests that identity development is a complex process influenced by various factors beyond the family environment. Future research could explore additional variables, such as cultural influences, socioeconomic status, and peer relationships, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of identity formation. These findings also have implications for parenting interventions and counseling, emphasizing the need to focus on nurturing supportive and adaptive parenting styles rather than merely addressing structural family dynamics.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 4 | April 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

REFERENCES

1. *APA PsycNet. (n.d.). https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1975-26412-001*
2. *Carrey N. The Two Ericksons: Forgotten Concepts and what Constitutes an Appropriate Professional Knowledge Base in Psychiatry. J Can Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2010 Nov;19(4):248. Manikandan, K. (2013). Perceived parenting style scale. Universityofcalicut. https://www.academia.edu/42141918/Perceived_Parenting_Style_Scale*
3. *Relational identity orientation: a fourth scale for the AIQ Jonathan M. Cheek, Shannon Smith, and Linda R. Tropp Wellesley College; Boston College*
4. *Kivnick HQ, Wells CK. Untapped richness in Erik H. Erikson's rootstock. Gerontologist. 2014 Feb;54(1):40-50.*
5. *Cheek, J. M., Tropp, L. R., Chen, L. C., & Underwood, M. K. (1994, August). Identity Orientations: Personal, social, and collective aspects of identity. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA. Adapted from: Cheek, Underwood & Cutler (1985). Cheek, J. M., Smith, S.M., & Tropp, L. R. (2002, February). Relational identity orientation: A fourth scale for the AIQ. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Savannah, GA.*