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Abstract
This article utilizes a symbolic interactionist approach in an investigation of perceived parenting during early adulthood. The aim is to explore the family environment and family relationships in the light of how parenting is constructed through the interaction of parents with their children and with society. The findings from semi-structured interviews conducted with adult volunteer respondents concerning their recollections of their relations with their parents are summarized. This provides the basis for outlining subjective experiences of the social environment and perceived parenting styles from a retrospective point of view in respect to gender and age differentiation.
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The Relationship between Parenting Style and Symbolic Interactionism

The symbolic interactionist approach, which resides upon the symbolic meaning that people form and develop in the process of social interaction, constitutes a basic reference framework for the social sciences in general. It comprises an analytical approach that addresses the subjective meaning that individuals ascribe to objects, events, and behavior. This type of meaning takes precedence over others insofar as individuals typically act according to their beliefs rather than what should be done in a strictly objective sense, whereby society may justifiably be
perceived as structured through human interpretation. People interpret each other’s behavior, and it is these interpretations that form the social bond.

The term symbolic interactionism is used to define a relatively distinct approach to the study of human life and human behavior (Blumer 1969). Through the prism of symbolic interactionism, reality is perceived both as social in character, and as constructed through interactions between people. In this respect, the individuality of human beings is a social product, but it is also focused and creative. That is to say that people act in accordance with the meaning that the actions in question have for them, which is formed through social interaction and subsequently moderated by personal interpretation.

Symbolic interactionism has been an important theoretical perspective in family studies since their early stage of development in the 1920s and 1930s (LaRossa and Reitzes 1993), and numerous inquiries have addressed its relationship with parenting style. For example, basic concepts of the theory of interactionism are evident in investigations that focus on family patterns of behavior, as well as personality adjustments and transformation (Thomas and Znaniecki 1918). This also holds true for analyses of processes of socialization, adjustment, identity formation, role creation, and the development of self-concept. Subsequent studies systematically applied a processual notion of symbolic interactionism such that the family came to be viewed as “a unity of inter-acting personalities” (Burgess 1926) that comprised a micro-universe of communication in which each particular personality affects every other, including the roles and selves of all involved.

Such research primarily employed conventional methods of measurement as it explored the dynamic interactions within the family as a whole, thus reflecting a more structural type of interactionism that emphasizes social structure rather than individual processes (Burgess and Cottrell 1939; Hess and Handel 1959). Other applications of an interactionist approach utilized qualitative methods to examine the dynamics of the family environment, particularly processes of interpersonal conflict, negotiation, and exploitation (Waller 1937; 1938). One basic presupposition in this regard was that the person least interested in or committed to a given relationship has the most power in that relationship, and often takes advantage of such power to exploit the other. The focus later shifted from conflict and the process of orientation towards a relatively structured perspective that emphasized family roles and a harmonious view of family life (Hill 1949; Waller and Hill 1951).

Many contemporary family studies that proceed from a symbolic interactionist perspective employ some type of role analysis. These discuss how the roles of husband and wife are defined during the various stages of family life; how conceptions of gender roles affect the definitions of spousal roles; how having children and the transition to parental roles change role constellations and interaction patterns; how both external events (parental employment, natural disasters, migration) and internal events (births, deaths, divorces) impact role definitions, performance, stress, and conflict; and how these role-specific variables affect the attitudes, dispositions, and self-conceptions of family members (Hutter 1985). In respect to the present discussion,
we may say that the symbolic interactionist perspective emphasizes the processes of role-making, role definition, role negotiation, and role identity within the family (Hochschild 1979).

Many family researchers who adapt a symbolic interactionist approach investigate the processes of socialization through which personalities and self-concepts are formed, the culture of one generation is passed to the next, and values and attitudes are transmitted from parents to children. The socialization of children is one of the few remaining—and most critical—functions of the family in modern societies. A symbolic interactionist perspective concerning child socialization encompasses a broad range of processes and outcomes involved in integrating the child into its family and society. Research has revealed that retrospective positive appraisals of one’s parents, coupled with the use of inductive control and parental support of their own children, lead to positive outcomes regarding a child’s self-conception in terms of socialization (Gecas and Schwalbe 1986; Peterson and Rollins 1987). We should note that the socialization process itself is highly reciprocal insofar as parents and children affect each other’s self-concepts. High levels of reciprocity are in fact an important characteristic of socialization processes within the family, as well as a hallmark of symbolic interactionism.

A number of investigations since the early 1990s have focused on the key role of individual perceptions in determining behavioral outcomes within the context of parent-child interactions. Children typically begin to question the authority of their parents and critically evaluate their behavior during early adolescence (Smetana 1995). Highlighting the importance of meaning for human behavior (LaRossa and Reitzes 1993) enables us to say that young adolescents assign a significance to their mother’s and father’s parenting that is based on their interactions with them, from which they proceed to interpret their parents’ behavior. Although these interpretations do not necessarily accord with their actual behavior, they nevertheless shape the children’s own behavior—studies in fact suggest that adolescent perceptions of parenting style may be more influential than the actual parenting style of their parents (Sheehan and Noller 2002; Spera 2006; Yahav 2006).

For example, a study that compared the effects of perceived parenting styles with that of actual parenting found that perceptions of parenting had a greater influence upon both the external (aggression or delinquency) and internal (depression or anxiety) behavior of adolescents than the actual style of parenting (Yahav 2006). A tenet of symbolic interactionism is that social interactions and cultural context exert a substantial influence upon individuals (LaRossa and Reitzes 1993), one conclusion being that parenting does not occur in isolation even as parents play critical roles in the adolescent behavior of their culture (Barnes et al. 2006). In addition, the influence of peer pressure and conformity is greater in early adolescence than in childhood (Brown, Lohr, and McClanahan 1986). Adolescent behavior and actions are consequently influenced by personal beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions, as well as by interactions with parents and peers.

In the light of previous studies (Sheehan and Noller 2002; Spera 2006; Yahav 2006), and in respect to the
importance of the theory of symbolic interactionism, we may conclude that how we interpret our parents’ behavior is perhaps the most important factor that affects our own behavior. The way in which a child perceives the parenting styles of their mother and father, along with how they interpret the similarities and differences in the behavior of their parents, can be crucial to a child’s development.

In turn, parenting is a process of child-raising that promotes, supports, and to a significant degree shapes a child’s physical, emotional, social, and intellectual development (Davies 2000). Moreover, it is influenced by the unique characteristics of the parents, such as their personalities, beliefs, education, well-being, and other features, which determine the daily interactions between parent and child and the ways in which their relationship develops (Bronfenbrenner 1979). Parenting is a complex activity that includes many specific actions that both individually and taken together influence what the child becomes, and most researchers who endeavor to describe this broad milieu rely upon Diana Baumrind’s concept of parenting style. Baumrind, who operationalizes parental behavior within a bio-psycho-social framework, introduces this concept as a psychological construct in order to explain the conventional strategies that parents utilize in raising their children, taking into consideration the impact that individual and social factors, and their inherent interaction, have upon the dynamics of their development over time (Baumrind 1966; 1971). The aim of this concept is to capture normal variations in attempts by parents to control and socialize their children (Baumrind 1991) in respect to two important elements of parenting, namely, parental responsiveness and parental demandingness.

(Maccoby and Martin 1983). Parental responsiveness (also referred to as parental warmth or supportiveness) refers to

the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation, and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s special needs and demands. [Baumrind 1991:62]

while parental demandingness (also referred to as behavioral control) refers to

the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys. [Baumrind 1991:61-62]

Categorizing parents in respect to the degree to which they are demanding and responsive creates a typology of four parenting styles that describes acceptance and control on the part of the parents (see: Baumrind 1991; 1996; 2005).

- Authoritarian (high demandingness and low responsiveness)
- Authoritative (high demandingness and high responsiveness)
- Permissive (low demandingness and high responsiveness)
- Neglectful (low demandingness and low responsiveness)

Each of these parenting styles, which express different naturally occurring patterns of parental values, practices, and behavior (Baumrind 1991), reflects a distinct balance of responsiveness and demandingness (Fig. 1).
Permissive parents are non-traditional and lenient, do not require mature behavior on the part of their children, allow considerable self-regulation, and avoid confrontation. Authoritarian parents are highly demanding and expect their commands to be obeyed without explanation, but are not responsive, while authoritative parents are both demanding and responsive, monitoring their children’s conduct and imparting clear standards for their behavior. They are thus assertive, but not intrusive and restrictive. In contrast, neglectful parents are low in both responsiveness and demandingness. This style of parenting may encompass parents who are both rejecting-neglecting and neglectful, although most parents of this type fall within the normal range (Baumrind 1991:62).

Parenting style has also been found to predict child well-being in respect to social competence, academic performance, psychosocial development, and problem behavior. Research based on parent interviews, child reports, and parent observations consistently finds that

- Children and adolescents whose parents are authoritative rate themselves, and are rated by objective measures, as more socially and instrumentally competent than those whose parents are non-authoritative (Baumrind 1991; Weiss and Schwarz 1996; Miller et al. 1993).
- Children and adolescents who are neglected by their parents perform most poorly in all domains.
In general, parental responsiveness predicts the future social competence and psychosocial functioning of the child, while parental demands are associated with instrumental competence and behavioral control. These findings indicate that

- Children and adolescents from authoritarian families tend to perform moderately well in school and not be involved in problem behavior, but they have poorer social skills, lower self-esteem, and higher levels of depression.

- Children and adolescents from permissive homes are more likely to be involved in problem behavior and perform less well in school, but they have higher self-esteem, better social skills, and lower levels of depression.

It is undeniable that primary parental activities are of the utmost importance for the development of the child. While this particularly includes the formation of habits consistent with a child’s given age, child development also exerts a certain influence on parents’ behavior, especially with the advance in age. It is thus important to note that the parent-child interaction is not static, but rather comprises a dynamic that is both bilateral and bidirectional.

**Research**

There is a broad, rich, and varied range of contemporary studies in the field of parenting styles (Bornstein 2005), and the solid theoretical foundations of the paradigm of parental style lend support to a diverse spectrum of research areas in developmental psychology. The research interest of the present discussion resides upon a study of how people in early adulthood perceive the parenting style of their parents. Their perceptions of parenting styles, along with the influence of the social environment, were investigated in a 2014 survey that utilized a symbolic interactionist approach. Baumrind’s model of parenting styles was also employed, but not only because of its validity and popularity. The primary motivation for the decision to employ it was that it has been successfully applied in studies of childhood, adolescence, early adulthood, and later adulthood in order to evaluate both parenting styles of one’s parents, and the parenting style later adopted by children when they become parents themselves.

Our respondents averaged 30 years in age, and our primary aim was to evaluate how they perceived their parents’ style of parenting and investigate the differences between them in this regard. An issue of particular interest concerned mixed parenting styles. We assumed that if one’s parents utilized different styles of parenting, then the young adult would perceive their general parenting style to be mixed. This would mean that it could not be clearly identified in respect to the four basic parenting styles discussed in the literature. We have also sought to identify the influence of the social environment, differences in the perceptions of parenting styles depending on the gender and age of the respondents, as well as the influence of the warmth and level of control warmth exhibited by parents from a retrospective point of view.

**Method**

A two-part semi-structured interview was utilized in our analysis of the data for two primary reasons.
The first took into consideration the fact that the social environment determines the style and process of parenting to no small degree. This led to the inclusion of questions in the first part of the interview that were aimed at revealing the influence of such external factors as social context, life changes, social pressures, and so forth. The second consideration reflected the fact that half of the participants failed to identify a specific parenting style characteristic of when they were growing up. This suggested that the main determinants of a given style of parenting—demands placed upon children and responsiveness—are blurred over time. This assumption was explored in the second part of the interview by questions designed to reveal whether perceived warmth or perceived control was more important for the respondents when assessing the parenting style of their parents from a retrospective point of view.

35 respondents aged 18 to 45 participated in the interviews. The perceived parenting styles of their parents had previously been defined by completion of the questionnaire designed for this purpose. The gender of the respondents, whether they had children of their own, and whether they had a brother or sister were also reported. 21 of the participants were women and 14 men, 32 had their own children, and all 35 had a brother or sister. The interviews consisted of 30 questions and were approximately 50 minutes in length. The questions addressed four groups of topics: the influence of the social context, the influence of time, the perception of warmth in the parent-child relationship, and the perception of control in the parent-child relationship. 45 questions had initially been formulated, but these were reduced in number after an expert assessment in order to avoid redundancy.

**Results**

**Social Environment**

In accordance with our theoretical perspective, we assumed that the extensive influence of the social environment is a significant factor in the formation and implementation of specific parenting practices. This was confirmed by our respondents’ answers—the 32 who had children of their own stated that the demands placed upon them by the environment clearly influence the guidance they give their children.

I don’t want to stop my daughter if there’s something she likes and enjoys doing, but I would certainly never encourage a profession that was outdated.

If my son wouldn’t be able to earn enough money with his future job, how could I encourage him? It would be best if what he likes is in demand today. I would hardly support him becoming an artist if that was what he wanted.

What you can’t earn money and achieve something in life with is not a profession. It might be a hobby.

Only three participants gave the opposite answer. For example,

I would definitely encourage my child to develop their talents. There is nothing better than working at something that gives you pleasure.
I will encourage my daughter even more if there’s something that makes her happy. I see nothing wrong with being yourself and developing in the direction that satisfies you.

Our respondents were unanimous regarding the values that they would like to instill in their children. All of them stated that they are guided largely by their own views and by what they themselves believe is right in raising their children, but do not ignore the accepted values, rules, and norms of society.

Of course I try to give my child good values, but we should not forget that we live in a society together with other people. If I want my child to fit in well in the future, I have to take this into consideration.

When we are in a public place, I can’t help but tell him how to behave or what not to do. I try to be a good example. I think my child will learn better that way than if I’m grumbling every day about different things all day long.

In summary, the environment is a factor that strongly affects the formation of a specific parenting behavior in child-raising. This was the expected result.

Gender

We examined our data to see whether there were any differences depending on the sex of the respondents, and we observed gender differences regarding perceptions of permissive and authoritative styles of parenting, with men being likely to perceive the general style of parenting in their family as having been more authoritative and permissive than did women. This result was also largely confirmed by the interviews. Our respondents maintained that there was a certain degree of double standard in this regard, and that greater “freedom” was given to boys concerning, for example, when to be home in the evening. The replies of most men also indicated that their parents exercised less control over them in respect to their daily responsibilities than was the case with the women. For instance, most men stated that the time at which they had to be home was not strictly determined, and the smaller number who stated that they did have a curfew also remarked that no serious consequences were associated with them coming home late.

No, I didn’t have a curfew. When I went out at night, my parents used to ask me where I was going and who else would be there, but they never told me to be home at 10. Of course, I didn't abuse their trust and the freedom they gave me.

Yes, you could say that I had to be in by a certain time. My parents told me not to be late and to be home on time. They even used to tell me a specific time when I was younger, but I rarely managed to be on time—I was almost always 20 or 30 minutes late. But, I don’t remember quarreling seriously with my parents about it or being punished.

Similar differences also pertain to the various responsibilities that parents placed upon children at home and at school, with compliance being monitored to some extent. Most of the men said that their parents gave them routine tasks concerning their room or the family in some way, but that they were rarely punished if they did not do them.
My sister and I shared a room. My part of the room was always messier and my things were more scattered around. My mother used to tell me to put away my clothes or my school books, but I seldom did. Usually my sister could not stand being that messy and would straighten everything up. I don't remember being punished for that.

My mother worked a lot and almost every week gave me different things to do—clean my room, do the dishes, run the vacuum cleaner. I did some of them, but I also forgot about some of them really often. But, I don't remember being punished for it.

In respect to performance at school, the majority of the men stated that their parents insisted that they do well and get high marks. However, they reported being punished for low grades or bad behavior in only very few cases. Poor performance or behavior led most of the time only to a stern conversation with their parents.

My parents have always told me how important education is and that I have to study hard because it's for my own good. I mostly had high marks, but there were also times when the opposite happened. My mother would then simply say that everything was fine and that I should try to do better the next time.

I wasn't an excellent student in school, but my behavior was rather good. I had pretty low grades, but I don't remember being punished or restricted by my parents. They had a serious conversation with me, and that was all.

The women's responses display the opposite tendency—they generally believed that their parents imposed greater control over them in terms of duties and responsibilities. For example, almost all of the women stated they had a curfew, and that they would not be permitted to go out for a day or two in most cases when they had been late.

Oh yeah, I had a curfew. I had to be at home at 10. I did that most of the time, but sometimes I was late. Then I knew that I would be punished by not being allowed to go out or not having spending money for a day or two.

My parents used to ask me a thousand questions at the door when I was about to go out—where are you going, with whom, why, how many people will be there, when will you get home? I had to mention a specific time for coming home and actually stick to it because I didn't want to be punished, which usually happened if I was late.

The women respondents also indicated that they were likely punished in some way, reprimanded, or restricted when they did not meet their obligations at home or school.

I had a younger brother and we shared a room. His toys were everywhere. Of course it was me who had to put everything away. Whenever the room was messy, I was reprimanded.

My mother always seriously involved me in cleaning the house when I was younger, and she often gave me different responsibilities after I grew up—to do the dishes or the dusting. I seldom remember being punished if I didn't do something, but almost every time my mother would criticize me or make remarks
like, “I think you didn’t remove everything from the shelf before you dusted” or “I think I see dust in that corner over there.”

I was an excellent student. I don’t know whether that was because of my parents, or simply because everything was easy for me. I remember that my mother was not very happy when I got a C. She used to say that it might have been a B or an A if I had worked harder.

My mother insisted that I do my homework immediately after school, and she often punished me when I got a low grade—no going out, no money, no computer. The good thing was that I rarely had bad grades.

The majority of those we interviewed thus confirmed our expectations regarding gender differences in how they perceived their parents. For example, respondents who had a brother or sister gave almost the same answers to the question “Do you think that your parents exerted more or less control over your sister/brother?” The clear tendency was for men to say that there had been more strict control over their sisters.

My sister was the oldest child, so it was normal that our parents controlled her more. I walked the beaten path.

Women in turn stated that they were subject to stricter control and more restrictions than were their brothers.

Oh yes, our parents definitely didn’t treat my brother in the same way. More demands were always placed on me, and I was expected to follow them. My brother had more freedom when it came to expectations and restrictions.

This result is quite logical and expected, particularly given the norms of our society—it strongly supported our relevant assumptions and was fully confirmed by our respondents’ answers in the interviews. Briefly stated, people think that parents still regard girls as the weaker and gentler sex who should be controlled to a greater degree. We believe that this view is driven by an unconscious desire on the part of the parents to protect girls from problems rather than by a degree of disinterest or neglect.

**Age Group**

The influence of age was also investigated. Our respondents were between 18 and 45, with an average age of 30, and we divided them into two groups in accordance with that mean value age when analyzing the results. We found that age influences perceptions of the permissiveness of both parents in child-raising and of the authoritative style of the father. Those under 30 perceived the styles of both their mother and father as more permissive than did people over 30, while those under 30 also perceived the father’s style of parenting as more authoritative.

This result can be explained in part by the fact that one’s assessment of their parents changes with the accumulation of social experience over time insofar as standards and criteria are refracted by time, which serves to place a greater emphasis upon warmth rather than control in recollections of parental behavior. This was largely evident in the interview results.
We sought to identify the most important evaluative factor in our examination of the connection between age differences and recollected perceptions of parenting styles—either the extent of control or the degree of warmth—and determine whether we could assume that this would change in respect to how much time had passed. While our respondents’ answers in this regard contained a certain lack of clarity, they nevertheless confirmed our assumptions to no small degree. For example, we found no visible differences in the responses of people aged 27-35, who expressed roughly similar views. However, significant differences were observed between the responses of those who were 25-26 and those aged 34-35, with the younger sub-group indicating that greater warmth in relations was rather important, regardless of the degree of control. A typical response was

I think my parents supported me very much, and if I was punished, I fully deserved it.

In contrast, those who were 34-35 felt that they were subjected to more control than was necessary, and they associated this with a lack of warmth and being neglected by their parents.

I don’t think my parents were particularly democratic, but I guess this was because they didn’t have enough time to pay more attention to me.

There was also a substantial difference between those who were 34-35 years of age and had children and those who did not, with the two sub-groups responding differently in respect to what they perceived to be the positive and negative aspects of their parents’ styles of parenting. They also stated that while they borrowed a significant number of elements of their parents’ behavior, they sought to avoid those that were associated with unpleasant emotions in their childhood.

I don’t think that my parents brought me up badly, and in general I have no complaints. Even if there were shortcomings, this is a lesson for me—I know what I should not let happen in relations with my child.

I try to avoid the things that were bad in relations with my parents. My father had the habit of not answering me when I asked him something. When my child now has a question to his father and he does not respond immediately, I always remind my husband to pay attention.

Such responses reveal that parenting can develop and change in respect to changed circumstances and a different temporal point of view. The results show that responsiveness and warmth in relationships with one’s parents are important when evaluated retrospectively, and that people are more likely over time to remember the degree of warmth and responsiveness shown by their parents than their degree of strictness and control. We regard this as a significant insight because it reveals the importance of parental roles in child-raising—when children feel a sufficient level of support and stability, they have a greater number of opportunities to develop and build their identity. This result can also be very useful for parents in that a majority of concerns relate to the restrictions and limits they impose on their children. Data show that a sense of
security is much more important than other factors that characterize parenting.

Conclusion

In summary, I would like to reiterate the importance of one’s perception and interpretation of parenting style and behavior in raising children. In symbolic interactionist terms, the connection between a developing person and how they perceive the parenting style of their parents is crucial for his or her future development. This was revealed in our research concerning perceived styles of parenting in early adulthood—what is essential is not the actual style of parenting employed, but rather the child’s personal interpretation of parental behavior and practices. Furthermore, the most important issue in assessing a given style of parenting is the degree of warmth and responsiveness in parent-child relations, especially from a retrospective point of view. Also significant is influence of the social environment, which comprises a factor in the formation and implementation of specific parenting practices.
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