
Impact of Parental Attitude on Successful Intelligence

Shabnam*

Department of Humanities & Social Sciences,
National Institute of Technology (NIT) Kurukshetra (Haryana) India

ABSTRACT

Parents have a parental attitude adapted to their own kids needs, some of them consider opportune educating adolescents like they were once educated, and others wish to act differently from their parents' education. The present study proposes to highlight the relationship between parental attitude and the development of successful intelligence (analytical, practical, and creative). For this purpose a sample of 503 under graduate students were administered Sternberg Triarchic Ability Test (STAT) (Sternberg, 1993) and Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) (Saxena, 1976, mother form) for Authoritarian-Control, Hostility-Rejection and Democratic-Attitude. Simple correlation and factor analysis was applied to analyze data. Correlational analyses and factor analysis revealed that some of the child rearing attitude are correlated with the development of different components of successful intelligence.

KEY WORDS: *Successful intelligence; analytical, creative and practical intelligence, child rearing attitude and family environment.*

The triarchic theory of successful intelligence (Sternberg, 1997, 1998, 1999) defines successful intelligence in terms of one's ability to succeed according to what one values in life, within one's socio cultural context (Sternberg, 2003). One achieves success through a balance of adaptation to, shaping of, and selection of environments. One optimizes these interactions with the environment by recognizing and capitalizing on one's strengths and by recognizing and correcting or compensating for one's weaknesses. One does so by a blend of analytical, creative, and practical abilities (Sternberg, 1997, 1999). All three kinds of abilities are ultimately the result of the interactions of three kinds of information-processing components: metacomponents, performance components, and knowledge-acquisition components (Sternberg, 2003). Metacomponents are executive processes, such as recognizing the nature of a problem, defining the nature of the problem, allocating resources for the solution of that problem, mentally representing information about the problem, and so forth (Sternberg, 2003).

Performance components, such as inference of relations, mapping of higher order relations, and application of relations, execute the instructions of the metacomponents. Knowledge acquisition components, including selective encoding, selective comparison, and selective combination, are used to learn how to solve problems in the first place. Metacomponents activate performance components and knowledge-acquisition components, which in turn provide feedback to metacomponents (Sternberg, 2003).

Components represent analytical (academic) abilities when they are applied to relatively abstract and academic kinds of problems that are, nevertheless, somewhat familiar. They represent creative abilities when they are applied to relatively novel kinds of tasks and situations. And they represent practical abilities when they are applied to everyday problems requiring adaptation, shaping, and selection (Sternberg, 2003). Thus, analytical, creative, and practical abilities are not wholly distinct, but rather related to each other in some degree, depending upon the given problem and the situation in which it is solved (Sternberg, 1984, 1985).

Parental Attitude and Successful Intelligence

The environmental factors in the development of different components (analytical, creative, and practical) of successful intelligence start from family because in the early childhood, the family provides care required for

children's growth and development. A great deal of evidence indicates that psychological family environment (parenting or child rearing practices) affect the development of different components (analytical, creative, and practical) of successful intelligence which has been concern of the present study.

The relationship between paternal child-rearing practices and intellectual functioning in young boys indicated that IQ was positively correlated with paternal nurturance, and negatively correlated with paternal restrictiveness (Norma, 1972). Amato & Fowler (2002) investigated the links between positive parenting practices (parent's reports of support, monitoring, and harsh punishment) and child competence. Parents' reports of lower support, lower monitoring and frequent harsh punishment were associated with children's poorer adjustment, lower school grades, and more behavior problems. Negative parenting practices such as intrusiveness predict negative child cognitive and behavioral outcomes (Jacobvitz & Sroufe, 1987; Olson et al., 1992; Egeland et al., 1993). Egeland et al. (1993) indicated that children whose mothers had been judged to be intrusive when they were six months old were less competent academically, socially, emotionally, and behaviorally than children of non-intrusive mothers. Parents can foster cognitive competence in their children has been well established by research in the past three decades (Sternberg & Williams, 1995).

Hubbs-Tait et al. (2002) concluded that the parenting practices are very important components on children's cognitive developmental outcomes within the family context. Research has indicated that children of depressed parents are at increased risk for behavior problems, emotional difficulties, as well as cognitive maladjustment (Egeland, et al., 1990). Graves and Wright (2011) examined that parental involvement was related to academic achievement (analytical intelligence) at school entry. Mohoney et al. (1998) indicated that intervention effects on child cognitive development were unlikely to occur unless mothers modified their style of interacting with their children participated in intervention modified several different parameters of interactional style, only their level of responsiveness was positively associated with their children's cognitive developmental outcomes. College students having spent most of their lives with both parents will be more creative (Eisenman et al., 1970).

Capacity-building help-giving and family-systems intervention practices had direct effects on both parent self-efficacy beliefs and well-being and indirect effects on parent-child interactions and child cognitive development mediated by self-efficacy beliefs and parent well-being (Trivette et al., 2010). Maccoby (2000) indicated that children's genetic predispositions and their parents' childrearing regimes are seen to be closely related, and the ways in which they function jointly to affect children's cognitive development. Mothers of high creative children were less emotionally involved with their children than other mothers, less likely to be perceived as overprotective, and less likely to deny their feelings of hostility towards them. They were more self-confident and self-realized in their homes and had higher occupational levels than other mothers (Michel & Dudek, 1991). Parental attitude (e.g., Abell et al., 1996; Beyer, 1995; Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999) contribute in the development of intelligence. Parenting styles as part of parental attitude also important in the development of different components of successful intelligence. Baumrind's (1978) three parenting styles of authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative are often used in studies investigating parenting styles in relation to diverse child outcome variables, such as academic achievement (analytical intelligence), self-confidence, aggression, delinquent behavior, and substance abuse (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Hart, et al., 1998; Hill, 1995; Lamborn, et al., 1991). Authoritative parenting predicts more positive outcomes for children and adolescents than other types of parenting styles (Coplan et al., 2002; Steinberg, 2001). Authoritative parenting style incorporates both encouragement and monitoring because it is the "simultaneous ability to be loving and supportive and yet maintain an adequate level of discipline in the household" (Jeynes, 2010a). While permissive and authoritarian parenting styles are typically associated with poorer cognitive and behavioral outcomes (e.g., Driscoll et al., 2008), authoritative parenting style is associated with positive school outcomes (e.g., Jeynes, 2005a, 2007, 2010a; Simpkins et al., 2006). The extant literature pertaining to the impact of specific aspects of parental involvement on school achievement document the strong positive relationship of parental expectations and parental beliefs with children's scholastic outcomes (Bronstein et al., 2005).

Researchers typically have identified these three parenting styles based on the levels of control and warmth displayed by parents on a regular basis and in a variety of situations. Studies that examined how parenting styles influenced the cognitive development of young elementary-aged children are rare (Chen et al., 1997).

One of the dimensions of authoritative parenting style-monitoring-has been found to be both positively and negatively associated with student achievement (Clark, 1993; Muller, 1993; Niggli et al. 2007; Pomerantz & Eaton, 2001; Rogers et al. 2009). Authoritative (or flexibly structured) style is more likely to be associated with adapted cognitive development (Baumrind, 1967; Lautrey, 1980). Effect size for parental monitoring dimensions, such as checking homework, was not statistically significant for elementary school achievement (Jeynes, 2005b). In the absence of sophisticated controls, the effect size for checking homework was found to be statistically significant for secondary school achievement. However, when sophisticated controls were used, it was not statistically significant (Jeynes, 2007). In a study of adolescents, Dornbusch et al. (1987) found that authoritarian parenting styles were negatively associated with higher grades, whereas the authoritative parenting style was positively associated with higher grades. Radziszewska et al., (1996) found similar results in their study of 15-year-olds. In another study of adolescents, Boveja (1998) found that adolescents who perceived their parents to be authoritative engaged in more effective learning and studying strategies.

There are some studies which depict the relationship of child rearing practices with another component of successful intelligence i.e. creative intelligence. Positive parental attitudes had influenced the development of certain features in children, which later resulted in their adult life in a creative approach to their professional work and negative parental attitudes were restrictive and made development of such features difficult (Mendecka, 1992). Attitude of the parents are directly link to the flexible thinking of the children (Busse, 1969). Child-rearing practices also emerged as significant antecedents of adolescent creative potential (Harrington et al., 1987). According to Lautrey's extension of Piaget's equilibrium paradigm to the child's social environment, a flexible parenting style favors cognitive development because this environment provides both regularities and disruptions, that is family rules to be assimilated and at times provide situations (labeled perturbations) in which negotiation is acceptable, with the possibility for novel co-constructed rules to be accommodated (Mouchiroud & Bernoussi, 2008). Authoritarian childrearing attitudes of the mother were negatively related to the creativity and originality (creative intelligence) of the child, but were positively related to academic performance (analytical intelligence) (Nichols, 1964). Maternal high control and low nurturance, is also associated with low creativity in sons. Parental conflict was significantly positively related to later adult levels of creativity but parental warmth and non-restrictiveness were not reliably associated with creativity (Koestner et al., 1999). Parenting styles that reflected higher levels of leniency were associated with no relationship with children's creative personality. Parenting styles that reflected higher levels of acceptance were associated with higher levels of creativity in their children (Lim & Smith, 2008).

Culp et al. (2000) and Hubbs-Tait et al. (2002) indicated that maternal intrusiveness measured during the preschool period is related to former Head Start children's cognitive functioning during kindergarten. They examined the relationship of maternal cognitive stimulation, emotional support, and intrusive behavior during Head Start to children's kindergarten cognitive competence. Results indicated that parental emotional support (positive feedback) during guidance of problem solving explained statistically significant unique variance in children's perceptual scores beyond other measures of emotional support. Moreover, asking questions during the problem solving process also explained statistically significant unique variance in children's cognitive performance. Finally, intrusiveness when defined as physical restraint or taking on the task explained perceptual or verbal outcomes for kindergarten children. These results were consistent with the relation of intrusiveness to teacher ratings of the social competence (practical intelligence) of children. Moreover, studies of preschool children in high-risk samples have identified maternal depression as a significant predictor of children's behavioral problems and social competence (practical intelligence) (Leadbeater et al., 1996). Maternal depression also influences the social competence (practical intelligence) of children (Brody et al.,

1994). Maternal depression was also one risk factor for cognitive competence identified by Burchinal et al. (2000). Much of the information about the role of democratic and hostile child rearing practices in the development of different components (analytical, creative and practical) of successful intelligence is not available.

METHOD

Sample: The total sample comprised of 503 under graduate students (from different branches of engineering) of National Institute of Technology (NIT) Jalandhar, Punjab (India). Students belong to different places of India, ranging from 18 years to 21 years with a mean age of 19.6 years. The variable of gender was controlled by taking only male participants.

Measures: The following psychological measures were used:

- 1) The Sternberg Triarchic Ability Test (STAT) Level H (Sternberg, 1993)
- 2) Parental Research Instrument (PARI) (Saxena, 1976)

RESULTS

Correlational Analysis: Product moment correlations of the entire variable included in the present were computed and found that some correlations of Sternberg Triarchic Ability Test (STAT) with PARI are significant and some correlations are insignificant. Significant correlations are also not so high. Correlations are reported in Table-1.

Table-1

Variables of SI	Authoritarian																Hostility-Rejection		Democratic-Attitude					
	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A9	A10	A11	A12	A15	A16	A17	A18	A19	A20	A23	A7	A13	A1	A8	A14	A21	A22	
SI	0.061	-0.077	.103*	-	.098*	-0.086	-0.006	-0.05	-0.06	-0.04	0.022	0.06	0.009	.106*	0.083	-0.004	0.05	0.024	.095*	-0.01	0.068	0.015	-0.057	
AN	0.019	-0.038	0.074	-0.02	.015	-.112*	-0.064	-0.02	-0.03	0.002	0.017	-0.01	-0.01	.093*	-0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.013	.143**	-0.04	.113*	0.031	-0.054	
PR	0.048	0.067	0.074	0.042	0.057	-0.05	0.058	-0.05	0.031	0.041	-	0.086	0.002	0.027	0.002	0.009	0.08	0.052	0.085	-0.01	.113*	0.033	-0.074	
CR	0.085	-0.04	0.064	0.062	0.082	.116**	-0.011	-0.08	-0.02	-0.01	-	0.041	-0.03	.129**	0.014	0.016	0.06	0.051	.127**	-0.04	.123**	0.028	-0.031	
V	-0.01	-0.021	0.087	-	.001	.013	-0.076	-0.032	-0.05	-0.02	0.006	0.02	0.083	0.055	0.016	-0.02	-0.07	0.06	0.018	.148**	-0.02	.1*	0.042	-0.032
Q	0.019	-0.013	0.075	-0.02	0.066	-0.082	-0.003	-0.02	-0.04	-0.02	0.011	0.029	-0.01	0.073	0.047	0.015	0.04	0.011	.089*	-0.01	0.054	-0.03	-.116**	
F	0.064	-0.073	0.072	0	0.019	-0.004	.126**	0.061	-0.01	-0.02	.098*	0.046	-0.06	0.038	0.004	0.024	0.06	-0.01	-0.025	0.052	-0.07	-0.04	-0.044	
EANALY	0.06	-.094*	0.075	-	0.02	0.011	.09*	-0.02	0.004	-	0.004	.09*	0.041	-0.06	0.048	0.025	0.037	0.07	0.055	-0.023	-0.04	-0.043	-0.04	0.009
Ecreative	0.026	.172**	0.064	-0.01	0.01	0.027	0.057	-0.01	-0.02	0.003	0.035	0.009	-0.02	.118**	0.023	0.028	0.04	0.03	0.055	-0.04	-0.052	0.015	-.121**	
Epractical	.112*	-.097*	0.047	0.001	0.004	0.073	0.047	0.02	0.056	0.03	0.062	0.042	-0.02	.147**	0.066	0.012	0.06	0.031	0.022	-0.03	-.093*	-0.06	0.051	
E4	.112*	-.097*	0.047	0.001	0.004	0.073	0.047	0.02	0.056	0.03	0.062	0.042	-0.02	.147**	0.066	0.012	0.06	0.031	0.022	-0.03	-.093*	-0.06	0.051	

*correlations are significant at .05 level

**correlations are significant at .01 level

a) Correlations of STAT with PARI variables

Correlations of successful intelligence with child rearing practices are in general ranging from .001 to .172. Thirty two of total two hundred thirty correlations are significant at or above .05 level of significance. Twenty one significant correlations are positive and eleven significant correlations are negative.

The correlations of analytical intelligence (AN) were found significant at .05 level with encouraging verbalization (A1), breaking the will (A4), fear of harming the body (A6) and ascendancy of mother (A19). Correlations of AN (analytical intelligence) with child rearing practices variables are not straightforward. One correlation is showing democratic (A1) child rearing practices and other are showing authoritative child rearing practice on mother part.

The correlations of practical intelligence (PR) were found significant at .05 level negatively with irritability (A9) and positively with equalitarianism (A14), ascendancy of the mother (A19) and encouraging verbalization (A1) at .01 level of significance. Correlations of PR (practical intelligence) with child rearing practices variables are also not clear-cut. Two correlations are showing democratic (A14 & A1) child rearing practices and other two (A9 & A19) are showing authoritative child rearing practices on part of mother.

The correlations of creative intelligence (CR) were found positively significant at .05 level with equalitarianism (A14). This correlation of creative intelligence (CR) with child rearing practices is showing authoritative child rearing practices .

The correlations of verbal intelligence (V) were found positively significant with encouraging verbalization (A1), equalitarianism (A14) ascendancy of the mother (A19) at .01 level and negatively with irritability (A9). Correlations of verbal intelligence (V) with child rearing practices variables are also not straightforward. One correlation is showing democratic (A1) and other are showing authoritative child rearing practice on mother part.

The correlations of quantitative intelligence (Q) were found positively significant with encouraging verbalization (A1) at .01 level and with equalitarianism (A14) at .05 level of significance. Correlations of quantitative intelligence (Q) with child rearing practices are showing clear-cut democratic (A1 & A14) child rearing practices.

The correlations of figural intelligence (F) were found positively significant with encouraging verbalization (A1) at .05 level and negatively with acceleration of development (A22) at .01 level of significance. Correlations of figural intelligence (F) with child rearing practices are not straightforward. One correlation is showing democratic (A1) child rearing practices and other are showing authoritative (A22) child rearing practices on mother part.

The correlations of essay analytical successful intelligence (EANALY) were found positively significant with exclusion of outside influences (A10) at .01 level and with avoidance of communication (A16) at .05 level of significance. Correlations of essay analytical intelligence (EANALY) with child rearing practices are showing straightforward authoritative (A10 & A16) child rearing practices on mother part.

The correlations of essay creative intelligence (Ecreative) were found positively significant with exclusion of outside influences (A10), avoidance of communication (A16) and negatively with seclusion of mother (A3) at .05 level of significance. Correlations of essay creative intelligence (Ecreative) with child rearing practices are showing clear-cut authoritative child rearing practices on mother part.

The correlations of essay practical intelligence (Epractical) were found positively significant at .01 level of significance with ascendancy of the mother (A19) and negatively with seclusion of mother (A3) and acceleration of development (A22). Correlations of essay practical intelligence (Epractical) with child rearing practices are also showing straightforward authoritative child rearing practices on mother part.

The correlations of total essay rating (E4) were found positively significant at .05 level with fostering dependency (A2) and with ascendancy of the mother (A19) at .01 level of significance and E4 is showing negative correlation with seclusion of mother (A3) and equalitarianism (A14) at .05 level of significance. Correlations of total essay rating (E4) with child rearing practices are not straightforward. One correlation is showing democratic (A14) and other are showing authoritative child rearing practices on mother part.

Though all the factors of successful intelligence were assumed to have correlation with child rearing practices, some of them are showing neither positive nor negative significant correlation with child rearing practices.

Factor analysis: The primary aim of this analysis was to determine the structure of successful intelligence associated with child rearing practices. The correlation matrices were subjected to principal component analysis. Seven factors were found by using varimax rotation (Kaiser, 1958) in table-11. A factor loading of .30 and above was considered to be significant. The total variance explained was 49.53%. The description is as follows:

Table –II
Rotated Factor Matrix

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	h ²
AN	0.69	0.082	0.143	-0.016	0.014	0.07	-0.059	-0.076	-0.112	-0.049	-0.009	-0.021	0.563
PR	0.70	0.009	-0.0824	-0.064	0.0671	-0.024	0.055	0.172	0.03	0.075	-0.034	0.017	0.561
CR	0.70	6E-04	0.017	0.024	-0.037	-0.004	-0.034	-0.033	0.098	-0.093	0.017	-0.005	0.515
V	0.67	0.091	0.0772	-0.066	0.127	-0.067	0.007	-0.0010	0.126	-0.178	-0.1	-0.045	0.611
Q	0.72	0.048	-0.114	0.002	-0.0149	-0.092	0.049	0.212	-0.0087	0.094	0.164	0.079	0.651
F	0.76	-0.047	0.068	-0.0041	-0.078	0.171	-0.062	-0.091	-0.122	0.061	-0.089	-0.033	0.663
EANALY	0.046	0.758	-0.07	0.108	0.0054	-0.054	0.009	0.02	-0.018	0.078	-0.033	-0.007	0.609
Ecreative	-0.004	0.815	0.022	0.012	0.0094	0.0055	0.057	-0.026	-0.026	-0.023	0.016	-0.054	0.679
Epractical	0.14	0.787	0.073	-0.04	-0.06	0.093	-0.099	0.034	-0.0033	-0.019	0.075	0.0081	0.683
E4	0.06	0.849	0.08	-0.0099	-0.019	0.059	-0.01	0.021	0.049	-0.006	0.007	0.012	0.747
A1	0.16	0.007	-0.393	-0.492	-0.114	0.079	-0.144	0.217	0.147	-0.088	0.012	0.033	0.56
A2	0.08	0.099	0.257	0.216	-0.081	0.121	0.391	-0.069	0.341	0.0048	-0.093	-0.174	0.486
A3	0.02	-0.164	0.059	0.159	-0.268	0.027	0.457	-0.247	0.296	-0.018	-0.016	0.117	0.552
A4	0.15	0.053	0.227	0.419	0.072	-0.198	-0.128	0.044	0.142	0.237	0.318	-0.224	0.548
A5	0.04	-0.02	0.134	0.149	0.123	-0.173	0.109	-0.067	0.563	0.161	0.13	-0.0293	0.468
A6	0.05	-0.032	0.49	0.0198	0.0077	0.145	0.088	-0.0091	0.0747	0.002	-0.083	-0.194	0.413
A7	0.08	0.064	0.477	0.092	0.039	-0.4	-0.047	-0.029	0.019	0.408	-0.013	-0.127	0.602
A8	-0.009	-0.042	-0.038	0.717	-0.0217	0.0028	0.027	-0.046	0.136	-0.03	0.07	0.119	0.586
A9	-0.16	-0.016	0.405	0.061	-0.225	-0.0056	-0.025	-0.0017	0.174	0.276	0.375	-0.18	0.554
A10	0.02	0.096	0.09	0.576	-0.077	0.091	-0.027	-0.138	-0.0034	0.238	-0.061	0.091	0.48
A11	-0.07	-0.015	0.066	0.145	-0.0246	0.068	0.127	0.0462	0.039	0.637	0.006	0.0077	0.506
A12	-0.04	0.008	0.12	0.369	0.069	0.049	0.021	0.079	0.479	-0.073	-0.043	-0.153	0.437
A13	0.04	0.02	0.384	-0.013	-0.199	-0.0161	0.406	-0.049	0.174	0.172	-0.036	0.064	0.43
A14	0.16	-0.076	-0.121	-0.448	0.0138	-0.195	-0.108	-0.043	-0.0418	-0.241	0.108	0.185	0.408
A15	-0.02	-0.037	0.152	0.512	0.09	0.178	0.128	0.191	0.263	-0.125	0.053	-0.024	0.51
A16	0.02	0.09	0.283	0.388	-0.054	0.002	0.384	0.075	0.117	0.211	-0.038	-0.252	0.524
A17	0.10	0.038	0.437	0.021	-0.26	-0.154	0.194	0.0219	0.297	-0.153	0.197	-0.061	0.538
A18	-0.0009	-0.048	0.073	0.0018	0.053	0.034	0.075	0.136	-0.083	-0.049	0.067	0.804	0.702
A19	0.07	0.093	0.671	0.013	0.089	-0.01	-0.029	0.118	0.131	0.024	0.002	0.16	0.57
A20	0.009	0.003	0.546	0.306	-0.0001	0.046	-0.249	0.048	0.126	0.139	-0.126	0.217	0.57
A21	0.01	-0.032	-0.193	-0.278	-0.0038	-0.045	-0.336	-0.027	-0.086	-0.394	0.331	0.174	0.537
A22	-0.09	-0.039	-0.025	0.022	0.117	-0.177	0.706	0.041	-0.0431	0.054	0.061	0.081	0.573
A23	-0.002	0.007	0.584	0.262	-0.0451	-0.028	0.237	-0.069	-0.125	-0.066	-0.057	-0.038	0.509
% Of Variance	9.36	7.991	5.725	5.166	4.549	3.029	2.601	2.507	2.331	2.245	2.046	1.984	

DESCRIPTION OF THE FACTORS: The description of factors is as follows:

FACTOR I: Successful Intelligence (Objective)

VARIABLES	LOADINGS
Figural (F)	.759
Quantitative (Q)	.717
Practical (PR)	.698
Creative (CR)	.696
Analytical (AN)	.691
Verbal (V)	.667

This factor highly loads on the variables F, Q, PR, CR, AN, and V of STAT with respective loadings of .759, .717, .698, .696, .691, .667. Variables mentioned above with the magnitude and direction of loadings clearly suggests it to be a factor of *Successful Intelligence(Objective)*. This factor explains 9.36% of total variance. All the loadings on this factor are positive. The loadings on this factor suggest that analytical, practical, creative, verbal, quantitative and figural successful intelligence all relate well to each other. The structure of all the loadings on this factor shows that they all are related to objective type of successful intelligence as listed by Sternberg (1997, 1998, & 1999). No variable related to subjective type of successful intelligence, child rearing practices, family environment and family characteristics are having significant loading on this factor. This is a factor of objective type of successful intelligence because this is only related to multiple choice tests. All the obtained significant loadings are showing relation with each other.

The overall obtained structure here describes the successful intelligence including analytical intelligence involved when components are applied to relatively familiar kinds of problems where the judgments to be made are of a fairly abstract nature. Practical intelligence suggest that family members are high on this dimension are intelligent in practical or adaptive sense where they apply their abilities to the problems which they face in daily life, it may be on the job or in the home, and creative intelligence emphasized the ability to devise new thoughts. So, this factorial combination only gives the structure related the multiple-choice subtests of successful intelligence by representing a crossing of three kinds of process realm (analytical, creative, and practical) with three major contents verbal, quantitative, and figural.

FACTOR II: Successful Intelligence(Descriptive)

VARIABLES	LOADINGS
Total essay Rating (E4)	.849
Essay Creative (Ecreative)	.815
Essay Practical (Epractical)	.787
Essay Analytical (EANALY)	.758

E4, Ecreative, Epractical, and EANALY variables of STAT have mainly been defined this factor with respective high loadings of .849, .815, .787, and .758. So, on the basis of contents of variables with significant loadings this factor is named as *Successful Intelligence(Descriptive)*. This factor explains 7.99% of total variance. All the loadings on this factor are positive. No variable related to objective or multiple choice successful intelligence, child rearing practices, family environment and family characteristics are having significant loadings on this factor. All the loaded variables on this factor are related to only descriptive or essay type successful intelligence. The obtained significant loadings .849, .815, .787, and .758 on this factor of the variables E4, Ecreative, Epractical, and EANALY respectively suggest that all descriptive type (essay overall, essay creative, essay practical and essay analytical) of successful intelligence extremely relate well with each other.

The obtained structure here characterizes the successful intelligence including descriptive analytical intelligence which involved analyzing, evaluating, judging or comparing and contrasting. Descriptive practical intelligence which involved their abilities to the kind of problems confronts them in daily life. Descriptive creative intelligence which involved the ability of formulating new ideas. This factorial combination only gives the structure related to descriptive or essay type of successful intelligence.

FACTOR III: Authoritarian Parenting

VARIABLES	LOADINGS
Ascendancy of the mother (A19)	0.671
Dependency of mother (A23)	0.584
Intrusiveness (A20)	0.546
Fear of harming the body (A6)	0.49
Marital conflict (A7)	0.477
Inconsiderateness of the husband (A17)	0.437
Irritability (A9)	0.405

This factor has been defined mainly by the variables A19, A23, A20, A6, A7, A17, and A9 of PARI. By looking the structure, this factor only relates to child rearing practices. It has accounted for 5.72% of total variance. All the loadings on this factor are positive. The variables having significant loadings suggest it to be a factor of *Authoritarian Parenting*. The obtained significant loadings 0.671, 0.584, 0.546, 0.49, 0.477, 0.437, 0.405 on this factor of the variables A19, A23, A20, A6, A7, A17, and A9 respectively suggest that child rearing practices related to ascendancy of the mother, dependency of the mother, intrusiveness, fear of harming body, marital conflict, inconsiderateness of the husband, and irritability. If we evaluate loadings on this factor with reference to Zuckerman & Oltean (1959) types of child rearing practices, out of seven one loading (A7) is related to hostility rejection and remaining six (A6, A9, A17, A19, A20, A23) are related to authoritarian control child rearing practices. Factor structure related to authoritarian control child rearing practices is also supported by Baumrind (1971) and Baumrind & Black (1967).

The obtained structure describes child rearing practices related to inattentiveness of the spouse, marital clashes, and touchiness. It also describes fear of harming body, the reliance and superiority of the mother which is characterized by intrusion.

FACTOR IV: Democratic Parenting

VARIABLES	LOADINGS
Strictness (A8)	0.717
Exclusion of outside influences (A10)	0.576
Approval of activity (A15)	0.512
Encouraging verbalization (A1)	-0.492
Equalitarianism (A14)	-0.448
Breaking the will (A4)	0.419

This factor also loads on the variables of PARI which is related to child rearing practices only. This factor explains 5.17% of total variance. This factor positively loads on the variables A8, A10, A15 and A4 and negatively loads on variables A1 and A14. On the basis of nature of markers with significant loadings, it is clearly a factor of *Democratic Parenting*. The obtained significant loadings 0.717, 0.576, 0.512, -0.492, -0.448, 0.419 on this factor of the variables A8, A10, A15, A1, A14, A4 likewise suggest that the child rearing practices related to strictness, exclusion of outside influences, approval of activity, opposite to encouraging verbalization, opposite to equalitarianism and breaking the will. Total loadings on this factor are six out of which three loadings (A1, A8, A14) are related to democratic attitude and remaining loadings (A4, A10, A15) are related to authoritarian control child rearing practices as reported by Zuckerman & Oltean (1959).

Overall obtained structure portrays child rearing practices not hopeful in articulation, and related to smashing the motivation, elimination of outside influences, firmness, and support for action, opposite to the desire of political and economic and social equality, Factor structure related to authoritarian control child rearing also resembles with Baumrind (1971) and Baumrind & Black (1967).

FACTOR VII: Child Rearing Practices-I

VARIABLES	LOADINGS
Acceleration of development (A22)	0.706
Seclusion of mother (A3)	0.457
Rejection of homemaking role (A13)	0.406

This factor loads on the variables A22, A3, and A13 of PARI which is related to child rearing practices only. This factor highly loads on the variable of acceleration of development. This factor explains 2.60% of total variance. All the loadings on this factor are positive. The obtained significant loadings 0.706, 0.457, 0.406 on this factor of the variables A22, A3, A13 respectively suggest that child rearing practices related to acceleration of development, seclusion of the mother and rejection of homemaking role. The factor structure is a sign of isolation on the part of mother, refusal to family responsibilities, and rushing toward maturity. This factor loads on the variables of democratic, authoritarian and hostility parenting or child rearing practices. Total loadings on this factor are three out of which one loadings (A22) is related to democratic attitude, another one loading (A3) is related to authoritarian control and remaining (A13) is related to hostility rejection child rearing practices. Hence, obtained structure is complex and difficult to be interpreted. So, it can be named as *Child Rearing Practice-I*. It may be because of sample peculiarities and tool factors.

FACTOR IX: Child Rearing Practices-II

VARIABLES	LOADINGS
Martyrdom (A5)	0.563
Suppression of aggression (A12)	0.479

Here the significant loadings 0.563 and 0.479 of PARI on this factor of the variables A5 and A12 correspondingly suggest child rearing practices related to martyrdom and suppression of aggression which portrays child rearing attitude characterized as hardship of death on account of devotion and containment of hostility. All the loadings on this factor are positive. This factor explains 2.33% of total variance. Total loadings (A5&A12) of PARI on this factor are related to authoritarian control child rearing practices. Hence, obtained factorial combination of the significant loadings of the variables does not provide any direction for the definition of this factor. So, this is a factor of *Child Rearing Practices-II*. It may be because of sample peculiarities and tool factors.

FACTOR X: Child Rearing Practices-III

VARIABLES	LOADINGS
Deification (A11)	0.637
Marital conflict (A7)	0.408

This factor is loads on the variables of PARI which is related to child rearing practices only. This factor explains 2.24% of total variance. All the loadings on this factor are positive. The significant loadings 0.637 and 0.408 on this factor of the variables A11 and A7 correspondingly suggest that the child rearing practices related to deification and marital conflict. Significant loadings of the variables of child rearing practices on this factor are related to authoritarian control (A11) and hostility rejection (A7) as reported by Zuckerman & Oltean (1959). Factor structure of A11 is named as permissive parent's style by Baumrind (1971) and

Baumrind & Black(1967). This factor reflects an unstructured child rearing practice which does not facilitate the interpretation of this factor. Hence it is named as a factor of *Child Rearing Practices-III*. It may be because of sample peculiarities and tool factors.

DISCUSSION: Since the aim of the present study was to study the role of family in the development of different components of successful intelligence, the findings reveals some factors of child rearing attitude which play role in the development of different components of successful intelligence. The findings also give a picture of factors related to family environment and family characteristics which explain a bond in the development of different components of successful intelligence. So, from the analysis of the results, it can be concluded that some of the variables related to family are showing appropriate relation in the development of different component of successful intelligence. In total fourteen factors were obtained out of which two factors load only on the variables of successful intelligence. Remaining factors weight parental child rearing attitude or practices, family environment and family characteristics. Due to low correlations, some of the family related variables are not showing any relation in the development of different components (analytical, creative and practical) of successful intelligence. So as compare to the earlier studies this study reports low and insignificant correlations of different factors. So, it can be concluded that the obtained results are not showing a clear cut relation of family factors (child rearing practices, family environment and family characteristics) in the development of different components (analytical, creative and practical) of successful intelligence. This limitation can be attributed to the restricted sample and other specifications too. So it may not be generalize to the whole population. There is a need to conduct similar studies on different sample drawn from a general population for the generalization of role of family factors in the development of different components (analytical, creative and practical) of successful intelligence.

Abell, E., Clawson, M., Washington, W. N., Bost, K. K., & Vaughn, B. E. (1996). Parenting values, attitudes, behaviors, and goals of *African American mothers from low-income population in relation to social and societal contexts*. Journal of Family Issues, 17, 593-613.

Amato, P. R. & Fowler, F. (2002). Parenting practices, child adjustment, and family diversity. Journal of Marriage & Family, 64, 703-716.

Baumrind, D. & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 38(2), 291-327.

Baumrind, D. & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. Child Development, 38(2), 291-327.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology. Monograph, 4 (1),1-103.

Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. Youth and Society, 9(3), 239-276.

Beyer, S. (1995). Maternal employment and children's academic achievement: Parenting styles as mediating variable. Developmental Review, 15, 212-253.

Bluestone, C., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (1999). Correlates of parenting styles in predominantly working- and middle-class African American mothers. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61, 881-893.

Boveja, M. E. (1998). Parenting styles and adolescents' learning strategies in the urban community. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 26, 110-119.

Brody, G. H., Stoneman, Z., & McCoy, J. K. (1994). Family and classroom correlates of Head Start children's developmental outcomes. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 9, 289-803.

-
- Bronstein, P., Ginsburg, G. S., & Herrera, I. S. (2005). Parental predictors of motivational orientation in early adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34, 559–575.
- Burchinal, M. R., Roberts, J. E., Hooper, S., & Zeisel, S. A. (2000). Cumulative risk and early cognitive development: A comparison of statistical risk models. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 793-807.
- Busse, T. V. (1969). Child rearing antecedents of flexible thinking. *Developmental Psychology*, 1(5),585-591.
- Chen, X., Dong, Q., & Zhou, H. (1997). Authoritative and Authoritarian parenting practices and social and school performance in Chinese children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 21(4), 855-873.
- Clark, R. M. (1993). Homework-focused parenting practices that positively affect student achievement. In N. F. Chavkin (Ed.), *Families and schools in a pluralistic society* (pp. 85–105). New York: SUNY.
- Coplan, R. J. , Hastings, P. D., Lagace-Seguin, D. G., & Moulton, C. E. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parental goals, attributions and emotions across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 2, 1-26.
- Culp, A., Hubbs-Tait, L, Culp, R.E., & Starost, H-J, (2000). Maternal parenting characteristics and school involvement: Predictors of kindergarten cognitive competence among Head Start children. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 15, 5-17.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., & Roberts, D. F. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., & Roberts, D. F. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Egeland, B. Pianta, R., & O'Brien, M. A. (1993). Maternal intrusiveness in infancy and child maladaptation in early school years. *Development and Psychopathology*, 5,359-370.
- Eisenman, R. & Cherry, H. O. (1970). Creativity, authoritarianism, and birth order. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 80(2), 233-235.
- Graves, Scott L. & Wright, Lynda Brown (2011). Parent involvement at school entry: A national examination of group differences and achievement. *School Psychology International*, 32(1), 35-48.
- Harrington, David M., Block, Jeanne H.,& Block, Jack (1987). Testing aspects of Carl Rogers's theory of creative environments: Child-rearing antecedents of creative potential in young adolescents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(4), 851-856
- Harrington, David M., Block, Jeanne H.,& Block, Jack (1987). Testing aspects of Carl Rogers's theory of creative environments: Child-rearing antecedents of creative potential in young adolescents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(4), 851-856
- Hart, C. H., Nelson, D.A., Robinson, C. D., Olsen, S. F., & McNeilly-Choque, M. K. (1998). Overt and relational aggression in Russian nursery-school-age children: Parenting style and marital linkages. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 687-697.
- Hill, N. E. (1995). The relationship between family environment and parenting style: A preliminary study of African American families. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 21, 408-423.
- Hubbs-Tait, L., Culp, A.M., Culp, R.E., & Miller, C. E. (2002). Relation of maternal cognitive stimulation, emotional support, and intrusive behavior during Head Start to children's kindergarten cognitive abilities. *Child Development*, 73, 110-131.
- Jacobvitz, D., & Sroufe, L. A. (1987). The early caregiver-child relationship and attention-deficit disorder with hyperactivity in kindergarten: A prospective study. *Child Development*, 58, 1488-1495.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). The effects of parental involvement on the academic achievement of African American youth. *Journal of Negro Education*, 74, 260–274.

-
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005b). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 40(3), 237–269.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: a meta-analysis. *Urban Education*, 42(1), 82–110.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: a meta-analysis. *Urban Education*, 42(1), 82–110.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2010). *Parental involvement and academic success*. New York: Routledge.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2010b). The salience of the subtle aspects of parental involvement and encouraging that involvement: Implications for school-based programs. *Teachers College Record*, 112, 747–774.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytical rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 23, 187-200.
- Koestner, R., Walker, M., & Fichman, L. (1999). Childhood parenting experiences and adult creativity. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33(1), 92-107.
- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.
- Lautrey, J. (1980). *Social class, family environment, intelligence*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Leadbeater, B. J., Bishop, S. J., Raver, C. (1996). Quality of mother-toddler interactions, maternal depressive symptoms, and behavior problems in preschoolers of adolescent mothers. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 280-288.
- Lim, S. & Smith, J. (2008). The structural relationships of parenting style, creative personality, and loneliness. *Creative Research Journal*, 20(4), 412-419.
- Maccoby, E. E. (2000). Parenting and its effects on children: On reading and misreading behavior genetics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 1-27.
- Mendecka, G. (1992). Attitudes of Parents and development of creativity. *European Journal of High Ability*, 3(2), 148-154.
- Michel, M., & Dudek, S. Z. (1991). Mother-child relationship and creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 4(3), 281-286.
- Mohoney, G., Boyce, G., Fewell, R. R., Spiker, D., & Wheeden, C. A. (1998). The relationship of parent-child interaction to the effectiveness of early intervention services for at-risk children and children with disabilities. *Early Childhood Special Education*, 18(1), 5-17.
- Mouchiroud, C., & Bernoussi, A. (2008). An empirical study of the construct validity of social creativity. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 18(4), 372-380.
- Muller, C. (1993). Parental involvement and academic achievement: An analysis of family resources available to the child. In B. Schneider & J. S. Coleman (Eds.), *Parents, their children, and schools* (pp. 73–113). Boulder: Westview.
- Nichols, R. C. (1964). Parental attitude of mother of intelligent adolescents and creativity of their children. *Child Development*, 35(4), 1041-1049.
- Niggli, A., Trautwein, U., Schnyder, I., Ludtke, O., & Neumann, M. (2007). Parental homework support can be beneficial, but parental intrusion is detrimental: Family background, parental homework supervision, and performance gains. *Psychologie In Erziehung und Unterricht*, 54, 1–14.
- Norma, R. (1972). Father-child interaction and the intellectual functioning of four-year-old boys. *Developmental Psychology*, 6(2), 353-361.

Olson, S. L., Bates, J. E., & Kaskie, B. (1992). Caregiver-infant interaction antecedents of children's school-age cognitive ability. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 38, 309-330.

Pomerantz, E. M., & Eaton, M. M. (2001). Maternal intrusive support in the academic context: Transactional socialization processes. *Developmental Psychology*, 37, 174–186.

Radziszewska, B., Richardson, J. L., Dent, C. W., & Flay, B. R. (1996). Parenting style and adolescent depressive symptoms, smoking, and academic achievement: Ethnic, gender, and SES differences. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 19(3), 289-305.

REFERENCES

- J Rogers, M., Theule, J., Ryan, B., Adams, G., & Keating, L. (2009). Parental involvement and children's school achievement. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 24(1), 34–57.
- J Saxena, U. (1976). Parental Attitude Research instrument (PARI). Agra Psychological Research Cell, Agra.
- J Simpkins, S. D., Weiss, H. B., McCartney, K., Kreider, H. M., & Dearing, E. (2006). Mother child relationship as a moderator of the relation between family educational involvement and child achievement. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 6(1), 49–57.
- J Sternberg, R. J. & Williams, W. M. (1995). Parenting toward cognitive competence. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 4. Applied and practical parenting* (pp.259-276). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- J Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: a triarchic theory of human intelligence*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- J Sternberg, R. J. (1993). Sternberg Triarchic Abilities Test (STAT). Unpublished test.
- J Sternberg, R. J. (1998). A balance theory of wisdom. *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 347-365.
- J Sternberg, R. J. (1999). The theory of successful intelligence. *Review of General Psychology*, 3, 292–316.
- J Sternberg, R. J. (2003). A broad view of intelligence: The theory of successful intelligence. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 55 (3), 139–154
- J Sternberg, R.J. (1984). Toward a triarchic theory of human intelligence. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 7, 269-287.
- J Sternberg, R.J. (1997). *Successful intelligence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- J Trivette, C. M., Dunst, C. J., & Hamby, D. W. (2010). Influences of family-systems intervention practices on parent-child interactions and child development. *Early Childhood Special Education*, 30(1), 3-10.
- J Zuckerman, M. & Oltean, M. (1959). Some relationships between maternal attitude factors and authoritarianism, personality needs, psychopathology, and self-acceptance. *Child Development*, 30(1), 27-36.