

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

S. Venkatesan^{1*}

ABSTRACT

New forms, types, styles and practices of parenting are emerging in contemporary times. Existing tools are unable to detect these upcoming nuances in parenting. The ongoing development and validation of the "Parental Opinion and Practices Scale" has completed the try-out of its "hyper-parenting" domain. This study seeks to validate the 20-item scale as its next domain on "uninvolved" parenting. A cross-sectional mixed research design covered a convenience sample of 74 parents (36 fathers and 38 mothers) of secondary and high school children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities. Results show a trend toward uninvolved parenting, which appears to be greater in fathers than mothers and those with higher than lower educational qualifications. Item analysis brings out a profile of mildly uninterested, unconcerned, and uninvolved parents in these children. The discussion covers whether this trend is the cause or consequence of an academically ever-failing child. The derived norms, reliability, and validity coefficients of this domain-specific parenting scale show promise for its regular use in early screening or identification of such parents to formulate, plan, implement, and evaluate appropriate training programs.

Keywords: *Neglectful Parenting, Academic Delay, Learning Disability, Hyper-parenting*

Parenting is both a state as well as a process. In either way, they form a tremendous influence on the behavior and development of a child (Chao & Tseng, 2002). Parenting practices cover many aspects like involvement, monitoring, goal-setting, abiding by rules, regulations, or value systems. It begins at birth and extends throughout life. The universal goals of parenting are to ensure the physical health and survival of the progeny, ensure the advancement of their capacities for economic self-maintenance, and continuation of the species or race across generations (Selin, 2014). Parenting styles are different from parenting practices (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). There can be differences in parenting styles for fathers and mothers (Simons & Conger, 2007). Available theories on parenting highlight its protective nature and functions for the benefit of children. Children turn vulnerable to abuse, violence, aggression, conduct disturbances, or delinquency without appropriate and adequate parenting.

¹Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Manasagangotri, Mysore, Karnataka, India

*Responding Author

Received: April 13, 2020; Revision Received: May 24, 2020; Accepted: June 25, 2020

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

Research on uninvolved or neglectful parenting has not received exclusive attention it deserves. There are studies on differential parenting patterns and their outcomes by gender (Daniel & Taylor, 2006). The available theoretical models for parenting research range from Reva Rubin's works on role attainment in sociology, Bronfenbrenner's models' on ecological systems, Karen Tridhan's cognitive-based explanations, paradigms on stress and coping, social learning, behavioral approaches, and the understanding of Bowlby's secure, avoidant, and insecure, ambivalent, or resistant types of attachment (Smith, 1999).

Despite a wide theoretical diversity, much of research on parenting also remains a theoretical and descriptive. This area of research continues to remain fragmented. There is a need to develop a coherent and overarching theory of parenting. There is a significant gap in the available literature on the changing scenario of parenting. There is also a need to go into the cultural aspect of uninvolved parenting, particularly in India. Against the preceding, it would be worthwhile to have tools to exclusively measure the domain of uninvolved parenting, especially in Children with Academic Delays and Specific Learning Disabilities (CAD & SLD). This condition is a recently happening phenomenon in the country, especially after its legal recognition under the Rights-Based Persons with Disabilities Act (Balakrishnan et al. 2019). Of course, subject to many pre-conditions, a child is to be labelled "specific learning disability" (Venkatesan, 2017a; 2017c; 2016; 2011). The presence of such a child in the family is frustrating and unacceptable for most parents. Having invested so much effort, time, and money on their education and despite no outwardly visible shortcomings, the academically failing child is seen as not deserving any excuse. They are called "lazy, irresponsible, mischievous, good-for-nothing," and many more-but not "disabled." Given the stigma and adverse reactions to be faced in society, their parents over-react, and turn hyper-vigilant, demanding, or coercive. At other times, they turn lax, uninterested, hopeless, and helpless in handling such children (Venkatesan & Lokesh, 2016).

MATERIALS & METHODS

Against this background, it was the aim of this study to investigate patterns of uninvolved parenting in secondary and high school CAD & SLD. The objectives of this study are:

1. To identify, compile, and prepare a provisional item-pool of statements on aspects of uninvolved parenting;
2. To prepare a scale for the measurement of uninvolved parenting;
3. To administer the prepared scale on a representative sample of parents of the secondary and high school CAD & SLD;
4. To determine the overall nature, extent, intensity or extensity of the measured subtype of uninvolved parenting as well as in relation to specific child and respondent variables; and,
5. To establish the norms, reliability, and validity of the developed scale on uninvolved parenting for secondary and high school CAD & SLD.

This study uses a cross-sectional mixed research design by combining reflective clinical practice, questionnaire-based survey, and open-ended interviews to empirically enlist a 20-item tool covering aspects of uninvolved or negative parenting relevant for parent-respondents having CAD & SLD from secondary and high schools. There is also an ingredient of tool development in this study based on item-response theory.

Operational Definitions

The key terms used in this study are "uninvolved or negative parenting," and the targeted sample is parents of secondary and high school CAD & SLD. The phrase "uninvolved or negative parenting" is herein defined as a parent with an increased focus on ones' problems and desires to the extent that they turn unresponsive to the everyday needs of their children. Their preoccupation is with themselves leaving little time or space for building an emotional attachment with their wards. As a result, they remain aloof, detached, disengaged, or lack interest in their child's activities and set no rules or expectations for behavior. In short, they are respondents beyond specific cut-off points designated above or below two standard deviations from the mean on the scale purported to be used for that purpose. The phrase "children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities" (CAD & SLD) refers to a unique heterogeneous group of academically laggard school children with average to above-average levels of general intelligence, and unaffected by any physical or sensory impairment. They are students who are tested and diagnosed as such on psychometric devices exclusively developed and standardized for that purpose. More specifically, children typically manifest academic delays by secondary school levels which then get confirmed formally as a specific learning disability during their high school (Venkatesan, 2017b).

Participants

The study used a convenience sampling technique by enlisting 74 parents, including 36 fathers (Mean Age: 43.63; SD: 6.41) and 38 mothers (Mean Age: 38.59; SD: 4.44) of secondary and high school CAD & LD seeking services in the investigating agency. The term "parent" means either the biological father or mother of the child living in the same household. Foster or adoptive parents, weekend, virtual, or online parents, guardians, or other caregivers got excluded. Among the respondents were 37 undergraduates, 15 graduates, and 22 postgraduates hailing from low (N: 24), middle (N: 28), and high (N: 22) socioeconomic status (SES) levels. The distribution of sample size and their characteristics, such as family size, number of children, and their years of parenting experience, is shown in Table 2.

Materials

The 20-item tool on uninvolved or negative parenting, a domain-extracted from the 100-item Parents Opinion and Practices Scale (POPS), is used in this study. A section of this instrument is already validated and published (Venkatesan, 2019b). As with the mother scale, this domain of the POPS also begins with a section to collect respondent and child's details, including their age, educational qualifications, family size, and the number of children. Each statement in this scale is to be answered by the parent respondent on a 4-point rating scale with options for strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The directional valence of each statement on the scale determines their score between 1-4 points. A high score on this scale implies a greater tendency for uninvolved or negative parenting. The minimum score possible on this tool is 20, and the highest is 80. The assumed median is 2 for each item for an individual respondent. The NIMH SES Scale (Venkatesan, 2016) was used by taking into consideration the highest education, occupation, property, annual family income, and per capita income to derive a three-tier high-middle-low group classification.

Procedure

The steps used in this study are:

1. Formation of item pool on uninvolved parenting for inclusion to be in line with the already published mother tool titled "Parents Opinion and Practices Scale (POPS)";
2. Initial & Final Try out; and,

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

3. Establishment of reliability, validity, and norms for the tool.

Data collection involved the distribution of the draft scale to prospective respondents with instructions to read each item carefully before choosing the appropriate response on the 4-point rating scale. They were helped with clarifications only when they sought for it. A reverse translation into the native language was used by recruiting help from subject experts who were familiar and proficient in both languages. The tool in the local language was used only by parents who expressed difficulty in English. The translation-retranslation correlation coefficient measured at 0.936.

RESULTS

This section is presented in the sequence as the objectives enunciated in this study.

Preparation of item-pool

Based on a comprehensive review of online and offline literature from different sources, such as the world wide web, blogs, textbooks, research papers, magazines, and newspaper reports, any or all statements that cover aspects of uninvolved parenting got enlisted. Further, opinions or suggestions from colleagues and experts, clinician diary notes, case records, daily activity log-books, and interview jottings available with the author-clinician were perused. The minutes of focus-group discussions, parent-group meetings, and transcripts of open-ended interviews with parents were also taken into account. A tentative list of 20-items on uninvolved parenting was generated at the end of this exercise (Table 1).

Table 1 Mean and SD Scores on Uninvolved Parenting for various sub-samples

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Probability	Tukey HSD Post-hoc Tests
Overall	74	53.79	12.72		
Parent					
Father	36	63.17	9.53	T: 8.8736; df: 72; SED: 0.059; p: 0.0001	
Mother	38	44.90	8.16		
Schooling Level					
Secondary	33	54.76	12.79	T: 0.7310; df: 72; SED: 2.982; p: 0.47	
High	41	52.58	12.72		
Gender					
Boys	50	53.62	13.41	T: 0.1603; df: 72; SED: 3.181; p: 0.8731	
Girls	24	54.13	11.42		
Parent EQ					
UG	37	50.22	11.21	F(2, 71) = 3.1931, p < .05	G1-G2: Diff: 5.2800; 95% CI: -3.0737 to 15.0337; p: 0.2604; NS
G	15	56.20	13.63		G1-G3: Diff: 7.9200; 95% CI: -0.0431 to 15.8831; p: 0.0516; S
PG	22	58.14	13.30		G2-G3: Diff: 1.9400; 95% CI: 7.9641 to 11.8441; p: 0.8861; NS
Number of Children					
One	30	54.73	12.87	F(2, 71) = 1.1564, p: 0.3205	G1-G2: Diff: -4.3700; 95% CI: - 12.441 to 3.4041; p: 0.3750; NS
Two	33	53.36	11.84		G1-G3: Diff: -5.2700; 95% CI: - 16.1325 to 5.5925; p: 0.4800; NS
Three or More	11	52.46	15.74		G2-G3: Diff: -9.000; 95% CI: - 11.6292 to 9.8292; p: 0.9780; NS
SES					
Low	24	57.75	11.31	F(2, 71) = 2.4109, p:	G1-G2: Diff: -7.6100; 95% CI: - 15.9224 to 0.7024; p: 0.0796; NS

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Probability	Tukey HSD Post-hoc Tests
Middle	28	50.14	11.84	.0970	<i>G1-G3: Diff: -306600; 95% CI: -12.4801 to 5.1601; p: 0.5835; NS</i>
High	22	54.09	14.37		<i>G2-G3: Diff: 3.9500; 95% CI: -4.5635 to 12.4635; p: 0.5107; NS</i>
Type of Family					
Nuclear	51	53.82	14.04	T: 0.0373; df: 72; SED: 3.217; p: 0.9703	
Extended/Joint	23	53.70	9.42		

Initial & Final Try-out

The 20-item tool on uninvolved parenting domain was initially tried out on a sample of 10 parents of CAD & LD randomly to receive feedback on the overall format, style, ease of understanding, or use of the scale by the respondents. Barring minor corrections in the length of statements, grammar, and syntax, and recommendations on simplifying the use of few words, the pilot tool was retained.

The final try-out or data collection covered a convenient representative sample of 74 parents of secondary and high school CAD & LD. The data was then collected, coded, compiled, collated, and calculated for descriptive and interpretative statistical inference by using SPSS Version 23.0 (George & Mallery, 2016).

Profile of Overall Sample

On the 20-item uninvolved domain of the overall 100-item POPS, the minimum score possible is 20, and the highest is 80. In this study, the derived mean score for the overall sample (N: 74) is 53.79 (SD: 12.72), which is interpreted as being "mildly uninvolved parenting" (-1.00 to +1.00 SD; Score Range: 41-55; Table 4). Neglecting, remaining aloof and uninvolved is a distinctive form of parenting. As a family level construct, it may happen owing to partial, intermittent, or total desertion by a spouse. Even with the physical presence of the parent in the household, a father figure can become a lesser entity compared to the other domineering spouse (Koulenti & Anastassiou-Hadjicharalambous, 2011).

Relationship with Various Variables

About **gender variable of parents** (Table 1), on an average, the fathers in this group appear to be relatively more detached (N: 36; Mean: 63.17; SD: 9.53) than mothers (N: 38; Mean: 44.90; SD: 8.16) in parenting their CAD & LD ($p < 0.0001$). Concerning their **educational qualifications**, there is a linear relationship between higher education and greater disengagement from their children. Parents with under-graduation (N: 37; Mean: 50.22; SD: 11.21) show the least scores compared to those with graduation (N: 15; Mean: 56.20; SD: 13.63) and post-graduation (N: 22; Mean: 58.14; SD: 13.30). A Tukey's HSD Post hoc test undertaken for the significant one-way ANOVA across the three EQ groups of parents show that the most significant differences emerge between undergraduates and postgraduates ($p < 0.05$). The socio-demographic variables like the number of children (single, two or more), SES (low, middle, or high), and type of family (nuclear or non-nuclear) do not emerge as significant in determining under parenting patterns in this sample of study ($p > 0.05$). There is no significant difference in uninvolved parenting in relation to the gender of child as well as their class of study being secondary or high school ($p > 0.05$).

There is some ground to suspect that many contemporary parents are turning uninvolved owing to their changing personality patterns (Savitha & Venkatachalam, 2016). Parenting is a dyad, unless it is a single parent. Parenting must happen in unison. While it is expected

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

and recommended to be so, in actuality, this is not happening (McKinney & Renk, 2008). There is evidence to show that the concordance between the quality of mothers' and fathers' interactive behavior with their child is only "moderate" (Deschênes, Bernier, Jarry-Boileau & St-Laurent, 2014). Such a situation does not favor the optimum development of their child (Kawabata et al. 2011), Disagreements to the point of using differential styles of parenting is shown to result in problem behaviors (Braza, Carreras, Sanchez & Braza, 2013) or depression, academic disengagements, and depression (Waterman & Lefkowitz, 2017; Tavassolie et al. 2016; Panetta et al. 2014; McKinney & Renk, 2008). Children themselves perceive marked gender differences in parenting. Conrade and Ho (2001) recorded that fathers were perceived by male respondents to be more likely to use an authoritarian style, and mothers were perceived to be more likely to use an authoritative style by female respondents and a permissive style by male respondents.

Item Analysis

Item analysis of the uninvolved parenting domain was carried out in two ways. (a) Calculation of weighted rank allocations; and, (b) Examining the mean and variance score of each statement. The *weighted ranks of each statement* are the percentage product of its frequency to bring uniformity and add precision to the raw score as in the previous study (Venkatesan, 2019b). Some overrated statements reflecting low involvement of parents in this sample are: "avoid showing great interest in the child's activities, or hobbies" (Item #9), "not interfering (even) if the child gets into trouble in the neighbourhood or at school" (Item #5), "not being one to tell the child that they love him/her" (Item #13), "preferring not to comfort the child when s/he needs it most" (Item #15), and others (Table 2).

Table 2 Item-wise Distribution of Frequency and Weighted Ranks on Uninvolved Parenting (N: 74) for Overall Sample

Code	Statement/s	Items	Ranks								Total
			I-SA		II-A		III-D		IV-SD		
			N	WR	N	WR	N	WR	N	WR	
C9	I don't take my child for a medical check even when there is an emergency	1	6	8.11	7	9.46	28	37.84	33	44.59	74
C12	I never bother even if my child indulged in activities like truancy, shop-lifting, or setting fire to public property	2	8	10.81	11	14.87	21	28.38	34	45.95	74
C22	I never ask the child what s/he did when they were outside or away from home	3	19	25.68	22	29.73	18	24.32	15	20.27	74
C33	I do not try to find out whether the child went to school	4	22	29.73	24	32.43	7	9.46	21	28.38	74
C36	I don't interfere if the child gets into trouble in the neighbourhood or at school	5	31	41.89	21	28.38	15	20.27	7	9.46	74
C38	I never show great interest in the kind of friends my child has	6	23	31.08	20	27.03	18	24.32	13	17.57	74
C43	I rarely help the child with his/her home assignments or school projects	7	27	28.72	18	24.32	15	20.27	14	18.92	74
C57	Many times, I have not										

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

Code	Statement/s	Items	Ranks								Total
			I-SA		II-A		III-D		IV-SD		
			N	WR	N	WR	N	WR	N	WR	
	been available when the child had difficulty in understanding something	8	24	32.43	15	20.27	21	28.38	14	18.92	74
C63	I avoid showing great interest in the child's activities, or hobbies	9	31	41.89	19	25.68	15	20.27	9	12.16	74
C71	I don't easily praise my child	10	26	35.14	21	28.38	15	20.27	12	16.23	74
C76	I never help the child to do or achieve the best	11	24	32.43	27	28.72	15	20.27	8	10.81	74
C81	I don't advise my child about personal appearance, hygiene or grooming	12	21	28.38	28	37.83	15	20.27	10	13.51	74
C83	I am not the one to tell the child now and then that I love him/her	13	31	41.89	19	25.68	12	16.22	12	16.22	74
C85	I don't venture out to help when the child has problems	14	24	32.43	24	32.43	15	20.27	11	14.86	74
C93	I prefer not to comfort the child when s/he needs it most	15	31	41.89	20	27.03	13	17.57	10	13.51	74
C95	Children of wealthy parents are often not well-disciplined	16	34	45.95	21	28.38	10	13.51	9	12.16	74
C96	Parents from low socio-economic status cannot discipline their children effectively	17	26	35.14	21	28.38	15	20.27	12	16.22	74
C98	Children born or brought up by parents with disabilities feel ashamed and guilty	18	29	39.19	17	22.97	14	18.92	14	18.92	74
C99	Children born to parents of different language backgrounds are likely to have speech-language problems	19	28	37.84	21	28.38	13	17.57	12	16.22	74
C100	It is alright to consult astrologers, gurus, or vastu experts on effective parenting practices	20	18	24.32	20	27.03	15	20.27	21	28.38	74

[KEY: Score 1-Strongly Agree; Score 2-Agree; Score 3-Disagree; Score 4-Strongly Disagree];

Another way of item-analysis was undertaken by calculating the mean and SD scores of each item statement for the overall sample (N: 74) (Table 3). Note that the individual ratings for each report can vary from 1 to 4. However, in this sample, they range from the highest mean score for item #16 (Mean: 3.47; SD: ±0.71) to the least mean score for item #1 (Mean: 1.11; SD: 0.37). Although many statements with high mean scores match the preceding analysis by weighted ranks, more specifically, the item rankings show that these parents “don't easily praise the child” (Item #10; Rank 4; Mean: 3.11; SD: 0.38), or “don't venture out to help when the child has problems (Item #14; Rank 8; Mean: 2.99; SD: 0.49).

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

Table 3 Rank-wise item-analysis of Uninvolved Parenting (N: 74) based on mean and SD

Code	Items	Statement/s	Ranks	Mean	SD
C9	1	I don't take my child for a medical check even when there is an emergency	20	1.11	0.34
C12	2	I never bother even if my child indulged in activities like truancy, shop-lifting, or setting fire to public property	19	1.85	0.86
C22	3	I never ask the child what s/he did when they were outside or away from home	18	2.11	0.35
C33	4	I do not try to find out whether the child went to school	16	2.17	0.25
C36	5	I don't interfere if the child gets into trouble in the neighbourhood or at school	6	3.09	0.38
C38	6	I never show great interest in the kind of friends my child has	13	2.55	0.04
C43	7	I rarely help the child with his/her home assignments or school projects	15	2.37	0.14
C57	8	Many times, I have not been available when the child had difficulty in understanding something	16	2.17	0.47
C63	9	I avoid showing great interest in the child's activities, or hobbies	3	3.15	0.29
C71	10	I don't easily praise my child	4	3.11	0.38
C76	11	I never help the child to do or achieve the best	10	2.95	0.85
C81	12	I don't advise my child about personal appearance, hygiene or grooming	14	2.51	0.48
C83	13	I am not the one to tell the child now and then that I love him/her	7	3.00	0.92
C85	14	I don't venture out to help when the child has problems	8	2.99	0.49
C93	15	I prefer not to comfort the child when s/he needs it most	2	3.21	0.42
C95	16	Children of wealthy parents are often not well-disciplined	1	3.47	0.71
C96	17	Parents from low socio-economic status cannot discipline their children effectively	5	3.10	0.38
C98	18	Children born or brought up by parents with disabilities feel ashamed and guilty	9	2.98	0.19
C99	19	Children born to parents of different language backgrounds are likely to have speech-language problems	11	2.87	0.13
C100	20	It is alright to consult astrologers, gurus, or vastu experts on effective parenting practices	12	2.57	0.50

[KEY: Score 1-Strongly Agree; Score 2-Agree; Score 3-Disagree; Score 4-Strongly Disagree];

Interpretative Norms

The obtained overall raw scores on the uninvolved parenting domain in this study were converted to Z scores to derive interpretative norms (Table 4). The conventional standards of population variance between ± 2.00 SD (4.55% of the population) were designated as critical for "under-parenting." Thus, for example, if a parent scored in the SD range of +2.00 and above (Raw Score: 70+) out of the maximum of 80 on this sub-scale alone, then it was surely an instance of "Severely Uninvolved Parenting." The raw score below 28 (SD range of below -1.00), another example, is interpreted as acceptable or outside the range of

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

uninvolved parenting. This tool is not meant to "diagnose" or "label" parents. Wherein a parent scores at the higher ends, the possibility of recruiting them for psycho-education or counseling-guidance program in the interest of their child is recommended.

Table 4 Interpretative norms for uninvolved parenting

S.No.	Interpretative Description	SD Range	Raw score range	Conclusions
1	Strongly Agree	+2.00 and above	70+	Severely uninvolved parenting
2	Agree	+1.00 to +2.00	59-70	Moderately uninvolved parenting
3	Disagree	-1.00 to +1.00	41-55	Mildly uninvolved parenting
4	Strongly Disagree	-2.00 to -1.00	28-40	Uninvolved parenting

[Minimum score: 20; Maximum score: 80]

Reliability and Validity

An in-house 3-week test-retest reliability verification for this 20-item sub-scale on uninvolved parenting of POPS in a sub-sample (N: 23) showed a correlation coefficient of 0.93. The face validity for this tool is endorsed as being high for clarity of wording, layout, and style. This was rated by subject experts, not below the rank of postgraduate in psychology with a minimum of three years of clinical experience. Content validity established through evaluation by the tripartite inter-examiner agreement as measured by Fleiss Kappa for multiple raters was 0.93, which is interpreted as 'almost perfect agreement' (Landis and Koch 1977).

DISCUSSION

Parenting research has traditionally recognized Baumrind's categories as authoritarian, authoritative, uninvolved, and indulgent. There is growing discontent with this narrow 2-factor typology of parenting practices (Kotaman, 2013). The tilt is now towards the dyad of child-parent relationships, wherein both the parent and child are considered as equally important, mutually influencing, and reciprocating interactive elements. At an extreme, there is a proposal as to why there cannot be an official diagnostic classification system for parents rather than children (Venkatesan, 2020).

Moreover, there are growing cultural divergences that tend to invalidate the tenets of Baumrind's theory of the 1960s (Smetana, 2017). With the rising recognition on the role of culture as a significant determinant of various aspects of childcare and parenting all over the world, including India, the classification, nomenclature, and taxonomy of parenting is itself being sought to be changed. Pederson (2014), for example, distinguished hyper-parenting, hypo-parenting, traditional/neo-traditional, divergent, and millennial parenting. Venkatesan (2019a) recognized three broad domains of parenting with 42 sub-types in the final taxonomy. Further, a 35-item hyper-parenting domain of the 'Parental Opinion and Practices Scale' was also developed and validated on a sample of parent respondents of children with intellectual and developmental disabilities (Venkatesan, 2019b). The present study is an extension to accurately profile the prevailing trends in uninvolved parenting domain by using a 20-item tool which is proposed to be amalgamated with the earlier one.

Apart from coming up with a valid, reliable, and norm-based indigenous tool on uninvolved parenting exclusively targeting CAD & LD, the present study has shown how fathers are relatively more detached than mothers in the dealings with their CAD & LD. In a

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

longitudinal cohort study, child neglect was measured via videotaped recordings of home observation to conclude how father-figures showed 11-30 % greater lack of involvement than mothers (Dubowitz et al. 2010). Likewise, parents with under-graduation show the least scores compared to those with graduation and post-graduation in the present study.

Uninvolved parents are emotionally detached, preoccupied with themselves or their problems, never express love, maybe use drugs, alcohol, or other abusive substances, show little or no expectations, and seldom supervise their children. The outcomes linked to uninvolved parenting leave children to fend by themselves, or look for alternative parent figures outside their home. Such children are reported to become emotionally withdrawn, suicidal, exhibit aggression, antisocial, and delinquent (Ehnvall, Parker, Hadzi-Pavlovic & Malhi, 2008; Knutson, DeGarmo & Reid, 2004). Siblings who share uninvolved parenting report similar experiences and long-term outcomes (McGillicuddy-De Lisi & De Lisi, 2007; Hines, Kantor & Holt, 2006).

In the contemporary Indian context, parents tend to place high premium on academic achievements. They send their wards to elite schools, online or offline coaching classes, private tuitions, and showcase the best of academic achievements. Against this, having the CAD & LD not achieving in school, parents and teachers are distraught. Some under-react, while others over-react. At the primary school level, parents of children with grade-level discrepancy may still hope that things might turn better. However, when this does not happen even by secondary or high school, the parenting strategies turn into repeated requests, bargaining, coercion, or even frank disengagement with the child (Venkatesan, 2015; 2014; 2013).

SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

In sum, it is admitted that a significant challenge in contemporary parenting research is not only to arrive at an empirically validated name-list on its various types but also, to ensure their objective measurements in a meaningful manner. Available parenting scales come by many names or target various dimensions at different lengths, breadth, depth, or intensities. Some of them use adults as respondents, while others target children to answer them by recalling how their parents reacted towards them when they were young. Response bias, retrospective falsification, expectancy effects, social desirability, and subjectivity owing to self-reporting are commonly alleged perils in the use of such tools. Further, there can be no parent who can be faulted or labelled for “hyper-parenting” in as much as another cannot be dubbed as fully “neglecting.” Parents do not exist as black and white. They are in all shades at different times with one or more children. However, the use of objective measures can at least give indications of ongoing trends for formulating, planning, implementing, and evaluating appropriate parent training programs.

REFERENCES

- Balakrishnan, A., Kulkarni, K., Moirangthem, S., Kumar, C. N., Math, S. B., & Murthy, P. (2019). The rights of persons with disabilities Act 2016: Mental health implications. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine, 41*(2), 119.
- Braza, P., Carreras, R., Sanchez, J. M. M., & Braza, F. (2013). Negative maternal and paternal parenting styles as predictors of children’s behavioral problems: moderating effects of the child’s sex. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 24*(4): DOI: 10.1007/s10826-013-9893-0
- Chao, R., & Tseng, V. (2002). Parenting of Asians. Chapter 4. In: Bornstein, M. H. (Ed.). *Handbook of Parenting, Volume 4-Social Conditions, and Applied Parenting*. New

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

- Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. Pp. 59-94.
DOI: 10.1080/03004430.2014.939650
- Conrade, G., & Ho, R. (2001). Differential parenting styles for fathers and mothers. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 53, 1, 29-35. DOI: 10.1080/00049530108255119
- Daniel, B. M., & Taylor, J. (2006). Gender and child neglect: theory, research, and policy. *Research and Policy*, 26(2): 426-439.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: an integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113 (3): 487-496.
- Deschênes, M., Bernier, A., Jarry-Boileau, V., & St-Laurent, D. (2014). Concordance between the quality of maternal and paternal parenting behavior within couples. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 175(4): 346-362.
- Dubowitz, H., Black, M.M., Kerr, M. A., Tarr, R. H., & Harrington, D. (2000). Fathers and child neglect. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 154(2): 135-141. Doi: 10.1001/archpedi.154.2.35
- Ehnvall, A., Parker, G., Hadzi-Pavlovic, D., & Malhi, G. (2008). Perception of rejecting and neglectful parenting in childhood relates to lifetime suicide attempts for females—but not for males. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 117(1): 50-56.
- George D, & Mallery P (2016). *IBM SPSS Statistics 23 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*. New York: Routledge
- Hines, D. A., Kantor, G. K., & Holt, M. K. (2006). Similarities in siblings' experiences of neglectful parenting behaviors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 30(6): 619-637.
- Kawabata, Y., Alink, L. R., Tseng, W. L., Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Crick, N. R. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles associated with relational aggression in children and adolescents: A conceptual analysis and meta-analytic review. *Developmental Review*, 31(4): 240-278.
- Knutson, J. F., DeGarmo, D. S., & Reid, J. B. (2004). Social disadvantage and neglectful parenting as precursors to the development of antisocial and aggressive child behavior: Testing a theoretical model. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30(3): 187-205.
- Kotaman, H. (2013). Freedom and child-rearing: critic of parenting practices from a new perspective. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 82: 39-50.
- Koulenti, T., & Anastassiou-Hadjicharalambous X. (2011) Uninvolved Parents. In: Goldstein S., Naglieri J.A. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Child Behavior and Development*. Boston, MA: Springer.
- Landis J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1): 159-174
- McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. V., & De Lisi, R. (2007). Perceptions of family relations when mothers and fathers are depicted with different parenting styles. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 168(4): 425-442.
- McKinney, C., & Renk, K. (2008). Differential parenting between mothers and fathers: Implications for late adolescents. *Journal of Family issues*, 29(6): 806-827.
- Mckinney, C., & Renk, K. (2008). Differential parenting between mothers and fathers. *Journal of Family Studies*, 29(6): 806-827. DOI: 10.1177/0192513X07311222
- Panetta, S. M., Somers, C. L., Ceresnie, A. R., Hillman, S. B., & Partridge, R. T. (2014). Maternal and paternal parenting style patterns and adolescent emotional and behavioral outcomes. *Marriage & Family Review*, 50(4), 342-359.
- Pedersen, J. M. (2014). *The rise of the millennial parents: Parenting yesterday and today*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Education. Pp. 57-60.
- Savitha, K., & Venkatachalam, J. (2016). Perceived parenting styles and personality factors: a study. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3, 4, 22-33.

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

- Selin, H. (2014). *Parenting across cultures: childhood, motherhood, and fatherhood in non-western cultures*. New York: Springer.
- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking mother-father differences in parenting to a typology of family parenting styles and adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 2, 212-241. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0192513X06294593>
- Smetana, J. G. (2017). Current research on parenting styles, dimensions, and beliefs. *Current Opinions in Psychology*, 15: 19-25. DOI: 10.1016/j.copsyc/2017.02.012
- Smith, C. A. (1999). *The encyclopedia of parenting theory and research*. London, England: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Tavassolie, T., Dudding, S., Madigan, A. L., Thorvardarson, E., & Winsler, A. (2016). Differences in perceived parenting style between mothers and fathers: Implications for child outcomes and marital conflict. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(6), 2055–2068. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-016-0376-y>
- Venkatesan S (2016). *Readapted Version for 2016: NIMH Socio-Economic Status Scale*. Secunderabad: National Institute for the Empowerment of Persons with Intellectual Disabilities.
- Venkatesan, S., & Lokesh, L. (2016). Differential perception of problem behaviors between parents, teachers, and therapists. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(4): 21-33.
- Venkatesan, S. (2011). The enigma of diagnosis by exclusion: A field study on children frequently mistaken for learning disability in India. *Disabilities and Impairments*, 26 (1): 5-16.
- Venkatesan, S. (2013). While testing behaviors and handling strategies in parents of children with academic problems. *Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 39 (1): 26-34.
- Venkatesan, S. (2014). Coercion tactics of parents on children with academic problems in India. *International Journal of Psychology & Psychiatry* 2 (1): 42-56. DOI: 10.5958/j.2320-6233.2.1.007
- Venkatesan, S. (2015). Parent reflections following diagnostic disclosure of learning disability in their children. *Journal of Disability Management and Special Education*, 5(1): 1-14.
- Venkatesan, S. (2016). A concept analysis of learning disability based on research articles published in India. *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 43, 2, 97-107.
- Venkatesan, S. (2017a). Analysis of attributes in the official definitions for learning disability. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(2): 46-57.
- Venkatesan, S. (2017b). Diagnostic decision tree for specific learning disability. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, 6, 2, 121-127.
- Venkatesan, S. (2017c). Opinion: Case vignette on a life span approach to the diagnosis of specific learning disability in India. *Journal of Psychology and Clinical Psychiatry*, 3, 5, 469-470. DOI: 10.15406/jcpy.2017.08.00469
- Venkatesan, S. (2019a). *Parenting: A caselets based narrative*. India/Singapore/Malaysia: Notion Press.com
- Venkatesan, S. (2019b). Hyper-parenting in children with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Journal of Psychology*, 10(1-2): 22-34. DOI: 10.31961/24566292.2019/10.1-2.196.
- Venkatesan, S. (2020). Is it time for a parental diagnostic classification system? *Journal of Psychiatry and Psychology Research*, 3(3): 191-193.
- Waterman, E. A., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2017). Are mothers' and fathers' parenting characteristics associated with emerging adults' academic engagement? *Journal of Family Issues*, 38, 9, 1239-1261. DOI: 10.1177/0192513X16637101

Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities

Acknowledgements

The author seeks to place on record the gratitude and credits due to the respondents, Director, AIISH, Mysore, as well as the fellow departmental staff involved in clinical work.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: S. Venkatesan (2020). Uninvolved parenting in children with academic delays and specific learning disabilities. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 8(2), 197-209. DIP:18.01.024/20200802, DOI:10.25215/0802.024