

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

Jyoti Chaudhary^{1*}

ABSTRACT

The objective of this paper is to assess the effect of disruptive parental behavioral patterns with love styles. The independent variable of this study is Disruptive patterns of Parental behavior, and the dependent variable is Love styles. Data collection happened through the snowball sampling method; via Google forms. The current study includes 150 participants. Participants from the age range of 13-30 were selected. They were either school/college students or were self-employed. Love Attitudes Scale by Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. and Parent-Child Relationship Scale by Dr. Nalini Rao is used and modified according to the needs of the study. The results concluded a significant effect of disruptive patterns of parental behavior in the love styles of an individual. 3.4 percent variance observed among love styles. Research also postulated that other factors like gender, occupation, family structure, relationship status, and educational qualification might affect the prime variables.

Keywords: Parenting, Parenting styles, Disruptive patterns of parental behaviors, Love, Love Styles

INDIAN CULTURE & TRADITION BETWEEN PARENTS & CHILDREN

India consists of diversified inhabitants having multifaceted religious, cultural & political views on the upbringing of children. The traditional Indian parenting system is framed by; the cultural and religious beliefs of the soil, intergenerational insight, and life experiences. A bond established in childhood comes to signify a lifelong friendship between an Indian parent and child.

Indians have substantial variability; it is unfeasible to pin on a unified set of beliefs to the whole nation about parenting. Child-rearing practices have many prominent aspects that vary within families, like education, family structure, individual experiences, and socio-economic status.

The main objective of parenting is the complete development of their children in every aspect, such as affective, behavioral, cognitive, emotional, and spiritual components. These contribute to both the personal and social development of an individual.

¹B.Sc. (Botany, Zoology, Psychology), M.Sc. (Applied Psychology), India

*Corresponding Author

Received: October 08, 2021; Revision Received: December 24, 2021; Accepted: December 28, 2021

© 2021, Chaudhary J.; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

In India, many people live with their extended families, insinuating that children are brought up in an environment that provides support and encouragement. But traditional Indian parenting cannot come without its share of depreciation. Possessive parents inhibit their child's personal growth, self-confidence & self-esteem. Regular interference by extended family members serves as the medium of inflicted anger in children. Physical punishment is often given to the child as an act to teach discipline; such type of punishment, tolerated in traditional Indian child-rearing practices, leaves the child scarred emotionally for life. Sometimes parents use the method of deprivation as an act of discipline.

PARENTING

Parenting is the practice of child-rearing, which provides behavioral, emotional, physical, intellectual, and social support to a child's development from infancy to adulthood. The parenting style adopted by the parents is affected by factors like family structure, culture, educational qualification, and occupation of the parents, social class and environment, financial condition of the family, and gender differences.

Parents use different strategies and techniques in the upbringing of their children that are known as parenting types or styles. They are representative of the psychological environment at home. A child's self-esteem, psychological well-being, positive relations, emotions, and many other elements of mental health are significantly related to their child-rearing practices. There are four parenting styles, each involving combinations of acceptance & responsiveness and command & control.

These are as follows:

- i. **Authoritative parenting:** The child-rearing practices that use equal combinations of affection, responsibility, and demand from the child come under authoritative parenting. These parents are cognizant of their child's emotional feelings, strengths and weaknesses. They use positive reinforcement as a teaching method. Method of punishment is hardly ever used, and they encourage their child within reasonable limits.
- ii. **Authoritarian parenting:** This type of child-rearing practice has a combination of high demandingness from the child and little responsibility towards their children. These parents have a very high level of presumptions from their children, and they give very little warmth & affection in return. Parents who use this parenting style are often very stern and inflexible. These parents are absolutist in terms of discipline and are vital for compliance. When these expectations are not inclined, they use punishment as a medium to clinch future obedience. These parents often use corporal punishment such as slapping, caning, spanking, pinching, or pulling.
- iii. **Permissive parenting:** This type of parenting incorporates low demandingness and high responsiveness towards their children. Permissive parents are very affectionate and devoted towards their children. They set a low level of benchmark for the children in terms of discipline. They are amiable figures rather than disciplinarians. Parents, who use this type of parenting technique, value their child's privacy, freedom, and sovereignty. These parents are not demanding at all. No or very little punishment is inclined to the child.
- iv. **Uninvolved parenting:** It is also known as neglectful parenting. The child-rearing practice, where parents are not demanding and have no responsibility towards their child, is known as uninvolved parenting. As the name suggests, in this style of upbringing, parents are not involved in their child's lives and make few or no demands at all from their children. Uninvolved parents are very mediocre, unresponsive, indifferent, negligent, delinquent, and unenthusiastic.

DISRUPTIVE PARENTAL PATTERNS

Disruptive patterns of parental behaviors refer to both behavior and relationships (that are not on good terms); between a parent and their child and have over one negative trait for the upbringing methods for their child such as over or under involvement, neglect, poor communication, and frequent conflicts. Disruptive patterns can be distinct as the abnormal or impaired functioning of an individual that causes distress to the self or the people around them and affects their relationships.

Of all the four parenting styles, three of them (that are authoritarian, permissive, and uninvolved styles of parenting) have disruptive patterns, which are not ethical for a child's development and mental health. Bad parenting can be identified, with behaviors as small as rejection, corporal punishment, indifferent, mediocre, unresponsive, or unenthusiastic to the extremes such as physical, emotional, and sexual abuse. These are the most mutilating traits in their parenting style that can ruin or scar the child for life. Most of the time, parents don't even know what leads to adverse outcomes for a child. They unintentionally do or say things that can hurt the child. Most parents have both positive and negative traits for child-rearing practices, and those negative traits can lead to disruptive patterns in their upbringing practices.

LOVE

Love is a complex emotional feeling of positive sentiment and deep affection towards an individual. According to Jeremy Griffith (2011), 'Love is an unconditional selflessness.' It can be present in the form of emotional intimacy; or a romantic attachment. It is sometimes correlated and contrasted with lust. It is a feeling of an experience one perceives for another. When a person is in love, he respects the other individual, has mutual trust and understanding, and is honest and loyal to his partner. Their partners' happiness and safety come first for them, and they can compromise and sacrifice everything in this world for their love. One becomes more vulnerable when they are in love. In love, there is a feeling of unity and completeness of self as a whole.

Ancient Greeks have given the concept of several types of love. Following the footsteps of Greeks, John Alan Lee, a Canadian sociologist, set out the theory of love styles. According to him; there are six styles of love which are:

- **EROS**: It is a passion for one's physical and sentimental feelings to forge and fulfill the certainty, sexual satisfaction and security, and amusement for each other. People, who have this type of love style, choose their partners by intuition and level of chemistry between the two of them. They believe in love at first sight and are hopelessly romantic. They want to share everything with their partners.
- **LUDUS**: People who seek only fun in relationships or other people and are afraid of commitment prefer this type of love. These types of lovers want to have fun all the time. They do not seek a stable relationship and can be involved with more than one partner at a time. They do not share their feelings and emotions with their partner. It resembles unfaithfulness towards a partner and often includes cheating, straying, adultery, and in extreme cases, this type of love can cause sexual addiction.
- **STORGE**: This type of love is rooted in similar interests and commitments between two individuals. The love, responsibilities, duties, and loyalty towards family members, siblings, cousins, partners, spouses, and parents are being embraced in this type. This type of love develops bit by bit out of fellowship or

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

companionship or out of extended prolongation of cohabitation. People of this trait believe that love is not the ultimate goal of life.

- **PRAGMA**: Pragmatic lovers are very sensible, logical, reasonable, and clear-sighted. They choose and repudiate their consort according to their desirable and compatible traits. They want the same morals, beliefs, and values in their partners to acquire a common goal. Due to their practicality, their relationship lasts longer than anyone else's. In a collectivist culture, pragmatic love is a bit natural where arranged marriages are in practice.
- **MANIA**: Manic lovers are very possessive of their partners; they have an explicit type of obsessiveness for their relationship. They want to be loved by their partners; in the same manner, they love them. Manic lovers tend to search for partners without any previous foresight or information regarding a person's character, health, financial and social status, education, or any other background check. Manic love, being pushed in any relationship, can be a tribulation for another partner, and it may result in another partner discerned as more materialistic and detached from society.
- **AGAPE**: It is the purest form of love. Individuals who have an agape love style tend to be altruistic and often engage in small acts of love towards their partners. As the name suggests, altruism bases on selflessness, a highly committed, and unconditional regard for a romantic partner. Agape love style is often juxtaposed with religious reasons. Agape lovers believe in giving more rather than receiving, remain loyal throughout every relationship, and wait for their romantic partners to return after a separation. These individuals tend to feel the highs of a relationship by feeling love in its purest form, while lows by feeling the guilt/incompetence of their loved one. At the end of the spectrum, they might end up getting used to someone who manipulates their partner, leading to a highly toxic and unhealthy relationship.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The 'non-experimental' or 'descriptive research' method is adopted to conduct this study. It aims to assess the relationship between disruptive patterns of parental behaviors and the love styles of an individual using the ex-post-facto research method to establish the relationship between variables. The independent variable of this study is Disruptive patterns of Parental behavior, and the dependent variable is Love styles.

Objective:

To assess if the disruptive patterns of parental behaviors affect the love styles of an individual.

Hypotheses:

H₁: Gender difference will have no effect on the two variables.

H₂: Gender difference will have no effect on different subscales of love styles preferred by an individual.

H₃: Gender difference will have no effect on different subscales of disruptive parenting patterns of an individual.

H₄: There is no significant difference between the two variables and the type of family structure.

H₅: There is no significant difference between the two variables and the educational qualification of an individual.

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

H₆: There is no significant difference between the two variables and the relationship status of an individual.

H₇: There is no significant difference between the two variables and the occupation.

H₈: There is no association between the two prime variables.

H₉: There is no significant effect of disruptive patterns of parental behavior on love styles preferred by an individual.

Participants

Data collection took place through snowball sampling and via google forms. The current study includes 150 participants. Males and females from the age group of 13-30 are idealized. The participants are either students of school or college or are self-employed. An inquiry of basic demographic details like gender, educational qualification, occupation, type of family structure, and relationship status occurred. According to the demographic characteristics collected, there was a ratio of 7:3 for females and males. 6% of the participants were school-going, 60% were undergraduates or graduates, and 34% were postgraduates. Based on the data collected, 77.3% of the individuals were students, 19.4% were working professionals either doing jobs or self-employed, and 3.3% were doing self-pleasure activities. 59.3% of individuals were living in nuclear families, 30.7% in extended/joint families & 10% individuals were living with single parents. Around 37.3% of people had never been in a romantic relationship, 26.7% people were not currently in a romantic relationship but had been in the past, and 36% of individuals were in a romantic relationship, either married or unmarried.

Instruments/Tools Used

1. Love Attitudes Scale

Description: The love attitude scale, assembled by Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986), is a 42-item questionnaire that assesses the preferred love style of an individual. It measures an individual's attitude towards love. This questionnaire has six subscales (7 items for each), and each represents a different love style which is as follows:

- i. EROS (passionate love)
- ii. LUDUS (game-playing love)
- iii. STORGE (friendship love)
- iv. PRAGMA (practical love)
- v. MANIA (possessive and dependent love)
- vi. AGAPE (altruistic love)

This scale combines attitudes towards one's current/recent/hypothetical partner with attitudes about love in general.

Reliability and Validity: By internal consistency, reliability is 0.62 to 0.85. Stability coefficients for the test-retest method were 0.44 to 0.77.

2. Parent-Child Relationship Scale

Description: The Parent-child relationship scale (1989) by Dr Nalini Rao measures the social and emotional functioning of participants & their relationship with their parents. This test included modifications according to the requirements of the study. The original test contains ten subscales, each having ten items. Five subscales support the cordial parent-child relationship, and the other five inhibit the same. The research selected subscales that inhibit cordial parent-child relationship according to the need of the study as it focuses on the disruptive patterns of parental behaviour. Those subscales are as follows: :-

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

- i. Symbolic punishment
- ii. Rejecting
- iii. Object punishment
- iv. Demanding
- v. Neglecting

A translation of items into English took place for the convenience of the participants. In the original questionnaire, the questions were separate for mother and father. While in this study, the researcher kept the items grouped for parents.

Reliability and Validity: The main version of the test has a reliability of 0.43, and the validity stretched from 0.289 to 0.578.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Table: 4.1 Descriptive Statistics of the variables (N=150)

S.no.	Variable	Mean	Standard deviation
1.	Disruptive parental patterns	105.60	39.644
2.	Love styles	129.22	30.152

A high score on these questionnaires represents a higher degree of construct in an individual. The total score of the parenting style questionnaire was 250; the results obtained from the data interpret that around 42% of the parents have adopted more than average disruptive patterns in their parenting styles. The highest possible score for love styles was 210. According to the results obtained, around 50% of the sample have an inordinate love style and are affectionate towards other individuals.

Table: 4.2 Descriptive Statistics of subscales of Disruptive parental patterns

S.no.	Subscale	Mean	Standard deviation
1.	Symbolic punishment	25.33	7.842
2.	Rejecting	18.83	9.013
3.	Object punishment	18.42	9.285
4.	Demanding	24.19	10.320
5.	Neglecting	18.83	9.072

The highest score for any subscale is 50. As per the results, 52% of the parents scored more than average on the scale of *Symbolic Punishment*. Around 38% of parents scored more than average on the dimensions of *Rejecting* and *Object Punishment*. 48% of parents use *Demandingness* in their parenting styles and about 43% of parents have a tendency of *Neglecting* their child's needs. In conclusion, the most disruptive parental patterns adopted are *Symbolic Punishment* and *Demandingness* towards their children, and the less adopted are *Rejection* and *Object Punishment*.

Less preference to the scale of *Rejection* and *Object punishment* could be due to an adaptation to modernization. Parents are not interested in the usage of corporal punishment anymore. Rather, preferring and applying positive and negative reinforcements when their child misbehaves. A high rate of *Symbolic punishment* & *Demandingness* inferred from the data presents the perspective that parents want their children to learn from their experience, therefore, taking the help of symbolic retribution. According to the competition in today's world, parents' expectations are high; they compare their child with every other child. Parents try to badger their children to perform better and always make it clear that they are the

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

authoritative figure. Parents make strict rules about everything to teach discipline to their children. They punish their children either by scolding them or not talking to them.

Table: 4.3 Descriptive Statistics of subscales of Love styles

S.no.	Subscale	Mean	Standard deviation
1.	Eros	22.07	7.667
2.	Ludus	18.09	6.799
3.	Storge	23.11	7.412
4.	Pragma	22.15	7.155
5.	Mania	20.85	6.728
6.	Agape	22.95	7.724

The highest score for any subscale is 35. As per the results, 50% of the individuals scored more than average on the scales of *Eros* (passionate love) and *Agape* (altruistic love). Around 46% of the sample scored more than average on the dimensions of *Ludus* (game-playing love) and *Storge* (friendship love). 51% of the individuals scored more than average on the subscale of *Pragma* (practical love) & 60% of the sample scored more than average on the *Mania* (possessive, dependent love). However, according to the results, the most preferred love styles by individuals were *Eros* & *Storge* love styles, and the least preferred love styles were *Ludus* & *Mania* love styles nonetheless the sample showed a high degree of the trait in possessiveness.

Most preference to the scale of *Eros* could be because people are passionate about their love towards their significant others. Individuals share chemistry with their partners; they understand each other and are emotionally attached. Their partner fits into their ideal standards of beauty. Most preference to the scale of *Storge* would mean people see friends in their partners; they first want their partner to be a friend and then a lover. Their love grows out of friendship. Less preference to the scale of *Ludus* and *Mania* is because individuals might not be scared of the commitment and want actual relationships with their partners. They do not want to hurt or cheat on their lovers and yearn to be completely honest with them. They want to give space & privacy to their partners so that their significant other won't feel suffocated in the relationship. They want to trust each other & grow as a person, simultaneously focusing on their career.

Table: 4.4 t-test among the major variables based on gender

S.no.	Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	p-value
1.	Love styles	Male	46	127.70	21.570	-.482	.631
		Female	104	129.89	33.323		
3.	Disruptive parental patterns	Male	46	108.57	36.942	.632	.529
		Female	104	104.29	40.886		

*equal variances not assumed

The above result table indicates that the gender difference does not affect the three variables because p values for both the constructs are superior to the alpha level of 0.05.

Negative disruptive patterns like demanding behavior affect gender equally. They may be different in aspects yet, the amount of pressure is equal from the parents reflecting no gender difference. Leaper, C., Anderson, K. J., & Sanders, P. (1998) stated that there is a negligible effect in the plight of mothers using directive speech, which is related to symbolic

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

punishment and demanding behavior of parents. Endendijk, Groeneveld, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & Mesman (2016) stated that parents have a higher degree of control towards boys, but the effect was negligible. There were no reports of gender-differentiated autonomy-supportive strategies & overall parenting techniques were the same for both genders.

An individual explores love in friendships or unnamed bonds/ relationships that are not gender-specific therefore, the gender difference is not reflected in love styles. Although these results contradict previous research, for example, Neto (1993) has found gender differences for their preferred love styles among college students and significant relationships between relationship age and romantic loving styles. Goswami, & Sarkar, (2018) found a significant gender difference in the romantic categories of an individual. It could be due to the cross-cultural differences; hence further research needs to be done to generalize the results with a large sample size.

“Therefore, the 1st hypothesis was accepted as there was no significant difference between gender and disruptive parental patterns & love styles.”

Table: 4.5 t-test among the subscales of love styles based on gender

S.no.	Subscale	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	p-value
1.	Eros	Male	46	21.13	6.892	-1.060	.292
		Female	104	22.49	7.982		
2.	Ludus	Male	46	19.48	5.419	1.866	.065
		Female	104	17.48	7.267		
3.	Storge	Male	46	21.50	6.535	-1.894	.061
		Female	104	23.82	7.692		
4.	Pragma	Male	46	21.63	6.655	-.611	.543
		Female	104	22.38	7.386		
5.	Mania	Male	46	20.89	6.357	.056	.956
		Female	104	20.83	6.916		
6.	Agape	Male	46	23.07	6.836	.126	.900
		Female	104	22.90	8.116		

*equal variances not assumed

In table 4.5, the results indicate that the gender difference does not affect the subscales of love styles because p values for all the subscales are greater than the alpha level of 0.05.

The possible reason for the same could be that an individual explores love in friendships or unnamed bonds/ relationships, which are not gender-specific therefore; gender difference is not contemplated in different subscales of love styles. Love Styles refer to how individuals characterize or approach love, with the end goal that their states of mind in regards to love manage their conduct toward, and experience of, those they love (Hendrick and Hendrick 1986; Lee 1973), which has nothing to do with the gender of an individual. Each individual develops a particular ideology & mentality about love according to their preferences, based on his life experiences and the effect of the surrounding environment. Significant gender differences were found on Ludus, Storge, Pragma, and Agape love styles in the study done by Neto, & Pinto, (2003). According to the research done by Mridhula, et al, (2018), no gender difference was found in love styles, hope, & marital attitude among young adults, thus supporting the results of this study and adding more literature in this field.

“Therefore, the 2nd hypothesis was accepted, as there is no significant difference between gender and different subscales of love styles.”

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

Table: 4.6 t-test among the subscales of disruptive parental patterns based on gender

S.no.	Subscale	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	p-value
1.	Symbolic punishment	Male	46	26.26	6.780	1.047	.298
		Female	104	24.91	8.265		
2.	Rejecting	Male	46	19.33	9.636	.428	.670
		Female	104	18.62	8.764		
3.	Object punishment	Male	46	19.41	9.595	.855	.395
		Female	104	17.98	9.157		
4.	Demanding	Male	46	24.83	9.655	.523	.602
		Female	104	23.90	10.634		
5.	Neglecting	Male	46	18.74	8.285	-.089	.930
		Female	104	18.88	9.437		

*equal variances not assumed

The above table represents that the gender difference does not affect the subscales of disruptive patterns of parenting behavior because p values for all the dimensions are greater than the alpha level of 0.05.

Negative disruptive patterns like demanding behaviours affect gender equally. Women face more rejection and neglect from parents when compared to males, while men encounter objective punishment more often. Both genders were equally receiving symbolic punishment reflecting no significant gender difference in different subscales of disruptive parental patterns. A study conducted by Kumari, Singh, Mehra, & Mishra (2019) investigated gender differences in young adults perceptions of parent-adolescent relationships among families (Class I to IV). Boys and girls from all the social classes reported no gender difference in their parents' practice of symbolic punishment. Boys and girls of I, II and III, failed to report gender-based parental differential attitudes on rejecting, object punishment, demanding, and neglecting domains of parent-adolescent relationship. However, girls from social class IV perceived their parents to be significantly more rejecting, indifferent, and neglectful and mothers, in particular, to be more demanding and practising object punishment. Whereas boys from social class IV reported their fathers, in particular, to demand in excess and practising object punishment. Thus, supporting the results of this study.

"Therefore, the 3rd hypothesis was accepted, as there is no significant difference between gender and different subscales of disruptive parenting patterns."

Table: 4.7 ANOVA among the major variables based on family structure

S.no.	Variable	F	sig.
1.	Love styles	.037	.964
2.	Disruptive parental patterns	1.096	.337

The above table represents that there is no significant difference between the two variables and the type of family structure because the p or significant value is greater for the two variables than the alpha level of 0.05.

The two variables are not impacted by family structures, as obligations and expectations fall attached to individuals are the same by their parents. Most nuclear families face pressures from society or extended family and are often compared with them, while in joint families, comparison happens within the family. In joint families, child-rearing practices are more rules-ridden, less individualized, high demanding behavior & corporal punishment, and less

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

investment in resources. Smaller families tend to result in higher IQ, academic achievement, and occupational performance. Large families produce more delinquents and alcoholics (Wagner, Schubert, & Schubert, 1985). Irrespective of the type of family one lives in, the boundations and expectations are higher from the parents' side.

According to previous studies, individuals who grew up in nuclear families or single-parent families had feelings of security and trust in their romantic relationships. Family structure affects various aspects of the life of the individual, especially interpersonal skills. The more positive a relationship is between a parent and child, the more effective is the child-rearing technique, eventually influencing the preference of love style adopted by an individual. Good interpersonal skills can or might lead an individual to be more passionate, friendly, or altruistic. Bad interpersonal skills might lead an individual to have a preference for dependent, possessive, game-playing, or practical love. Inclinations made by an individual, in the context of love style adapted by them, are influenced by the surrounding environment, however, the type of family structure doesn't need to have a significant effect on the precedence for the love style of an individual.

"Therefore, the 4th hypothesis was accepted, because no significant difference was found between family structure and disruptive patterns of parental behavior & love styles."

Table: 4.8 ANOVA among the major variables based on educational qualification

S.no.	Variable	F	sig.
1.	Love styles	.793	.454
2.	Disruptive parental patterns	5.787	.004

Table 4.8 represents that there is no significant difference between the construct love style and the educational qualification of an individual because the p or significant value is greater for love styles than the alpha level of 0.05. It is also found that there is a symbolic difference between the construct, disruptive patterns of parental behavior, and the educational qualification of an individual because the p or significant value is less than the alpha level of 0.05.

The performance of an individual is likely to differ from the expectations generated by the parents, which results in disruptive child-rearing practices, especially in the case of demanding behavior. For example, if a child scores good grades in class, it will provoke more expectations from the parents. If a child is not attaining good grades in his academics, in that case also, parents will have high expectations and demanding behavior from the child, and if the child cannot meet the expectations of the parents, parents can neglect their child and his needs or can use other negative traits to show disappointment towards their child. The more disruptive patterns a parent adopts in his child-rearing practices, the more the child would want to be educationally qualified to change the environment around him. It can also result in the opposite direction that less parental involvement, rejection & neglect from the parents could leave an impression on an individual's mind that education is inessential or could indirectly affect his academic achievements due to mental health problems. Sometimes due to disruptive parental patterns, an individual's expectations for self are higher than usual, and when they are not met it affects his psychological well-being. When one is inefficient at controlling their surroundings, personal growth becomes stagnant, which affects their psychological well-being.

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

Love styles are not affected by the educational qualification of an individual because, due to disruptive parental patterns, the absence of love leads the individual to search for love in surroundings that are not related to educational qualifications. When a person experiences disruptive patterns of parental behavior by his parents, when his parents do not show love and affection towards him, they will look for that love and care in their surroundings, which are not related to the educational qualification of that individual.

“Therefore, the 5th hypothesis was accepted in case of love styles as the educational qualification of a person does not have a significant effect on his preferred love style. While it was rejected in case of disruptive patterns of parental behaviors because educational qualifications do have a significant impact on the variable.”

Table: 4.9 ANOVA among the major variables based on relationship status

S.no.	Variable	F	sig.
1.	Love styles	2.713	.070
2.	Disruptive parental patterns	.001	.999

The results in table 4.9 indicated no significant differences between the constructs of love style and disruptive parental patterns and the relationship status of an individual because their p or significant value is greater than the alpha level of 0.05.

There was no correlation between disruptive patterns of parental behavior and relationship status. The possible reason for this could be a lack of interest in their children's relations with others. Parenthood does not dwell on the romantic feelings of their child's life. The parents do not care about the love life of their children. They want them to get married as soon as they are old enough, have graduated, or are employed, however, disruptive patterns adopted by them are irrespective of the relationship status of their child.

Furthermore, love is a feeling of being attached to someone, an apprehension of belongingness. It doesn't matter if a person is single or in a relationship, hence love styles showed no correlation with an individual's relationship status as it does not care if another person is a friend/family or a significant other. The person who has an agape love style will show altruistic traits in both contexts. However, a person with a mania love style is dependent on another person. These individuals are possessive. Thereby, the love style is not affected by the relationship status of an individual.

“Thus, the 6th hypothesis is accepted for both love styles and disruptive patterns of parental behavior as they are not impacted by the relationship status of an individual.”

Table: 4.10 ANOVA among the major variables based on occupation

S.no.	Variable	F	sig.
1.	Love styles	.321	.726
2.	Disruptive parental patterns	.300	.742

The above table indicates no significant difference between the two variables. Occupation of an individual as the p/significant value is more for both love styles and disruptive parental behaviours than the alpha level of 0.05.

There was no association between disruptive patterns of parental behaviour and occupation as a disruptive parenting style remains unchanged concerning any profession. The individual gets evaluated and derogated regardless. For example, if a person is unemployed, he will face

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

demanding and rejecting behaviour while also facing criticism from his parents. Whereas, if a person is employed, they face critique and devaluation in terms of parental expectations & demands which increase with time. So it doesn't matter in the Indian context whether the child is employed or not; they still have negative patterns in their child-rearing practices. Even if it is negligible in the general picture, those patterns are evident in a typical Indian family/parent.

Similarly, no association was present between love style and occupation as humans do not consider an individual's profession when they feel attracted towards another individual. Feelings of love and attraction are not in one's hands as they are involuntary actions. Therefore, employment status does not matter. So the possible reason for the same could be that when an individual falls in love or feels attracted towards someone, they have a specific preference for another person. That preference is according to their personality, the kind of a person they are, are they passionate about love or are very possessive about their partners and dependent on them, or they are practical in love. To sum up, love style is dependent on the personality of an individual and not profession, thereby demonstrating the results of the research.

“Therefore, the 7th hypothesis was accepted as there is no significant impact of occupation on the disruptive parental patterns & love styles.”

Table: 4.11 Correlation among the major variables of the study

S.no.	Variable	Love styles	Disruptive patterns
1.	Love styles	1	.167*
3.	Disruptive patterns	.167*	1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

This table interprets that; there is a positive and significant relationship between disruptive patterns of parental behaviors with love styles at 0.05 levels.

A **positive correlation** between disruptive patterns of parental behavior and love styles means one has a direct impact on the other, the more disruptive patterns a parent adapts, the more it will affect the preferable love style of an individual. The possible reason could be that since individuals who have disruptive parents grow up neglected, they try to fill the void of love and affection by finding it in their friends/significant others. Parents, who do not show love and devotion to their children, might result in emotional and psychological problems. Individuals who face conflicts with their parents regularly or have rejecting or overprotective parents experience feelings of jealousy and fear of abandonment in their relationships.

“Therefore, the 8th hypothesis was rejected as there is an actual relationship between disruptive patterns of parental behavior & love styles.”

Table: 4.12 Regression upon love styles by the subscales of disruptive parental patterns

Predictors	B	Std. error B	β	Sig. value	R ²	Adjusted R ²
Demanding	.589	.235	.202	.013	.041	.034

Table 4.12 represents the results for Multiple Regression by stepwise method among the variables to study the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. Predictor variables including disruptive patterns of parental behaviour are symbolic punishment, rejecting, object punishment, demanding, and neglect. While the criterion variable is love styles.

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

The sample population included multiple regression; only one dimension named 'demanding' could enter the final model. The β value calculated for the variable was .202, which was significant at the alpha level of 0.01. The demanding variable had an adjusted R^2 of .034, which indicates that it has a variance of 3.4% in the model.

Disruptive patterns of parental behaviour have a positive correlation with the love styles of individuals, which means one has a direct impact on the other. The more disruptive patterns a parent adapts, the more it will impact the preferable love style of an individual. This variance means that disruptive patterns of a parent impact an individual's love styles by 3.4%. The direct relationship between disruptive patterns of parental behaviour and love styles indicates that the more the demanding behaviour of a parent, the higher an individual is on the scale of practical or dependent/possessive love. Traits of rejection and symbolic punishment were also positively correlated with high scores of practical love and low scores of passionate love style. The research proffers that individuals who scored higher on a scale of possessive or dependent love style also scored higher on a scale of game-playing love and vice-versa.

"Thus, the 9th hypothesis was rejected as there is a significant effect of disruptive patterns of parental behavior on love styles of an individual."

CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, the research established a correlation between disruptive parenting patterns and love styles. It also includes a significant effect of disruptive patterns of parental behaviour on love styles. A variance of 3.4% was found in love styles by disruptive patterns of parental behaviours. Limitation of the study include:

- Conduction of mediation correlation not administered.
- The sample was only limited to the Indian population.
- Small and homogenous sample size.
- Cause and effect relation was not established (although it is studied).
- Due to the small sample size, results cannot be generalized.
- Some participants were uncomfortable in answering the questions for love styles and disruptive parental patterns questionnaires.

Future Scope

The study can be conducted on a larger sample size to make generalizations on the population. Future research should focus on orchestrating this research on a heterogeneous sample to consider all aspects of impact factors. The researchers can also debrief participants about the importance of studying the extreme sides of the prime variables so they won't get uncomfortable while filling out the questionnaires.

REFERENCES

- Aoki, Kikuyo (2003). Psychology of parent child relationship. *Japan Medical Association Journal*, 46(2), 75-79.
- Avinash P. R., Kalra, G., Subramanyam, A., Shah, H., & Kamath, R. (2015). Love styles of young adults in a metropolitan city of India. *Open Journal of Psychiatry & Allied Sciences*, 6, 83-8. DOI: 10.5958/2394-2061.2015.00002.6.
- Del Toro, M. (2012). The Influence of Parent-Child Attachment on Romantic Relationships. *McNair Scholars Research Journal*, 8(5).
- Endendijk, J. J., Groeneveld, M. G., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Mesman, J. (2016). Gender-differentiated parenting revisited: Meta-analysis reveals very few differences in parental control of boys and girls. *PLoS One*, 11(7), e0159193.

Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles

- Gillaspy, A. et al (1995). Concurrent Validity of Scores from the Hendrick-Hendrick "Love Attitudes Scale": Predicting Score Variance Using Androgyny Sex-Roles Data. *Reports-Research/Technical*, 143.
- Goodboy, A. K., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (2009). Love styles and desire for closeness in romantic relationships. *Psychological Reports*, 105, 191-197.
- Kretschmer, T., Vollebergh, W., & Oldehinkel, A. J. (2017). Parent-child positivity and romantic relationships in emerging adulthood: Congruence, compensation, and the role of social skills. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 41(2), 198-210.
- Kumari, A., Singh, R., Mehra, M., & Mishra, A. K. (2019). Parent-Adolescent Relationship in Context of Gender of Adolescents and Social Class of Families: A Case Study of GBPUAT, Uttarakhand. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 1-9.
- Moore, K., Kinghorn, A., & Bandy, T. (2011). Parental relationship quality and child outcomes across subgroups. Retrieved from *Child Trends website*: http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Child_Trends-2011_04_04_RB_MaritalHappiness.pdf.
- Mridhula, A. & Anayalakshmi, V. R. (2018). The effect of love styles on hope and marital attitudes among young adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 6(3), 215-224. DIP: 18.01.020/20180603, DOI:10.25215/0603.020.
- Neto, F., & Pinto, M. D. C. (2003). The role of loneliness, gender and love status in adolescents' love styles. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 11(3), 181-191.
- Overbeek, G., Stattin, H., Vermulst, A., Ha, T., & Engels, R. C. (2007). Parent-child relationships, partner relationships, and emotional adjustment: A birth-to-maturity prospective study. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(2), 429.
- Shah, S., & Nakhat, P. (2018). Parent Child Relationship of Indian Students and Suggestive Techniques. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 6(2), 12-20. DIP:18.01.102/20180602, DOI:10.25215/0602.102.
- Wagner, M. E., Schubert, H. J., & Schubert, D. S. (1985). Family size effects: A review. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 146(1), 65-78.

Acknowledgement

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process. I am indebted to my supervisor Mr. K.M. Tripathi who is a source of constant guidance and made an immense contribution to this research work. I wish to show my appreciation to my friends Pragya Khari, Aakriti Mittal, Ayushi Gupta, Himani Bairwa, and Zakira Habibi for their immense support and guidance in helping me to bridge gaps and pave ways where I stuck.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Chaudhary J. (2021). Effect of Disruptive Patterns of Parental Behaviours on Love Styles. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(4), 2030-2043. DIP:18.01.194.20210904, DOI:10.25215/0904.194