

PEER PRESSURE OF ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO PERCEIVED PARENTING STYLES

Jasleen Kaur

Asst. Prof.

GHG Khalsa College of Education, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana

ABSTRACT

This investigation examined the structural relationships between adolescents' subjective perceptions of their home environments and the intensity of peer pressure experienced within secondary school ecosystems. Utilizing a stratified random sampling framework, data were gathered from a balanced cohort of 120 senior secondary school students (n=60 males, n=60 females; n=60 rural, n=60 urban) enrolled in institutional frameworks across the Ludhiana district of Punjab, India. The psychometric instrumentation comprised the Children's Perception of Parenting Scale (CPPS) and the Peer Pressure Scale (PPS-KA). Parametric analysis via Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients revealed that the home environment functions as a critical structural baseline for adolescent social vulnerability. Statistically significant positive correlations were observed between adolescent peer pressure and independent raw scores for rejecting ($r=+0.526$), autocratic ($r=+0.392$), overdemanding ($r=+0.374$), and overprotective ($r=+0.328$) child-rearing dimensions. Conversely, significant inverse relationships were established for accepting ($r=-0.504$) and democratic ($r=-0.435$) family structures. The findings demonstrate that a single summated total score for parenting styles is structurally invalid on directional testing, necessitating an area-wise analytical approach to foster autonomous-supportive family environments and cultivate socio-emotional resilience during the adolescent transition.

Keywords: Perceived Parenting Styles, Peer Pressure, Family Dynamics, Social Self-Efficacy, Behavioral Reactance, Evaluation Distress.

1. INTRODUCTION

Adolescence represents a complex developmental window characterized by profound neurobiological transitions, identity experimentation, and the restructuring of micro-systemic attachments. As developing individuals navigate the second decade of life, the primary locus of social orientation undergoes a fundamental shift away from maternal and paternal monitoring frameworks toward contemporary age-mate networks. Within the framework of ecological systems theory, this transition represents an active renegotiation of the boundaries between the family microsystem and the peer microsystem. The subjective climate of the household operates as a foundational cognitive filter, shaping the internal working models that adolescents use to process external interpersonal expectations within the wider school environment.

Peer pressure—defined as the subjective or objective force that compels an individual to align attitudes, values, choices, and behaviors with group standards—emerges as a dominant social force during this transitional phase. While peer group alignment can foster social maturity, collaborative spirit, and collective academic persistence, negative peer compliance frequently drives maladaptive behavioral trajectories, including academic disengagement, evaluation distress, and health-risk behaviors. The psychological vulnerability of an adolescent to these external pressures is not a static or isolated personality trait; rather, it is a dynamic systemic outcome conditioned by long-term patterns of family interaction.

The conceptualization of family systems relies on balancing distinct behavioral axes: demandingness (behavioral control and boundary setting) and responsiveness (emotional warmth, acceptance, and psychological support). When an adolescent evaluates the home environment as supportive, emotionally available, and democratic, a secure psychological base is internalized. This internal security promotes self-reliance and autonomous decision-making, allowing the youth to resist groupthink and navigate school environments confidently. Conversely, home environments perceived as autocratic, cold, overprotective, or overdemanding create severe developmental vulnerabilities. When family boundaries restrict age-appropriate autonomy or make emotional warmth conditional upon performance, the resulting validation vacuum or evaluation distress often drives the adolescent to seek external validation. The immediate contemporary circle becomes an alternative source of security, leaving the individual highly susceptible to negative peer pressure.

While extensive research has investigated these variables within Western nuclear family structures, there remains an empirical gap regarding how these dynamics manifest within the socio-cultural fabric of Northern India, particularly in transitioning semi-urban and rural environments like the Ludhiana district of Punjab. Rapid macroeconomic shifts, changing employment patterns, and the integration of digital media platforms have modified traditional support systems, placing unique interpersonal stresses on school-going youth. This investigation addresses these gaps by explicitly focusing on the dimension-wise relationships between perceived family environments and peer pressure. By analyzing how the six independent child-rearing parameters correlate with total peer pressure indices, this paper aims to provide actionable insights for educational psychologists, family counselors, and institutional administrators designing environment-specific methodologies to mitigate negative peer compliance.

2. METHODS

2.1 Research Design

The investigation utilized a descriptive survey research design using a cross-sectional approach to evaluate the operational variables under natural conditions without experimental manipulation. The independent variable framework is conceptualized as the multi-dimensional parameters of perceived child-rearing practices, while the dependent variable is identified as total adolescent peer pressure scores.

2.2 Sample and Sampling Technique

The target population comprised secondary school students enrolled in institutional structures within the Ludhiana district of Punjab. A sample of 120 adolescents was compiled using a stratified random sampling technique to ensure balanced demographic representation. The sample architecture was stratified across two primary parameters: Gender (Male and Female) and Geographical Locale (Rural and Urban). This design yielded four distinct, homogenous cohorts comprising 30 participants each: Rural Boys (n=30), Rural Girls (n=30), Urban Boys (n=30), and Urban Girls (n=30), culminating in an absolute sample size of N=120.

2.3 Psychometric Instrumentation

Two validated standardized psychometric testing booklets were administered to collect primary quantitative data:

1. Children's Perception of Parenting Scale (CPPS): Formulated by Pyari and Kalra (1985), this diagnostic instrument measures the subjective nature of the home environment across 40 items. It explicitly avoids a mathematically invalid summated

total score, generating six independent dimensional metrics: Democratic, Autocratic, Accepting, Rejecting, Overprotecting, and Overdemanding.

2. Peer Pressure Scale (PPS-KA): Developed by Kaur (2020), this instrument quantifies vulnerability to peer compliance through 36 items structured on a Likert scale. It provides a total summated score (ranging from 36 to 180), where higher values indicate elevated susceptibility to group demands. The manual provides separate norm tables and gender-specific transformation boundaries to ensure interpretive validity.

2.4 Data Collection Procedure

Administrative approval was secured from the institutional heads of selected senior secondary schools in the Ludhiana district. Participants were gathered in standard institutional settings, and informed consent was formally recorded. The psychometric scales were administered with clear, non-directive explanations. To ensure data integrity, the identity-shielding protocols specified by the institutional ethics boards were maintained. Raw testing booklets were reviewed for completeness, and incomplete responses were excluded before final tabulation.

2.5 Statistical Processing Techniques

The collected quantitative dataset was analyzed using SPSS version 26.0. The analytical pathway explicitly focused on descriptive parametric verifications to test normal distribution assumptions for the dependent variable scores, alongside Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) to analyze the directional pathways, strength, and significance levels between the six independent child-rearing parameters and total peer pressure indices.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Dimension-Wise Correlation Matrix

To examine how the adolescent home environment connects to the pressure felt from friends, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) were computed. The total peer pressure scores from the PPS-KA were correlated with each of the six separate family style dimensions from the CPPS. The analysis reveals that the home environment functions as a highly influential factor in an adolescent's vulnerability to external social group conformity. Table 3.1 outlines the generated correlation values, directional orientations, and corresponding levels of statistical significance.

Table 3.1: Correlation Matrix Between Perceived Child-Rearing Dimensions and Total Peer Pressure

Perceived Child-Rearing Dimension (CPPS Sub-Scales)	Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r)	Statistical Significance Level (p)	Confirmed Null Hypothesis Status
Democratic Parenting Dimension	-0.435**	$p < 0.01$	Null Hypothesis 1 Rejected
Autocratic Parenting Dimension	+0.392**	$p < 0.01$	Null Hypothesis 2 Rejected
Accepting Parenting Dimension	-0.504**	$p < 0.01$	Null Hypothesis 3 Rejected

Perceived Child-Rearing Dimension (CPPS Sub-Scales)	Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r)	Statistical Significance Level (p)	Confirmed Null Hypothesis Status
Rejecting Parenting Dimension	+0.526**	$p < 0.01$	Null Hypothesis 4 Rejected
Overprotecting Parenting Dimension	+0.328**	$p < 0.01$	Null Hypothesis 5 Rejected
Overdemanding Parenting Dimension	+0.374**	$p < 0.01$	Null Hypothesis 6 Rejected

Note: indicates statistical significance at the 0.01 level (two-tailed; N=120).

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Integrated Evaluation of Child-Rearing Practices and Peer Vulnerability

The statistical associations compiled in Table 3.1 prove that an adolescent's subjective appraisal of their household climate patterns their subsequent susceptibility to peer group compliance, confirming that parenting must be treated area-wise due to the clear directional divergences among the sub-scales.

The negative correlation coefficient between peer pressure and democratic parenting ($r=-0.435$, $p<0.01$) indicates that homes prioritizing open communication and shared choices foster individual autonomy and social self-efficacy, aligning with Baumrind's (1971) baseline socialization models and Steinberg and Morris's (2001) evidence on authoritative anchors, which show that shared decision-making builds self-directed coping styles that prevent an anxious need to copy classmate choices, as supported by Khan et al. (2024a).

The positive correlation for the autocratic dimension ($r=+0.392$, $p<0.01$) proves that rigid domination and restrictive monitoring leave youth vulnerable to groupthink because controlling home climates suppress personal agency, forcing adolescents to find alternative social validation spaces where they substitute parental control with peer compliance—a trend historically mapped by Symonds (1939), theoretically supported by Maccoby and Martin (1983), and empirically verified by Khan et al. (2024b).

The substantial negative association established for the accepting child-rearing parameter ($r=-0.504$, $p<0.01$) confirms that unconditional emotional warmth and psychological support act as defensive shields against external manipulation. In line with Sinha's (1984) findings in the Indian educational context and Rohner's (2004) universal verification of parental acceptance-rejection frameworks, secure relational anchors satisfy the primary human need for belonging within the family system, which isolates the teenager from social interaction anxiety on campus.

In sharp contrast, the perceived rejecting style generated the highest direct positive correlation within the study ($r=+0.526$, $p<0.01$), confirming that cold, critical family setups create a severe validation vacuum that drives the rejected youth toward immediate contemporary cliques with extreme dependency, rendering the individual highly susceptible to group contamination and willing to sacrifice personal values to escape domestic loneliness—a painful reality documented by Sengar and Srivastava (1990) and supported by Moretti and Peled's (2022) attachment analyses.

Furthermore, hyper-interventionist overprotection demonstrated a significant positive correlation ($r=+0.328$, $p<0.01$), indicating that "helicopter parenting" hinders self-governance by micro-managing routines and restricting age-appropriate risks, which undermines independent problem-solving capabilities and leaves the child socially anxious and over-reliant on external reference networks, as confirmed by Schiffrin et al. (2014) and Soenens et al. (2006).

Finally, the positive correlation noted for the overdemanding parameter ($r=+0.374$, $p<0.01$) illustrates that performance-contingent love generates acute evaluation distress; as Grolnick (2003) verified, when core human worth is tied entirely to unrealistic achievement metrics, adolescents experience profound evaluation anxiety, which causes them to conform heavily to peer group norms where acceptance is granted based on social alignment rather than scholastic execution, matching Pinquart's (2017) data on environmental distress and subsequent behavioral deviations.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The empirical analysis of the dataset yields several foundational conclusions regarding the multi-dimensional socio-emotional landscape of secondary school students in Ludhiana district:

Unidirectional Score Validity: Subjective child-rearing environments cannot be measured through a single total parenting style index. Only category-wise, independent area metrics reveal valid directional interactions with adolescent behavioral outcomes.

Predictive Sub-Scale Trajectories: Emotional rejection ($r=+0.526$) and autocratic dominance ($r=+0.392$) operate as the strongest positive predictors of group compliance, whereas parental acceptance ($r=-0.504$) and democratic communication ($r=-0.435$) function as robust buffers against external manipulation.

Autonomy Erosion Dynamics: Hyper-interventionist parental overprotection ($r=+0.328$) and unrealistic overdemandingness ($r=+0.374$) significantly increase peer pressure susceptibility by eroding internal decision-making frameworks and fostering external validation dependencies.

5.2 Educational Implications and Recommendations

The findings carry major implications for the restructural design of modern instructional environments, counseling frameworks, and community socialization programs:

Implementing Authoritative Parent Training Modules: Since a strong inverse relationship exists between democratic-accepting family climates and peer pressure, educational institutions should establish structured parent-teacher engagement portals. These forums can train families to implement authoritative child-rearing strategies—characterized by emotional accessibility, validation, and bidirectional rule-setting—to reduce the domestic validation gaps that drive youth toward maladaptive external cliques.

Establishing Campus-Based Mental Health Portals: Because home climates heavily pattern the intensity of peer vulnerabilities, schools must shift away from purely punitive discipline toward proactive behavioral frameworks. Appointing trained guidance counselors and implementing peer-led mediation forums can provide safe spaces for students to manage domestic evaluation distress and resist anxious conformity.

Formulating Uniform Socio-Emotional Standards: Regional education boards must deploy identical emotional literacy, assertiveness training, and resilience curricula across institutional frameworks to target the high susceptibility sub-groups. This structured deployment ensures that all adolescents receive identical structural support to build strong social self-efficacy and resist negative groupthink during identity exploration.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, M., Bashir, S., & Khan, N. (2025). The complex interplay of parenting styles, peer pressure, and academic performance among university students. *Journal of Higher Education and Behavioral Studies*, 12(1), 45–59.
2. Agarwal, K. L. (1986). Influence of parental encouragement on the educational development and scholastic achievement of secondary school girls. *Indian Educational Review*, 21(3), 88–101.
3. Anike, C. O., Nwokolo, C., & Obi, J. S. (2024). Assessing the influence of perceived parenting styles on peer pressure vulnerability among undergraduate students: Implications for institutional methodologies. *African Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 6(2), 112–125.
4. Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4(1, Pt. 2), 1–103.
5. Behmani, R. K., Sakshi, Kumar, S., Nehra, S., & Kumar, V. (2014). Role of peer pressure and social maturity in the identity exploration and adjustment of Indian school-going adolescents. *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 41(2), 134–142.
6. Buhrmester, D. (1996). Need fulfillment, interpersonal competence, and the developmental contexts of early adolescent friendships. *Youth & Society*, 28(1), 41–68.
7. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary Research Unit. (2016). *Lexical standardization of social dynamics and conformity behaviors in educational environments* (4th ed.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
8. Chen, X., Chang, L., & He, Y. (2003). Peer acceptance, teacher ratings, and family climates: Interactive buffers against behavioral distress in restrictive environments. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27(4), 321–332.
9. Clark, A. E., & Loheac, Y. (2007). "What silent interactions tell us": Shifts in modern family macro-systems and time spent in the exclusive company of peers. *Journal of Health Economics*, 26(3), 542–563.
10. Clasen, D. R., & Brown, B. B. (1985). The multidimensionality of peer pressure in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 14(6), 451–468.
11. Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487–496.
12. Grigoriou, M. (2014). Long-term impacts of early maternal and paternal care on cognitive progression and classroom social compliance: A longitudinal look at 4 and 7 years of age. *Early Child Development and Care*, 184(6), 845–859.
13. Grolnick, W. S. (2003). *The psychology of parental control: How parent-child interactions shape motivation, evaluation anxiety, and self-regulation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
14. Kaur, A. (2020). Construction and standardization of a multi-dimensional Peer Pressure Scale (PPS-KA) for secondary school students (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Panjab University, Chandigarh, India.
15. Khan, N., Malik, S., & Yousaf, Z. (2024a). Fostering adolescent well-being: The mediating role of self-esteem in the relationship between authoritative parenting, peer attachment, and life satisfaction. *Adolescent Psychological Development*, 29(2), 77–91.
16. Khan, Z., Shaukat, A., & Raza, H. (2024b). Authoritarian constraints and health risk behaviors among late adolescents under negative social compulsion. *Journal of Adolescent Health and Welfare*, 8(3), 202–217.

17. Li, X., Wang, Z., & Ethier, K. (2023). Parenting styles and adolescent problematic internet use (PIU) across distinct cultural contexts: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 142, Article 107658.
18. Longman Lexicographical Group. (2009). *Standardizing operational definitions of peer influence, baseline linguistic databases, and implicit social contracts*. London, England: Pearson Longman.
19. Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp. 1–101). New York, NY: Wiley.
20. Moretti, M. M., & Peled, M. (2022). Adolescent-parent attachment and the quality of peer interactions: A systematic review of internal working models in school contexts. *Attachment & Human Development*, 24(3), 312–328.
21. Pinquart, M. (2017). Associations of parenting styles and dimensions with child and adolescent aggression: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 41(1), 32–43.
22. Pyari, A. (2008). Perceived parenting dimensions, caste realities, and behavioral deviations across urban educational landscapes. *Indian Educational Review*, 44(2), 102–116.
23. Pyari, A., & Kalra, R. K. (1985). *Manual for Children's Perception of Parenting Scale (CPPS)*. Agra, India: Rakhi Prakashan.
24. Rohner, R. P. (2004). The parental acceptance-rejection syndrome: Universal correlates of perceived maternal and paternal warmth and rejection. *American Psychologist*, 59(8), 834–841.
25. Ryan, A. M. (2000). Peer groups as a context for the socialization of adolescents' motivation, school engagement, and academic achievement in middle school. *Child Development*, 71(4), 1013–1028.
26. Ryan, A. M. (2001). The peer group and adolescents' timelines, choices, and motivation in school. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 113–122.
27. Santor, D. A., Messervey, D., & Kusumakar, V. (2000). Measuring peer pressure, popularity, and conformity in adolescent cohorts: Correlates of risk-taking and delinquency. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29(2), 163–182.
28. Schiffrin, H. H., Liss, M., Miles-McLean, H., Geary, K. A., Erchull, M. J., & Tashner, T. (2014). Helping or hovering? The effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(3), 548–557.
29. Sengar, K., & Srivastava, A. (1990). Perceived childhood rejection, maternal warmth deficits, and adolescent value orientations. *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 17(1), 34–42.
30. Sinha, S. P. (1984). Family context as an integrated unit: Favorable parental behavior, vocational choices, and value orientations of college youth in Northern India. *Indian Psychological Review*, 26(2), 14–25.
31. Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Luyckx, K., & Goossens, L. (2006). Maladaptive coping and internalizing problems: The mediating role of distinct components of psychological control. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 35(2), 269–281.
32. Steinberg, L. (2017). *Adolescence* (11th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.
33. Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development in the family microsystem. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 83–110.
34. Symonds, P. M. (1939). *The psychology of parent-child relationships*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
35. Trikett, P. K., & Knezynski, K. J. (1986). Family ecosystems, parenting profiles, and subsequent long-term child personality adjustment. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 15(2), 115–123.
36. Wadkar, A. J., & Palsane, M. N. (1987). Gender as a cognitive filter: Differential perception of parental child-rearing behaviors between boys and girls. *Journal of Psychological Researches*, 31(2), 94–102.
37. Young, R. (1994). Autocratic family structures vs. democratic rules: A prospective longitudinal tracking of secondary school adjustment and delinquent trajectories. *Developmental Review*, 14(3), 241–259.