



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

*Journal homepage:* <http://www.journalijar.com>  
*Journal DOI:* [10.21474/IJAR01](https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01)

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL  
OF ADVANCED RESEARCH**

# RESEARCH ARTICLE

## HOVERING, PARENTAL CONTROL AND RESPONSIVENESS IN RELATION WITH COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT ISSUES AMONG UNDERGRADUATE RESIDENTIAL AND NON RESIDENTIAL STUDENTS.

**Tanu Kukreja<sup>1</sup> and Nivriti Chauhan<sup>2</sup>.**

1. Assistant Professor, Amity Institute of Behavior and Allied Sciences, Amity University Haryana.
2. Student, Amity Institute of Behavior and Allied Sciences, Amity University Haryana.

### Manuscript Info

#### Manuscript History:

Received: 12 May 2016  
 Final Accepted: 22 June 2016  
 Published Online: July 2016

#### Key words:

helicopter parenting, hovering, parental responsiveness, parental control.

#### \*Corresponding Author

**Tanu Kukreja.**

### Abstract

Parental support, protectiveness, and involvement in a child's life are generally considered a positive thing. In recent years, parents who are highly involved in their child's life are termed as "Helicopter parents". The study is conducted to see if hovering, parental control and responsiveness are related to college adjustment issues among undergraduate residential and non-residential students. The sample consists of 145 undergraduate students of Amity University, Gurgaon. The results indicated hovering is more on Non Residential students than on Residential students. A significant relationship is also seen of hovering with parental responsiveness, but the relationship of hovering with college adjustment like problem in career choice, academic issues and suicidal ideation was not significant. There was no significant difference found in Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students for parental control and parental responsiveness. A negative moderate correlation of father responsiveness is found with suicidal ideation.

*Copy Right, IJAR, 2013., All rights reserved.*

In recent years, parents who are highly involved in their child's life are termed as "Helicopter parents". This term was first used in Dr. Haim Ginott's (1969) book *Parents and Teenagers* where a teen complained that his mother hovers over him like a helicopter. Helicopter parents are those who hover over their children. Parents who are always calling their child multiple times a day, solving their every problem and not letting them face any kind of obstacle themselves, they come to rescue their child at the first sign of difficulty or any disappointment. These type of parents are also often termed as "micro-managers" and believe that because they "have done it before" so they know how to do it better than them.

There is a fine line between parental involvement and over-parenting. The parental involvement might be a boost up, support that children need to build their own confidence and abilities but over-parenting leads to many different things which can make their child totally dependent on them. Media has tagged helicopter parents with various synonyms such as "hovercraft", "hummingbirds", "stealth fighters" and "black hawks".

Lately, many books have raised both the issue and concern about parental over-involvement that may have negative outcomes in children (Bronson and Merryman, 2009; Hofer and Moore, 2010; Levine, 2006; Marano, 2008; Nelson 2010). Mainly these authors have discussed how over-involvement of parents can lead to higher levels of anxiety and depression as well as less perseverance in children (Gibbs, 2009; Levine, 2006; Marano, 2008). This literature has also suggested that children of over-involved or over-controlling parents may feel less competent and less able to manage life and its stressors (Bronson and Merryman, 2009; Gibbs, 2009; Hofer and Moore, 2010; Marano, 2008).

Lythcott-Haims (2015) has written a book titled "How to Raise an Adult ." She argues that "over helping" may make good resumes for college admissions but this also robs them of the chance to know them, to know what they want and what they love. She writes that parents want to help their child by shepherding them from milestone to milestone and by shielding them from failure and too much of pain, but this may cause harm. It can leave young adults without the strength of skills, and characters that are needed to know themselves effectively.

A study was conducted by Brigham Young University (2015) which examined undergraduate students and the study suggests that helicopter parenting demoralizes kids. According to this study, if parents are doing the things that their kids should be doing on their own, it can lower their self-worth and it can also encourage them to engage in risky behaviors like binge drinking. Todd Deutsch, a psychotherapist in Los Angeles, agrees with the study's conclusion as he says children developing in today's time are not well equipped with tools to manage life's problems and they acquire coping tools that are maladaptive such as drug use, living off parents and job failures. He offers a parental workshop called "avoid the helicopter blades".

Parenting styles are the representation of how parents interact with their children and use it in child-rearing. Diana Baumrind a clinical and developmental psychologist focused her research on parenting styles and gave three types of parenting style in 1966 which are Authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting and permissive parenting. Whereas the fourth parenting style uninvolved parenting was introduced by Maccoby and Martinsug (1983).

Authoritative parenting builds up their own rules and guidelines which are expected to be followed by their children. They give priorities to child's needs and abilities and also encourage them to be independent. If child fails to fulfil their expectations then parents forgive and encourage them instead of giving punishment. They are assertive in nature. They want their children to be socially responsible and cooperative.

Authoritarian parenting type parents are very responsive towards their child. They are firm and have consistent control without being overly restrictive. They give priority to child's needs and abilities. These type parents may have high expectations from their children but they provide them with every basic need which they'll need for succeeding in life. They encourage their children to be independent and also encourage autonomy. They are forgiving parents. They also offer encouraging autonomy. They even punish the child when mistakes are done but they make sure that the child knows for what he is being punished. They set limit and demand maturity.

Permissive parenting is a kind of parenting in which parents are very involved with their children but have very few demands and control over them. These types of parents are very loving and impose very few rules on them. They are very friendly towards their children and do not play a parental role. Children are least disciplined of permissive parents. Baumrind did a research on pre school kids with permissive parents and concluded that children were immature, impulsive in control and showed behavior of irresponsibility because of permissive parenting style.

Helicopter parents and authoritarian parents have some similar concerns about their children in such a way that they both are actively engaged in helping their children to succeed and achieve in life. Helicopter parenting becomes problematic in giving the kind of independence to their kids as these kinds of parents try to solve their problems during task-oriented challenges. Sometimes helicopter parents may seem like authoritative parents as authoritative parents tend to be generally assertive and use no reason to shape child's behavior. So it may be that helicopter parents are assertive in some cases but also intrusive regarding education and competitiveness.

### **College adjustment perspective**

Adjustment is defined as institutional commitment, the absence of psychological distress and feelings of academic adjustment. A study defines adjustment as the "opposite of transitional trauma," which is "level of alienation a student experiences when unfamiliar with the norms, values, and expectations that predominate" (Bennett and Okinaka, 1990). Although linking college adjustment with attrition is of critical importance, a focus on the development and monitoring of college adjustment indicators is necessary if they are to serve as an effective early warning system for institutions (Krotseng, 1992)

### **Academic problem**

There are many more characteristics of colleges that may have an effect on college adjustment. Selectivity in colleges shows the general level of academic ability in student body and this may be challenging to academic adjustment for students. Parenting style has also played a major role in academic adjustment problems. The

authoritative parenting is associated with high levels of academic performance and study skills (Strage, Amy; Brandt, Tamara Swanson, 1999). The authoritative parenting also influences the academic performance of college students, and both intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy predicted good academic performance (Turner, Chandler, Heffer, 2009).

### **Career problem-**

During the process of career development, an individual makes numerous important decisions that affect major areas of his or her life. Work adjustment is associated with mental health and physical well-being. - Hackett & Betz, in press. Lent et al. (1994) hypothesize that there is a relationship between career interests and career goals. They suggest that ethnic and gender differences in interest goal congruence are rooted in ethnic and gender differences in perceived barriers. Arbona (1990) and Leong (1985) assert that the perceived barriers to educational and career goals are very important to understanding the gap between ability and occupational attainment.

### **Suicidal ideation**

Suicide is the act of killing oneself because he has no desire to live any further in life. Worldwide suicide rate per year is 1 million and out of which 17% that is 135000 are Indians. NDTV has reported that maximum suicide rates in the country are between 15-29 age group. The presence of a mood disorder is the most closely associated psychiatric condition in teenage suicide (Beautrais, 2003; Pfeffer, 2002). A basic risk factor for suicide in adolescents and young adults is depression (Nemeroff et al., 2001). Substance abuse has also been identified to have an increase in suicides in teens and young adults (Esposito-Smythers and Spirito, 2004; Fowler et al., 1986; Garlow, 2002; Garlow et al., 2005). Some of the other risk factors which are associated with youth suicide are bad life events before death, some kind of legal arrest issues, family history of suicide and mental illness, and a history of sexual abuse (Agerbo et al., 2002; Cooper et al., 2002; Gray et al., 2002; Juon and Ensminger, 1997). If there is a history of any kind of attempt of suicide then it is a definite risk factor for further more attempts (D'Eramo et al).

### **Review of Literature**

Bonner and Rich (1989) examined the relationship of various interpersonal, emotional, and cognitive variables to suicidal ideation and behavior in college students. The study consisted of 158 subjects (58 males, 100 females) completed self-report measures of life stress, depression, hopelessness, adaptive reasons for living, faulty cognitions, and loneliness family cohesiveness, and suicidal ideation and behavior. The results of a multiple-regression analysis, forward-inclusion algorithm, indicated that the reasons which best accounted for suicidal behaviour scores were irrational beliefs, loneliness and low adaptive reasons for living best accounted for suicidal behavior scores.

Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994) conducted a research where a survey assessing expectations about their college adjustment was completed by the undergraduates, and later a second survey assessing actual adjustment was completed. The inspection of academic transcripts six years later showed which students had dropped out and whether they had been in good academic standing or poor academic standing. Results indicated that two different sets of items best discriminated among good-standing students, the persisters (n=113) and the leavers (n=29) and among poor standing students, persisters (n=36) and leavers (n=30). Generally, emotional and social adjustment items predicted attrition as well or better than academic adjustment items.

Jacobson & Crockett (2000) conducted a research to examine whether high levels of parental monitoring were associated with, lower levels of adolescent depression, higher adolescent grade point average and lower level of adolescent sexual activity and minor delinquency, and whether these relations were moderated by gender, grade level, or mothers work status. The study was done on 7<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade students from a single rural school district in central Pennsylvania. The results indicated that parental monitoring had strong associations with all indicators of adjustment for both girls and boys, with exception of boy's depression. Gender and grade level simultaneously moderated the relation between parental monitoring and adolescent delinquency, as parental monitoring increased across grade level for boys, and decreased with grade level for girls. Furthermore, maternal employment moderated the relation between monitoring and adolescent delinquency and sexual behaviour. For both boys and girls, monitoring was a significant predictor of problem behaviours among adolescents whose mothers worked full time. The relation between monitoring and adjustment was also significant among girls when their mothers were not working and among boys when mothers worked at least part time.

Hofer (2008) conducted a study which focused on the significance of contact patterns for attachment and student adjustment as recent reports have emphasized a link between electronic communications technologies, helicopter

parenting and autonomy issues. The first-semester 190 students at Midwest public liberal art university completed an online survey examining parent contact, attachment, shyness, and college adjustment. Results indicated students with frequent contact scored significantly higher on mother attachment but did not differ from the rest of the sample on father attachment, shyness, or adjustment. Mother and father attachment were positively associated with adjustment. Within the subsample of students with frequent parent contact ( $n = 59$ ), students with poor adjustment were significantly more likely to report exhibiting greater shyness, having poorer father attachment, and being from divorced families compared to students with positive adjustment. Findings confirmed that, while technology facilitates frequent contact, this contact may reflect secure attachment as well as problems with developmental tasks.

Garlow, Rosenberg, Moore, Haas, Koestner, Hendin and Nemeroff (2008) conducted a research to examine suicidal ideation and depression in undergraduate college students. The study consisted of 729 students samples participated over a 3-school-year interval (2002–2005). The result suggested that 11.1% of the students endorsed current (past 4 weeks) suicidal ideation and 16.5% had a lifetime suicide attempt or self-injurious episode. Students with current suicidal ideation had significantly higher depression symptom severity than those without suicidal ideation and 28.5% of the students reported suicidal ideation compared to 5.7% of those with lower scores. These results suggest that there is a strong relationship between severity of depressive symptoms and suicidal ideation in college students, and that suicidal feelings and actions are relatively common in this group.

Shoup, Gonyea, and Kuh (2009) conducted a research to assess the frequency and quality of students' interactions with their parents while in college, and the impact of highly involved parents on student engagement and educational outcomes. This study uses data from the 2007 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement, and consists of 4,532 first-year students and 4,652 seniors from 24 selected institutions. The results implied that students with highly involved parents reported significantly greater gains in personal competence, personal and social development and students also excelled in many areas, including higher levels of engagement, deep learning activities, reported educational gains, and satisfaction among others.

*Wolf, Harper (2009) conducted a research to investigate parental engagement in college students' academic lives, the mode and frequency of student-parent communications, and how all of this varies across different student populations (by race/ethnicity, social class, parental immigrant status, gender, and year in school). Drawing from the 2006 University Of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), results revealed parental contact and engagement in college students' academics is greatest among women, freshmen, and wealthy/upper middle-class students. Comparisons by race, ethnicity, and parental immigration status revealed above-average levels of parental contact among Mexican American, Latino/Other Spanish, Japanese/Japanese American, American Indian/Alaska Native students, and students of foreign-born parents, but below-average ratings of parental engagement in these same students' academic lives.*

LeMoyné & Buchanan (2011) conducted research on the attitude about parents and a number of well-being and mental health related issues. The study was done in a university of USA, and consisted 317 samples. Helicopter parenting scale (HPS) was used which were analyzed using the technique of principle component factor analysis with varimax orthogonal rotation. The results suggest that helicopter parenting is negatively related to psychological well-being and positively related to prescription medication use for anxiety- depression and recreational consumption of pain pills.

Segrin, Givertz, Swaitkowski, Montgomery (2013) conducted a research to investigate that over parenting should be associated with greater child problems in relation to other people and a more critical family environment. The hypotheses were tested on 477 emerging adult child- parent dyads from 30 of the 50 United States. The results indicated that child, but not parents, over parenting latent variable was strongly associated with reports of more child problems. Both the emerging adult child and over parenting latent variables were positively and significantly associated with critical family environment latent variable.

Schiffirin, Liss, McLean, Geary, Erchull, Tashner (2013) conducted a research to examine self-determination theory as the potential underlying mechanism explaining this relationship. The study consist of 297 college students who completed measures of helicopter parenting, autonomy supportive parenting, depression, anxiety, satisfaction with life, and basic psychological needs satisfaction. The results indicated that students who reported having over-controlling parents reported significantly higher levels of depression and less satisfaction with life. Furthermore, the

negative effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being were largely explained by the perceived violation of students' basic psychological needs for autonomy and competence.

Gabriel Sims Faculty Mentor: Dr. Bredehoft (2013) did a research to examine the pathways from overindulgence to helicopter parenting, psychological entitlement and spiritual involvement. The sample consisted of 579 participants (74% female, 26% male; ages 16-59; mean age 23.23) from thirty-four states and the countries of Canada, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, India, Japan, Malaysia, South Korea, United Kingdom. The results indicated that Childhood overindulgence (CO) was statistically significant to each area tested. CO leads to helicopter parenting, a sense of psychological entitlement, and a reduction in spiritual involvement and beliefs (SIB). Not only does CO affect SIB but a sense of psychological entitlement does also. They both have a negative effect.

Odenweller, Butterfield, & Weber (2014) conducted a research to examine the relationship between helicopter parenting and Millennial's personal and interpersonal problems. The study was done in Mid-Atlantic University, and consisted 268 samples which had 147 women and 121 men. Helicopter parenting scale (HPS), Helicopter parenting instrument (HPI), parental authority questionnaire, revised family communication pattern questionnaire, NEO inventory, interpersonal dependency scale and coping efficacy scale were used. The result suggests a positive relation between helicopter parenting and conformity orientation, moderate positive relation between helicopter parenting and Millennial's neuroticism, a strong positive relation between millennial's interpersonal dependency and neuroticism, moderate positive relation between helicopter parenting and interpersonal dependency, moderate negative relationship between helicopter parenting and coping efficacy.

Jill, Julie (2014) conducted a research to examine antecedents and consequences of parental involvement and over-parenting as it relates to college students college experiences and workplace expectations. An online survey was conducted on 482 undergraduate college students. The result indicated that over-parenting was more common when college students lived at home and had fewer siblings and also over-parenting was associated with lower student self-efficacy as well as maladaptive responses to workplace scenarios.

AhKwon, Yoo, Bingham (2015) conducted a research to revisit and validate the current conceptualization of helicopter parenting with Korean college students by using helicopter parenting scale. They also examined associations between college students retrospective self-report of their parent's helicopter parenting and their own psychological adjustment. The study was done from 13 universities in Korea, and consisted of 412 students. Helicopter parenting scale was used. The results indicate perceived helicopter parenting was negatively associated with college student's internal locus of control and the association of helicopter parenting to emotional well-being was indirect through its link to student's locus of control.

Hong, Hwang, Kuo and Hsu (2015) conducted a research to see what effect helicopter parenting has on students learning behaviours, such as self-regulated learning and procrastination. The study was done on high school students in Taiwan and 624 questionnaires were delivered. The results indicated that parental monitoring behaviour positively predicts helicopter parenting and procrastination mediated by perceived helicopter parenting. The results implied that to develop students self-regulated learning, the level of helicopter parenting should be reduced.

Nelson, Walker, Nielson (2015) conducted a research to examine the moderating role of parental warmth in the relation between helicopter parenting and indices of child adjustment and maladjustment in emerging childhood. The study was done from four universities of USA, and consists 438 undergraduate students' samples. The study suggests that increased helicopter parenting was associated with lower levels of maternal warmth from their parents, but not for those with high levels of warmth.

Ingen, Freiheit, Steinfeldt, Moore, Wimer, Knutt, Scapinello and Roberts (2015) conducted a research to examine how helicopter parenting is related to self-efficacy and peer relationships. The study consists of 190 undergraduate students samples of age 16 to 28 years. The results indicate that helicopter parenting was associated with low self-efficacy, alienation from peers, and lack of trust among peers.

## Objectives

1. To study the relationship of hovering with parental control and parental responsiveness among undergraduate Residential and Non Residential students.

2. To study the relationship of hovering with college adjustment (academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation) among Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students.
3. To study the relationship of parental control and parental responsiveness with the college adjustment problems (academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation) among Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students.
4. To study the difference between Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students for hovering.
5. To study the difference between Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students for parental control and parental responsiveness.
6. To study the difference between Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students for the college adjustment problems (academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation).

## Hypothesis

1. There shall be significant relationship of hovering with parental control and parental responsiveness among Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students.
2. There shall be significant relationship of hovering with college adjustment (academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation) among Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students.
3. There shall be significant relationship of parental control and parental responsiveness with the college adjustment problems (academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation) among Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students.
4. There shall be significant difference between Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students for hovering.
5. There shall be significant difference between Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students for parental control and parental responsiveness.
6. There shall be significant difference between Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students for the college adjustment problems (academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation).

## Method

### Sample:-

The sample consisted of undergraduate students of Amity University, Gurgaon. The sampling frame was composed of the total targeted students (N = 160). From this study purposive random sampling was done and for this frame 145 students completed the questionnaires which consists 66 residential students and 79 non residential students, resulting in a response rate of 90.62%. Non-response was entirely a result of those who had single parent.

### Procedure

A set of three questionnaires was distributed among students. The questionnaire consisted of Helicopter parenting scale, College adjustment scale and Scale of parenting style. After the collection of the questionnaires back from the Residential and Non Residential students the scoring was done and the results were calculated.

## Measures

### Helicopter parenting scale

The scale was designed by LeMoyne and Buchanan's (2011). A 10 item scale was constructed for the helicopter parenting scale (HPS) for the study of helicopter parenting (e.g., "My parent supervised my every move growing up," "My parent often stepped in to solve life problems for me") and its effect on well-being, which was also used in the current study. The helicopter parenting scale items were analyzed using the technique of principle components factor analysis with varimax orthogonal rotation. The first rotated factor extracted consisted of seven items which had loadings of .45 or greater. There were three items which resulted in a second factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 (1.8). These items had factors greater than .60 on the second factor, and had loadings .25 or lower on the first factor extracted. Coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) was used to estimate reliability. The Cronbach's reliability alpha for the helicopter parenting scale (HPS) in this sample was .71. Nunnally (1978) recommends that scales used in basic research have reliability of about .70. The response set for helicopter parenting items is as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. For the computation of the scale score, each respondent's item scores are summed and divided by the number of items constituting the scale. This computation returns scale scores to the same metric as each item. Higher scores represent higher levels of helicopter parenting perceived by respondents.

### Scale of parenting style

The scale was designed by Gafoor&Kurukkan (2014). The items in the scale were prepared on the basis of description given by Baumrind, Maccoby and Martin for parental responsiveness and parental control. Items measure the responsiveness and control of parents as perceived by their adolescent wards. All the items were prepared as matching for the involvement of both parents. The scale consists of forty in total items in which twenty show responsiveness item and twenty control items. The subject need to respond on five point scale as, “always true”, “almost true”, “sometimes true, sometimes false”, “almost false”, and “always false”. Half of the items in scale are responsiveness item and half of them are control item. The results will give six separate score of mother’s responsiveness, father’s responsiveness, mother’s control, father’s control, parental responsiveness and parental control. The validity coefficient is 0.80 for responsiveness and 0.76 for control subscale. The test-retest coefficient of reliability of responsiveness variable in the scale is 0.81 and for control it is 0.83.

### College adjustment scale

The scale was designed by Anton, Reed (1991). The college adjustment scale (CAS) inventory for use by professionals who provided counselling services to college students. The CAS was developed to provide a rapid method of screening college counselling clients for common developmental and psychological problems (mayson1989). Based on analysis of presenting problems in college counsellingcentres, the CAS scale provide measures of psychological stress, relationship conflicts, low self-esteem and academic and career difficulties. The item booklet contains 108 questions in total. The pupil required to respond on the four point scale as “F-false”, “S-sometimes true”, “M-mainly true” and “V-very true”. The nine CAS subscales are anxiety (AN), depression (DP), suicidal ideation (SI), Substance abuse (SA), self esteem problem (SE), interpersonal problem (IP), family problem (FP), academic problem (AP) and career problem (CP). The total internal consistency reliability coefficient of the CAS scale is between .80 to .92 with a mean of 86. The scales validity or utility is high. As in the study only four subscales were used which are academic problem (AP), career problem (CP), suicidal ideation (SI) and Substance abuse (SA). The total internal consistency reliability coefficient of academic problem (AP) is .87, career problem (CP) is .92, suicidal ideation (SI) is .86 and Substance abuse (SA) is .83.

## Results And Discussion

For a detailed description the dimensions of all the variables have been discussed. Academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation are the dimensions of college adjustment scale, whereas dimensions of parenting style scales are mother’s responsiveness, father’s responsiveness, mother’s control, father’s control, parental responsiveness and parental control.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Helicopter parenting	145	31.8966	4.65583
Mother responsiveness	145	72.7379	125.682
Mother control	145	74.9793	131.964
Father responsiveness	145	69.7172	133.113
Father control	145	71.8897	132.870
Parental control	145	142.43	142.43
Parental responsiveness	145	146.92	146.92
Academic problem	145	21.7103	6.09635
Career problem	145	21.0690	7.05500
Suicidal ideation	145	18.1517	5.36104

	HP	MOR	MOC	FAR	FAC	PR	PC	AP	CP	SI
HP	1	.221**	0.017	.187*	0.054	.217**	-0.054	0.057	0.061	0.087
MOR	.221**	1	.727**	.769**	.635**	.936**	.680**	0.018	0.133	0.124
MOC	0.017	.727**	1	.632**	.722**	.720**	.926**	0.021	-0.09	0.119
FAR	.187*	.769**	.632**	1	.774**	.944**	.631**	0.017	0.123	-.182*
FAC	0.054	.635**	.722**	.774**	1	.747**	.820**	0.008	0.105	0.153
PR	.217**	.936**	.720**	.944**	.747**	1	.693**	0.001	0.134	0.162
PC	0.054	.680**	.926**	.631**	.820**	.693**	1	0.009	0.038	0.068
AP	0.057	0.018	0.021	0.017	0.008	0.001	0.009	1	.631**	.509**
CP	0.061	0.133	-0.09	-0.123	0.105	-0.134	-0.038	.631**	1	.603**
SI	0.087	0.124	0.119	-.182*	0.153	-0.162	-0.068	.509**	.603**	1

**Table 2 – Intercorrelation Table**

From the Pearson product moment correlation, for the helicopter parenting there is a moderate correlation ( $r = .22$ ,  $p < .01$ ) with mother responsiveness, moderate correlation ( $r = .19$ ,  $p < .05$ ) with father responsiveness and a moderate correlation ( $r = .23$ ,  $p < .05$ ) with parental responsiveness. This correlation implies that the increase in father responsiveness, mother responsiveness and parental responsiveness leads to helicopter parenting. According to the (Gafoor, Kurukkan, 2014) highly responsive parents with low parental control is categorized as indulgent parent. In the correlation for the helicopter parenting there is no significant relationship with mother control ( $r = 0.017$ ,  $p > .05$ ), father control ( $r = 0.054$ ,  $p > .05$ ) and parental control ( $r = -0.054$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This proves that parents who are high in responsiveness are indulgent in their child's lives which make them known as helicopter parents. Thus hypothesis 1 is partially proved as there is a significant relationship of hovering with parental responsiveness and the relationship of hovering with parental control is not significant.

In the correlation for the helicopter parenting there is no significant relationship with academic problem ( $r = 0.057$ ,  $p > .05$ ), career problem ( $r = 0.061$ ,  $p > .05$ ) and suicidal ideation ( $r = 0.087$ ,  $p > .05$ ) among undergraduate residential and non-residential students. This may be as helicopter parents are always helping their child doing their work so they may face less academic issues. As it has been proved in the hypothesis 1 that hovering is more in non residential students so if the students are living with their parents they have more information about their career life and parents provide guidance from time to time this may be the reason for no significance of hovering in career problem among undergraduates. The reason for no significance in suicidal ideation may be that as parents are always in contact with their child so they may share talks with them which may cause no or less suicidal thoughts. Thus hypothesis 2 is not proved as there is no significant relationship of hovering with college adjustment among (academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation) undergraduate students.

In the correlation of parental control there is no significant relation with academic problem ( $r = 0.057$ ,  $p > .05$ ), career problem ( $r = 0.061$ ,  $p > .05$ ) and suicidal ideation ( $r = 0.087$ ,  $p > .05$ ) and of parental responsiveness there is no significant relationship with academic problem ( $r = 0.001$ ,  $p > .05$ ), career problem ( $r = 0.134$ ,  $p > .05$ ) and suicidal ideation ( $r = 0.162$ ,  $p > .05$ ) but there is a negative moderate correlation of father responsiveness ( $r = -.18$ ,  $p < .01$ ) with suicidal ideation. The correlation implies that if father responsiveness is more than suicidal ideation of the child decreases with it. Responsiveness is the warmth, love a parent provide to children. If father involvement is low the child may feel alone and feel he has no worth that may lead to low life satisfaction. A study done by Flouri and Buchanan (2002) indicated that low involvement of father in child's life has created low life satisfaction in them. This can be harmful in child's well being. Sign of depression can also be seen if the involvement of parent is less which can lead to suicide in youngsters. This has been proved in a research done by Kandel, Raveis, Davies (1991) indicated that in adolescent low parental involvement leads to depression, which in turn leads to suicidal ideation. Depressive symptoms are the strongest predictors of suicidal ideation in youth.

Thus hypothesis 3 has been partially proved as there is no significant relationship of parental control and parental responsiveness with the college adjustment problems among (academic problem, career problem and suicidal ideation) undergraduate students but a negative moderate correlation of father responsiveness is found with suicidal ideation is found.

**COMPARISON OF MEANS**

	HDS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
HP	Residential	66	30.3182	4.25046	3.912	.000
	Nonresidential	79	33.2152	4.59283		
PR	Residential	66	141.05	26.91950	.625	.533
	Nonresidential	79	143.59	22.21833		
PC	Residential	66	150.15	25.36154	1.444	.151
	Nonresidential	79	144.22	24.03986		
AP	Residential	66	22.0455	5.98828	.604	.547
	Nonresidential	79	21.4304	6.20935		
CP	Residential	66	22.3636	8.15737	2.042	.043
	Nonresidential	79	19.9873	5.81663		
SI	Residential	66	19.1667	5.96034	2.108	.037
	Nonresidential	79	17.3038	4.67496		

**Table 3 – Comparison of Means**

t value for residential and non-residential students comes out to be 3.912 which is significant at .01 level which means there is a significant difference for hovering between residential and non residential students. Mean of hostellers is 30.31 and day scholar is 33.21 which mean that day-scholars have got higher hovering score. This proves the hypothesis 4 which states that there is a significant difference of hovering in residential and non residential students. This has also been proved in the study of Jill, Julie (2014) where the research indicated that over-parenting was more common when college students lived at home. This may be because parents who live with their children have more opportunities to get involved in their child's life. Sometimes this may also happen that parents who try to over parent may ask their children to stay at home instead of going to hostel. The family differentiation theory (e.g. Gavazzi et al., 1993), says that college students living with their parents are more likely to have family interaction patterns that emphasize family intimacy to the detriment of students' independence.

t value for parental responsiveness is 0.62 and for parental control is 1.44 which is not significant which means there is no significance difference between the residential and non-residential in parental control and parental responsiveness. Thus hypothesis 5 cannot be accepted.

t value for academic problem comes out to be .60 which is not significant which means there is no significance difference between the residential and non-residential in academic problem. This may be because all students face the academic issues as after coming from the school the work seems really difficult due to which people may experience low grades. Many get indulged in substance abuse which may have a negative impact on academic performance which has been indicated in the study as substance use is negatively related to academic achievements (Schulenberg, Malley, Bachman, and Johnston, 2003). Time management may be poor as now there are no restrictions like in school time. As most students enter the college time in their adolescence so there may be concentration problem in studies.

t value of career problems comes out to be 2.04 which is significant at .04 level which means there is a significant difference between residential and non-residential. Mean of hostler is 22.36 and day scholar is 19.98 which classifies that career problem is more in hostlers. This may be as students are not staying with their parents so communication level has decreased as compared to the students living with their parents who constantly guide their child as are staying together. As the environment changes so students may change their career goals and major plans, which will create issues in their route of achieving them, and this may also surprise the parents to. The stay-in students may face problems like having less information about career option, they may even be confused about the career choice of their interest.

t value of suicidal ideation comes out to be 2.10 which is significant at .03 level which means there is a significant difference between residential and non-residential. Mean of hostler is 19.16 and day scholar is 17.30 which classifies that suicidal ideation is more in hostellers. As the parents are always around there child at home so child's sadness depression is visible to parents and they can help their child coming out of things in a healthy manner, but the students who stay away from their home are ideally alone so things may keep on accumulating inside them which may lead to depression even and may lead to suicide. This has been also proved in the study which says students

with current suicidal ideation had significantly higher depression symptom severity than those without suicidal ideation. (Garlow, Rosenberg, Moore, Haas, Koestner, Hendin, Nemeroff, 2008). Another reason can also be the conflict that occurs between parent and the child this has been proved in the study which says Conflict in parent-child relationships and a number of other family-level constructs are associated with suicide ideation (Reinherz et al. 1995). Hence hypothesis 6 is partially proved as there is no significant difference between residential and non residential students for the academic problem and a significant difference is seen between residential and non residential students for the career problem and suicidal ideation which is seen more in residential students.

## Conclusion

The above study concludes that hovering is more on Non Residential students than on Residential students. A significant relationship is also seen of hovering with parental responsiveness, but the relationship of hovering with college adjustment like problem in career choice, academic issues and suicidal ideation was not significant which means as such hovering has no or less effect on these problems. There was no significant difference found in Residential and Non Residential undergraduate students for parental control and parental responsiveness but a negative moderate correlation of father responsiveness is found with suicidal ideation which means as the father responsiveness increases the tendency of suicidal ideation in a child decreases.

## References:-

1. Abar, B., Carter, K. L., & Winsler, A. (2009). The effects of maternal parenting style and religious commitment on self-regulation, academic achievement, and risk behavior among African-American parochial college students. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32(2), 259-273.
2. Babor, T. F., McRee, B. G., Kassebaum, P. A., Grimaldi, P. L., Ahmed, K., & Bray, J. (2007). Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) toward a public health approach to the management of substance abuse. *Substance abuse*, 28(3), 7-30.
3. Bonner, R. L., & Rich, A. R. (1987). Toward a predictive model of suicidal ideation and behavior: Some preliminary data in college students. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 17(1), 50-63.
4. C. Bradley-Geist, J., & B. Olson-Buchanan, J. (2014). Helicopter parents: An examination of the correlates of over-parenting of college students. *Education+ Training*, 56(4), 314-328.
5. Dreiling, E. A. (2015). *The interrelationships among perceived parenting styles, psychological entitlement, and subjective well-being* (Doctoral dissertation, UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO).
6. Garlow, S. J., Rosenberg, J., Moore, J. D., Haas, A. P., Koestner, B., Hendin, H., & Nemeroff, C. B. (2008). Depression, desperation, and suicidal ideation in college students: results from the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention College Screening Project at Emory University. *Depression and anxiety*, 25(6), 482-488.
7. Gerdes, H., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students: A longitudinal study of retention. *Journal of Counseling and Development: JCD*, 72(3), 281.
8. Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1995). Self-efficacy and career choice and development. In *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment* (pp. 249-280). Springer US.
9. Helicopter Parenting: The Effect of an Overbearing Caregiving Style on Peer Attachment and Self-Efficacy. *Journal of College Counseling*, 18(1), 7-20.
10. Hong, J. C., Hwang, M. Y., Kuo, Y. C., & Hsu, W. Y. (2015). Parental monitoring and helicopter parenting relevant to vocational student's procrastination and self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 42, 139-146.
11. Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2007). Helicopter parents in the workplace. *Syndicated Research Project, nGenera* van Ingen, D. J., Freiheit, S. R., Steinfeldt, J. A., Moore, L. L., Wimer, D. J., Knutt, A. D., ... & Roberts, A. (2015).
12. Hurtado, S., Carter, D. F., & Spuler, A. (1996). Latino student transition to college: Assessing difficulties and factors in successful college adjustment. *Research in higher education*, 37(2), 135-157.
13. Jacobson, K. C., & Crockett, L. J. (2000). Parental monitoring and adolescent adjustment: An ecological perspective. *Journal of research on adolescence*, 10(1), 65-97.
14. Juyal, R., Bansal, R., Kishore, S., Negi, K. S., Chandra, R., & Semwal, J. (2006). Substance use among intercollege students in district Dehradun. *Indian J Community Med*, 31(4), 252.
15. Kwon, K. A., Yoo, G., & Bingham, G. E. (2016). Helicopter Parenting in Emerging Adulthood: Support or Barrier for Korean College Students' Psychological Adjustment?. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(1), 136-145.

16. LeMoyne, T., & Buchanan, T. (2011). Does "hovering" matter? Helicopter parenting and its effect on well-being. *Sociological Spectrum*, 31(4), 399-418.
17. Lowe, K., Dotterer, A. M., & Francisco, J. (2015). "If I Pay, I Have a Say!" Parental Payment of College Education and its Association With Helicopter Parenting. *Emerging Adulthood*, 3(4), 286-290.
18. Mohler-Kuo, M., Lee, J. E., & Wechsler, H. (2003). Trends in marijuana and other illicit drug use among college students: results from 4 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study surveys: 1993–2001. *Journal of American College Health*, 52(1), 17-24.
19. Nelson, L. J., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Nielson, M. G. (2015). Is Hovering Smothering or Loving? An Examination of Parental Warmth as a Moderator of Relations Between Helicopter Parenting and Emerging Adults' Indices of Adjustment. *Emerging Adulthood*, 2167696815576458.
20. Odenweller, K. G., Booth-Butterfield, M., & Weber, K. (2014). Investigating helicopter parenting, family environments, and relational outcomes for millennials. *Communication Studies*, 65(4), 407-425.
21. Sarigiani, P., Trumbell, J., & Camarena, P. (2013). Electronic communications technologies and the transition to college: Links to parent-child attachment and adjustment. *Journal of The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 25(1), 35-60.
22. Schiffrin, Holly H., et al. "Helping or hovering? The effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 23.3 (2014): 548-557.
23. Segrin, C., Givertz, M., Swaitkowski, P., & Montgomery, N. (2015). Overparenting is associated with child problems and a critical family environment. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(2), 470-479.
24. Segrin, C., Wosidlo, A., Givertz, M., Bauer, A., & Taylor Murphy, M. (2012). The association between overparenting, parent-child communication, and entitlement and adaptive traits in adult children. *Family Relations*, 61(2), 237-252.
25. Shoup, R., Gonyea, R. M., & Kuh, G. D. (2009, June). Helicopter parents: Examining the impact of highly involved parents on student engagement and educational outcomes. In *49th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Atlanta, Georgia*. Retrieved from <http://cpr.iub.edu/uploads/AIR> (Vol. 202009).
26. Strage, A., & Brandt, T. S. (1999). Authoritative parenting and college students' academic adjustment and success. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 91(1), 146.
27. van Ingen, D. J., Freiheit, S. R., Steinfeldt, J. A., Moore, L. L., Wimer, D. J., Knutt, A. D., ... & Roberts, A. (2015). Helicopter Parenting: The Effect of an Overbearing Caregiving Style on Peer Attachment and Self-Efficacy. *Journal of College Counseling*, 18(1), 7-20.
28. Wolf, D. S. S., Sax, L., & Harper, C. E. (2009). Parental engagement and contact in the academic lives of college students. *Naspa Journal*, 46(2), 325-358.
29. Yoo, T. J., & Kim, S. S. (2015). Impact of Perceived Parenting Styles on Depression and Smartphone Addiction in College Students. *Journal of Korean Academy of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 24(2), 127-135.