

# ***Influence of the Type of Family Relations on the Process of First-Graders' Adaptation to School***

S.A. Velikova

Vladimir state university  
Vladimir, Russia  
aya.velikova68@yandex.ru

I.A. Erolov

Vladimir state university  
Vladimir, Russia  
erolov@vlsu.ru

M.A. Gorshkova

State University of Humanities and Technology  
Moscow, Russia  
marucja.78@mail.ru

M.A. Kecherukova

Industrial University of Tyumen  
Tyumen, Russia  
kecherukovama@tyuiu.ru

**Abstract**—The article is devoted to the issue of parent-child relationships and adaptation of a first-grader. Gender peculiarities of relationships in families were explained and the influence of types of family relations on main adaptation indicators was proved by correlation analysis. The methodological basis of the study was the works of L. Vygotsky, A. Prokhorov, A. Wegner, G. Tsukerman, T. Volikova, I. Grebennikova, T. Gavrilova, I. Dubrovina, O. Urbansky, L. Friedman and others.

**Key words**—adaptation; gender; first-grader; family relations; socialization

## I. INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization (WHO) states that the number of neurological disorders and somatic pathologies among children increases every year [28]. Thus the problem of first-graders adaptation comes to the fore. The difficulties that come along with the processes of adaptation to school life could be overcome only if sociological, medical and psychological aspects of school education are taken into account. School life includes mental, emotional, and physiological components; it sets new, sometimes difficult for a first-grader, challenges for personality in general, as well as for its psycho-physiological, intellectual, social and psychological aspects in particular. Family is the main parenting institution where child spends a significant part of his life. Family is the place of the first life experience, the vital school. Interpersonal relations between parents and children determine features of both nature and personality of a child: his disobedience, aggressiveness, refusal to perform tasks, desire or unwillingness to study, which later determine the level of adaptation of the first-grade pupil [1]. The theoretical aspects of family upbringing were studied by Yu. Azarov, N. Amosov, M. Voskresenskaya, K. Bardin, L. Belova, I. Budnitskaya, P. Lesgaft, O. Urbansky and others. The impact of the family does not decrease with time, it rather changes qualitatively [2]. A. Wegner, G. Tsukerman, M. Bezrukikh, S. Efimova, I. Dubrovina, T. Volikova, T. Gavrilova, I. Grebennikov, V. Malysheva considered various aspects of these changes.

The purpose of the research is to identify the types of family relationships that influence the process of first-graders'

adaptation to school. For this purpose the following methods were applied: observation, determination of the individual style of parent's attitude to pupil (V.S. Ivashkin, V.V. Onufriev), socio-psychological adaptation to school (E.M. Aleksandrovskaya), methods of mathematical statistics (Student's t criterion) and correlation analysis. The sample consisted of 30 people – 10 of them were first-graders of school №40 of Vladimir, 10 mothers, 10 fathers.

There are many definitions of adaptation (I.P. Pavlova, I.M. Sechenov, P.K. Anokhin, T. Selye). M.I. Enikeev suggests that adaptation is the adjustment of individual to the conditions of the new environment [3]. During the process of adaptation all body systems work optimally (A.G. Maklakov). Adaptation can also be defined as individual's acceptance of new social roles. [4] The analysis of many definitions allows us to divide these definitions in two groups:

- I. "... the property of any living self-regulating system, ensuring its resistance to environmental conditions (which implies the existence of a certain level of development of adaptive abilities)";
- II. "... dynamic education, as a direct process of adaptation to environmental conditions" [7].

Of all the adaptation types, (social, physiological, biological, etc.), we chose psychological adaptation. There are several reasons for that. Firstly, school adaptation is interpreted as a symbiosis of criteria characterizing the conformity of the child's socio-psychological and psycho-physiological characteristics with the learning and educational environment of the primary school. Secondly, the concept of "psychological adaptation" partially overlaps with the concept of "social adaptation". Following E.M. Aleksandrovskoy, E.V. Novikova, N.G. Luskanova we define psychological adaptation as the adjustment of a person with his own needs, motives and interests to his existence in society [6].

Studying at school presupposes the ability to socialize among people, therefore for a first-grader having communication skills, the ability to collectively interact and take into account other people's opinions is of vital importance. Most children quickly make new friends, get used to the new

classroom environment, work together, but, nevertheless, the element of competitiveness prevails while they interact. However, not every child manages to get on well with his classmates in the classroom and during the break [7]. Sometimes, first graders feel uncomfortable among classmates. Waiting for lessons, huddle against the wall. During breaks they sit in their place and do not go out to play in the hall. Another part of first-graders, like to attract attention, trying to dominate among peers. They can humiliate other first-graders, giving then even greater discomfort. At the same time, positive, joyful emotions when communicating with peers is a guarantee of successful adaptation, future trust and good reputation among children. First-graders emotionally respond to the assessment of their success. They perceive the mark (grade) as an assessment not only of their activities, but of their personality as a whole. The question of adults: "What did you get today?" – emphasizes the importance of the final result of studies. Parents forget that marks are subjective, and sometimes they are accessing only one aspect of school process in general. For example – diligence or behavior.

That is an obvious fact that obedient children are equally "liked" both by parents and school teachers. More than half a century ago, educational psychologist J. Korchak wrote: "school, neglecting the interests of the child himself, day by day, by all means eliminates the student's will and freedom, ignoring the idea that he can be disorganized internally and vitally infantile" [8].

The period of adaptation is accompanied, as a rule, by negative changes in behavior of a first-grader: excessive agitation, aggressiveness or fear, unwillingness to go to class, school. At the beginning of the first academic year, the value of studying for getting new knowledge for achieving something new is not sufficiently developed. "This value is the psychological basis of all the educational activities" [10]. The need, desire to learn arises from the assimilation of theoretical information in the process of joint work with the teacher, by doing simple learning task. In other words, when transferring "from the zone of proximal development to the actual zone" [9].

It can be assumed that the criteria for psychological adaptation of a first-grader are law-abiding behavior, the establishment of a dialogue with other pupils, learning with passion.

## II. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Family relationships either contribute to or hinder the adaptation of the younger pupil to school and educational process. The fact is that any family, deliberately or not, has its own goals, objectives, methods of education. Mothers and fathers know what can and cannot be applied to their child as far as his upbringing is concerned.

Scientists claim that there are 4 types of family relationships [8]. The "autocratic" (dictatorial) type is a systematic humiliation by some family members. There are no conversations with children, only orders and violence. The schoolboy feels defective and worthless, unnecessary to anyone. All his independence and initiative is reset. Children adapt to such relationships: lie, being rude, etc. All this leads to serious violations in school. Children do not want to study, even

in the first grade. Such family relationships are relationships with no communication.

The second type of family relations "overprotection" is the antipode to "autocratic" type. In the center of the family is a child. The main goal of parental behavior is to make sure that he child feels good; we adults will do everything for this. Such relationships block the volitional development of the pupil. As a result of such upbringing style the child is not independent, not decisive, passive, has difficulties in dealing with classmates. The school perceived as a source of great anxiety and stress, a threat to the usual way of life and relationships with parents.

The third type of family relationship, "noninterference", suggests that the worlds of adults and children are parallel worlds, only occasionally intersecting. Parents do not know how their offspring lives and do not interfere in his life. In the educational process such pupils are rather passive and disinterested. The child is glad that nothing is prohibited, nobody forces him to do anything and he has freedom to do what he wants. He doesn't need, does not seek to get a higher assessment, etc. why should he try his best at school if his parents just couldn't care less. The child is completely neglected.

The fourth type of family relationship is "cooperation". This type establishes common goals for both adults and children in adapting to school. In this type of relationship, the family is social unit, part of the society. Family members take into account the interests of everyone, including the child; stimulate the initiative and independence of the young generation. They pay attention to the peers that surround their child, his social circle. They live in harmony, combining reasonable love, care and demands. Children with this type of relationship tend to easily adapt to school. They have many friends and good performance in the classroom.

Thus, the success of adaptation of a first-grader depends on the type of family relationships. Thus, 1, 2, 3 types obviously have a negative effect; reduce the level of adaptation, namely, motivation, self-esteem, volitional qualities. Only the fourth type of family relations "cooperation" with a democratic style of communication of family members contributes to a good adaptation to the educational process and to the school in general.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the diagnosis of psychological adaptation by the method of E.M. Aleksandrovskaya demonstrate the level of educational activity of first-graders. The average score on the scale "educational activity" is  $3.4 \pm 0.47$  points. This means that, on the whole, the sample of students is active in the classes at the middle level on the activity scale. However, 40% show high learning activity, which was observed by the number of raising hands and the desire to answer the questions, by the number of questions asked to the teacher when new material was presented. The average score is 4 points. 30% demonstrate a low level of learning activity, which is manifested in violation of the norms of behavior in the classroom. For example, pupils can get up and walk around the class while the teacher explains the assignment, bring toys to the classroom that they are trying to play during the lesson. And 30% the normal level of learning

activity. Depending on the situation, they can be attributed to either the first or the second group. Based on these criteria, we divided the sample group into 3 subgroups: with high, low and medium levels of learning activity.

The next indicator is the acquisition of knowledge by the first-graders. The average score on the "acquisition of knowledge" scale is  $3.4 \pm 0.40$  points. 40% show high rate of learning, which is manifested in the correctness and accuracy of homework, independent work in the classroom, the number of stars (highest grade for the first year pupils) in their notebooks. 30% demonstrate low rate. Their notebooks are full of triangles (lowest grade). 30% have an indicator of acquisition of knowledge in norm. In notebooks, they have about an equal number of stars and piglets (average grade). They can be attributed both to the first and the second group. The average score on the "behavior in class" scale is  $3.7 \pm 0.51$  points. This means that, in general, pupils' behavior is close to normal. However, 50% have a high rate on this scale, which is manifested in a greater number of raised hands, in discipline, the ability to quickly navigate in their school supplies. 30% demonstrate bad manners, which is manifested in inactivity during lesson, outcry, distractibility, inattention, inability to focus on the task. 20% are «normal», i.e. respond only when asked by the teacher. The scale indicator "break-time behavior" is equal to  $3.7 \pm 0.53$  points. 50%, demonstrate high rate on this scale, communicate with their classmates, peers and play in class with everyone. 30% have a low indicator of behavior during break time, which is manifested in the inability to communicate with peers, frequency of peer pushing, running around the corridors and in class. As a rule the return back to class tired. There are fights with peers, verbal and indirect aggressiveness towards other first-graders. 20% demonstrate the average level of behavior during the break. On a scale of "relationship with classmates", the average score is  $4.4 \pm 0.26$  points. 60% have high rate; it means that first graders communicate efficiently with each other: they are friends; they play together during break without showing rivalry or conflict. 20% low rate, this is manifested in the fact that first graders do not communicate with each other, try to keep apart from others, 20% have an average level on this scale, depending on their mood they may behave like extroverts or introverts. On a scale of "emotional state", the average score is  $3.8 \pm 0.29$  points. 70% have high rate. These children feel confident in the class, are not afraid to answer teacher's questions. 10% have low rate. These children are very shy; do not want to go to school. 20% show the average level.

Gender analysis showed that girls differ from boys significantly in terms of "educational activity", "acquisition of knowledge", "relationship with classmates", "break-time behavior" scales. Student's t test is from 2.1 to 2.4 at  $p < 0.05$ . In other words, compared to boys, girls are more active in their studies, better acquire knowledge, are more social and calmer during break-time. "Behavior in class" and "emotional state" differ significantly; Student's t test is from 1.3 to 1.9 with  $p > 0.05$ .

Thus, the results of our study reflect the dynamics of adaptation of first-graders. According to the works of A.L. Wenger [14] psychological adaptation of children to school can be done in different ways. As a rule, the majority of children

(56%) adapt to school during the first two months of schooling. These children eagerly meet their classmates; they are dominated by high spirits. They acquire calmness, goodwill, good faith and the desire to meet all the requirements of the teacher. Sometimes there are conflicts with peers: I want to run for a break or talk to a friend without waiting for a call. But by the end of October such manifestations, as a rule, are leveled.

The second group of children (30%) has a longer period of adaptation. They play in class or communicate with classmates, do not pay much attention to the teacher, do not respond to his comments, are vulnerable, can sometimes cry. They have hard time learning the curriculum. Only by the end of the first half of the year the reactions of these children become adequate to the requirements of school.

The third group (14%) – children, whose psychological adaptation is associated with significant difficulties, in addition, they do not master the curriculum; they have negative forms of behavior, a sharp manifestation of negative emotions. It is these children that teachers and parents most often complain about. "They disturb classroom work", "distract children". The younger pupils get the idea that studying can become a boring and tedious necessity. Adults scare, putting pressure on children's emotional responsiveness: they will be kicked out of school; will have to repeat a year, study with mentally retarded children (as if predicting that they will become losers). Fear appears and it paralyzes the will of the child, turning his self-confidence into nothing. The anxiety disrupts the activity and leads to failure. Due to the negative evaluations a first-grader has low self-esteem, contributing to the consolidation of failures. A prolonged state of anxiety adversely affects the work of the nervous system. As a result, with time a state of nervous exhaustion develops, fatigue increases, performance decreases, attention is disturbed and memory is weakened. Getting into a situation of exaggerated demands, pupil can feel depressed, abandon any efforts, abandon all school affairs, hide from the injustice of adults in a friendly company and really get bad grades. The mechanism starts to work towards an increase in anxiety, low self-esteem and, consequently, to real adaptation disorders.

In this article, the style of family education is postulated as a multidimensional concept consisting of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components. The basic definition is the one suggested by A.Ya. Vargi, describing the parental attitude as a holistic continuum of diverse feelings towards the child, behavioral stereotypes used in communication [11]. The style of parental relations, in its turn, has a direct impact on the formation of a child's behavior and lifestyle in future. According to E. Fromm, it is the emotional side of the parental relationship that determines the mental development of the child. The emotional attitude of the parent towards the child is identified as a phenomenon of parental love [E. Fromm]. At the same time, it is important to note that in modern psychology, mother's and father's attitude towards the child is clearly distinguished, acting as maternal and paternal love [Z. Freud, A. Adler, D. Winnicott, M. Donaldson, IS Kon, GG Filipova] [10, 22]. Parental love is today viewed by society as the «norm» of a person's mental health. Love for the child, emotionality, intimacy and mutual understanding is not the innate ability of the mother and father and does not arise at the instant as if by



magic with the birth of a child. The ability to love a child is formed during parenting, in the process of joint activities and communication with the child, bringing mother and father feelings of happiness, self-realization and self-fulfillment [12]. In the works of E. Galinski according to the criterion of cooperation between the parent and the child, six stages of parental relationship are distinguished [23]. At the stage of primary school age, parents change the style of communication. Relations with the younger pupil become either partner or rival.

Mother, being a source of feelings, creates an attitude of trust and stimulates the independent activity of the younger pupil, his self-development. In other words, contributes to the process of personalization – the formation of the “I”, the differentiation of the person and the environment and the formation of an autonomous, independent personality [25]. Mother's patience to the manifestations of nihilism, rudeness, forms of aggressiveness, care for the child, satisfaction of his needs, determine the harmonious development of the child.

In modern families, father increasingly acts as a mother's partner in raising children, taking on an increasing share of concern for them [26]. The first and foremost quality of a good father is to be a fine example of a “man” [27]. It is in communication with the father that the boy learns to be a man, acquires typical male character traits, and it is not difficult for him to do this — it is enough just to imitate an adult [28]. The girl gets an image of her future husband, observing many subtle nuances in the behavior of the parent. Father's participation in the upbringing of a younger schoolchild contributes to the successful emotional development of the child. It should be also noted that responsibility of father for the financial support of children contributes indirectly to their harmonious development. Therefore, even in the case when the father lives separately and his contacts are limited with the child, the father's role in raising the child cannot be overstated.

The family can act as both a positive and a negative factor in the process of education. Each family, sometimes not being aware of that, develops a certain system of upbringing. A.L. Wenger identifies 4 types of family relationships: “autocratic”, “overprotecting”, “non-interference” and “cooperation” [13]. Dictatorship in the family is manifested in the systematic influence by family member on the initiative and self-esteem of other members. This type of family implies an order, violence, hard authoritarianism [14]. Parents, of course, can and should have some demands concerning their child, based on the goals of upbringing, moral norms, specific situations in which it is necessary to make pedagogically and morally justified decisions. However, those who prefer order and violence to all types of influence inevitably face the resistance of a child who responds to pressure with hypocrisy, deception, outbursts of rudeness, and sometimes outright hatred. But even if the resistance is broken, many valuable personality traits are broken along with it: self-reliance, self-esteem, initiative and self-confidence. Children from such a family are dissatisfied with themselves. Child feels and deeply worries about the fact that he does not meet the requirements of his parents. Some of these children choose conflict, but more often adapt to this style of family relationships, and become less self-confident, less independent. The situation is complicated if high demands and control are combined with an emotionally cold, rejecting

attitude towards the child. Here the complete loss of contact is inevitable [15]. Children from such families rarely treat people with confidence, have difficulty in communication, often are cruel themselves, although they have a strong need for love. Reckless authoritarianism, ignoring the interests and opinions of the child is a guarantee of serious failures in school.

Overprotection is a system of relations in which parents, ensuring their labor satisfies all the needs of the child, protect him from any worries, efforts and difficulties. A child is often praised for achievements, even the most insignificant, given gifts, (the child gets used to material reward), is very rarely punished, the system of requirements is too soft [17]. The question of the active formation of the personality fades into the background. The prior issue of the upbringing is meeting the needs of the child and protecting him from difficulties. The beginning of school life is associated with the expansion and deepening of the independence of the child. Parents, in fact, block the process of serious preparation of their children for difficulties beyond the threshold of their home. The younger pupil will wait for such care in the classroom, and its absence will cause anxiety and confusion [16]. It is highly possible that the school reality can be perceived as threatening or even hostile. It is these children who are the most unprepared to life in a team. They lack autonomy, initiative. At the same time, these children have an excessive self-esteem. Excessive care for the child, excessive control over his entire life, based on close emotional contact – hyper-care – leads to passivity, lack of independence, difficulties in communicating with classmates.

The system of interpersonal relations in the family, based on the recognition of the possibility and even the expediency of the independent existence of adults from children, can be generated by the tactic of “nonintervention” [18]. In this case, it is assumed that two worlds can coexist: adults and children, and neither should move beyond the line. Most often, this type of relationship is based on the passivity of parents as educators. The child enjoys great freedom, but this freedom, in fact, is lack of control, a consequence of the indifference of parents to children, and indeed to each other. The children of such a family have lowered self-esteem (not necessarily very low), reluctance to learn, calm attitude to their failures, no desire to achieve more.

Cooperation as a type of relationship involves the mediation of interpersonal relationships in the family by common goals and objectives of the joint activity, its organization and high moral values [19]. It is in such families that the child's egoistic individualism is overcome. The family acquires a special quality, becomes a group of high level of development – a team. The leading style of upbringing in this type of family is the style of “agreement”, “democracy”, when the interests of the child are taken into account. Democratic parents value independence of their children, discipline; give them a lot of time; predict good performance in school. They themselves give them the right to be independent in some areas of their life; but at the same time require the performance of duties. The control based on warm feelings, reasonable love, care, usually does not annoy the child too much, he listens to the explanations of adults: why some things shouldn't be done, but other things are worth doing [20]. Attention to the child's personality (his interests, tastes, relationships with friends) is combined with reasonable

demands. These children have high, but not excessive self-esteem, as a rule, good results at school.

Thus, we see that the type of family relationships significantly influences the success of the adaptation of the younger pupil. A child can be expected to adapt to school life without any significant problems when the family is based on respect between the spouses, on respect for the child; when a reasonable love for their child is combined with reasonable demands; when a child is given attention, when family relations are based on democratic style of upbringing.

The results of the diagnosis of the research of individual style of parent's attitude to children based on the method of V. Ivashkina and V. Onufriyeva is demonstrated by the scale "overprotecting", the average score on which in the sample is  $2.4 \pm 0.26$  points, which corresponds to the average level. This means that parents take care of their child satisfying all of his vital needs. 50% show an indicator above the norm, the average score is in the range of 3-5 points. Such parents try to protect the child from solving his problems on his own: household duties, home tasks, relationships with teachers and peers. 20% show an indicator below the norm. The average score is 1 point. Such parents teach their child to be independent. 30% demonstrate the normal rate. The average score is 2 points. On a scale of «control», the average score is equal to  $2.7 \pm 0.26$  points. This corresponds to the average level, which means reasonable, moderate control of a child concerning major issues. 35% show an indicator above the norm. The average score is 3-5 points. This result is manifested in the desire to be aware of each step of the child, his actions, relationships with teachers and peers. 10% show the result below the norm. The average score is 1 point. These parents do not control their children. 45% show a normal rate. On a "care" scale, the average score is  $3.4 \pm 0.32$  points. This means that, in general, the sample manifests itself at an average level. Parents take care of their children. 40% show high rate on this scale. The average score is 4-5 points. This is manifested in the constant attention to the needs, moods, emotional state and health of the child. 10% show low rate. The average score is 1 point. Such parents argue that the pupil is already grown-up enough to solve his own problems and be responsible for his actions. 50% show an average level. On the "anxiety" scale, the average score is  $3.1 \pm 0.22$  points. This means that parents worry for their child within reasonable limits. 60% show high rate on this scale. The average score is 3-4 points. This means constant anxiety, fear that something terrible can happen to a child: he gets sick, gets into an accident, can be attacked by bullies, etc. 10% show a low level of anxiety. Such parents let their children go for a walk without supervision, do not accompany them to and do not meet them from school, believing that nothing bad will happen to their children. 70% show a normal rate. On a scale of «indulgence», the average score is  $3 \pm 0.29$  points. 65% show high rate on this scale. The average score is 3 points. This is manifested in the condescending attitude to the pranks, misconduct and other actions of the child, unacceptable in society. 10% show a low level. The average score is 1 point. These parents are strict, punish their children quite often. 25% show normal rate. On a "permissiveness" scale, the average score is  $1.6 \pm 0.34$  points. This means that in general, the sample shows itself at a low level. 25% show an indicator above the

norm. The average score is 3-5 points. These parents show lack of control, connivance, failure to take action in case of a clear violation of the rules and norms of behavior by the child. 75% have low level on this scale. These parents punish their child for any misdeeds. On an «ignorance» scale the average score is  $1.5 \pm 0.19$  points. This means that the sample manifests itself at a low level. Parents do little to help their children. 20% demonstrate an indicator above the norm. The average score is 1-2 points. This is manifested in deliberate refusal to interfere in the affairs of the child, unwillingness to delve into his problems and joys. 40% show low rate. These parents solve all the problems of the child, are happy for all his achievements. 40% show normal rate. On a "negligence" scale, the average score is  $1.5 \pm 0.18$  points. This score corresponds to the low level. This is manifested in the fact that parents pay little attention to the child. 35% show an indicator above the norm. The average score is 1 point. 65% show a normal rate. These parents are always happy to help their children. On a scale of "punishment" the average score is  $1.9 \pm 0.24$  points. This means that the sample manifests itself at a low level; this suggests that parents try not to punish their children, but to talk with them. 40% show an indicator above the norm. 60% show an indicator in norm.

Thus, according to the scales of "overprotection", "control", "care", "anxiety", "indulgence", "blaming", the study sample demonstrates an average level, which is manifested in reasonable care, control, moderate anxiety, as well as indulging and blaming their children. On the "permissiveness", "ignorance", "negligence", "punishment", "pressure" scales, the average score indicators are within the low level, the numerical indicator is within 1.3 points to 1.9 points, thus do not exceed 2 points. This means that the sample as a whole does not show permissiveness, punishment, pressure concerning their children. Parents try not to punish their children: they try to be aware of their problems, to understand and help out in difficult situations. Gender analysis showed that mothers and fathers have significant differences in the scales of "anxiety", "indulgence", "ignorance", "negligence", "pressure", therefore, we can say that the numerical indicators of mothers on the "anxiety", "indulgence" and "pressure" scale is higher. For the rest of the indicators numerical indicators of fathers are higher. This demonstrates that mothers tend to worry more about their children. According to the indicators "overprotection", "control", "care", "permissiveness", "indifference", "punishment", "accusation", the difference between mothers and fathers is insignificant. Fathers compared to mothers show more control, try to punish and blame the child if he is wrong. In general, in the sample, mothers and fathers treat their children equally. However, the average scores do not give a general idea of the sample. There is a percentage from 20% to 65% with numeric indicators above average, from 15% to 80% with indicators in the norm and from 10% to 75% below the norm. The major part of the study sample – above the norm. According to the percentage distribution, mothers and fathers differ insignificantly from each other, with  $p > 0.05$ .

Correlation analysis shows that the "overprotection" parameter closely correlates with emotional well-being,  $r = 0,37$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . This means that parents are worried about their child, the child understands this, and this is good for his

emotional state. On a “control” scale, the correlation coefficient is from 0.43 to 0.66 and has a feedback with the behavior in the lesson  $r = -0.59$   $p < 0.01$ , attitude to the teacher  $r = -0.45$   $p < 0.01$ , curiosity  $r = -0.55$ . The “care” parameter correlates with an indicator of behavior during the break  $r = 0.51$   $p < 0.01$ , emotional state  $r = 0.59$   $p < 0.01$ . The next indicator is “anxiety”. It correlates with the indicator of emotional state  $r = 0.67$   $p < 0.01$ . In terms of “indulgence”, the correlation coefficient is from 0.36 to 0.68. This indicator interacts with the parameter break-time behavior  $r = 0.44$   $p < 0.01$ , the relationship with classmates  $r = 0.41$   $p < 0.05$ . As far as “permissiveness” parameter is concerned, the correlation coefficient is from 0.34 to 0.51. This indicator interacts with the attitude to teacher scale  $r = 0.34$   $p < 0.05$ , with socially adaptive behavior  $r = 0.36$   $p < 0.05$ . Next, the parameter «detachment» correlation coefficient is  $-0.37$  to  $0.70$ . It has a feedback connection with indicators acquisition of knowledge  $r = -0.43$   $p < 0.05$ , break-time behavior  $r = -0.85$   $p < 0.01$ , relationship with classmates  $r = -0.91$   $p < 0.01$ , emotional state  $r = -0.51$   $p < 0.01$ . This indicates that detachment, ignorance, deliberate refusal to interfere in the affairs and relations of the child, unwillingness to delve into his problems and joys directly affect his educational activity and emotional state. The “indifference” parameter indicates that the fact that parents avoid their duties will definitely effect the child’s emotional state  $r = -0.65$   $p < 0.01$ . By the “negligence” parameter, the correlation coefficient is from 0.37 to 0.68. It correlates with learning activity  $r = 0.37$   $p < 0.05$  and has a feedback connection with emotional state  $r = -0.68$   $p < 0.01$ . The next indicator “punishment” appeal to moral, material and physical retribution in case of any mistakes and misdemeanors of the child, directly affects his behavior during the break,  $r = -0.63$   $p < 0.01$ , and relationship with classmates,  $r = -0.67$   $p < 0.01$ . As for the “pressure” parameter, the correlation coefficient is from 0.34 to 0.82. It has the inverse correlation with the indicator relationship with classmates,  $r = -0.34$   $p < 0.05$ , curiosity  $r = -0.49$   $p < 0.01$ , leadership,  $r = -0.36$   $p < 0.05$ . The parameter “overprotection” correlates with the indicator acquisition of knowledge  $r = 0.52$   $p < 0.01$ , behavior during the break  $r = 0.41$   $p < 0.05$ , relationships with classmates  $r = 0.37$   $p < 0.05$ , sociability  $r = -0.51$   $p < 0.01$ , socially adaptive behavior  $r = -0.43$   $p < 0.05$ . The “control” parameter has an inverse correlation with the learning activity index  $r = -0.40$   $p < 0.05$ , emotional state  $r = -0.41$   $p < 0.05$ . Excessive care and attention to the needs, moods among the fathers, badly affects the child’s learning activity  $r = -0.77$   $p < 0.01$ , acquisition of knowledge  $r = -0.38$   $p < 0.05$ , behavior during the lesson  $r = -0.56$   $p < 0.01$ , attitude to the teacher  $r = -0.52$   $p < 0.01$ , and  $r = -0.45$   $p < 0.05$  for curiosity. The demonstrative refusal to participate in the affairs and relationships of the child, the “negligence” scale, has correlation coefficient from 0.41 to 0.73, and demonstrates direct connection with the indicator of learning activity  $r = 0.63$   $p < 0.01$ , acquisition of knowledge  $r = 0.74$   $p < 0.01$ , behavior during the lesson  $r = 0.55$   $p < 0.01$ , relationship with classmates  $r = 0.46$   $p < 0.01$ , attitude to the teacher  $r = 0.73$   $p < 0.01$ .

Thus, the analysis of the correlation coefficient confirms that parenting style influences the process of the child’s adaption to school.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

1. Theoretical analysis of the problem of psychological adaptation of the younger pupil and the factors influencing it showed that adaptation is considered as a property of any living self-regulating system, ensuring its resistance to environmental conditions (which implies a certain level of development of adaptive abilities).
2. Among the factors of adaptation, the main are family relationships. The type of family relationships is a concept that includes an integral system of feelings, behavior, stereotypes and various cognitive processes of the child. Depending on the criteria, there are various classifications of these factors. The criteria are attitude to the world, to oneself, direction, aspirations, approaches used in solving life problems, etc.
3. The type of family relationships significantly affects the success of the adaptation process. A child can be expected to adapt well to school when the family is based on respect between the spouses, on respect for the child; when a reasonable love for the child is combined with sufficient exactingness; when a child, his interests and needs are given attention. When there is consent between the parents and the child.
4. Adaptation is a complex concept. All indicators of the first grader’s adaptation are in close cooperation, which confirms the correlation coefficient, ranging from 0.40 to 0.95 with  $p < 0.01$ . Adaptation parameters “learning activity”, “acquisition of knowledge”, “classroom behavior”, “attitude towards the teacher”, “break-time behavior”, “emotional state” of the younger pupil demonstrate the average level, with the average score equal to 3-4 points on a five-point scale. An individual analysis of adaptation for each child showed that 40% have high level of adaptation. This group has high scores on the criterion of adaptation, ranging from 4 points to 5 points. Pupils with an average level of adaptation 30% have an indicator of adaptation within the normal range. However, as a result, their personal characteristics may have a low adaptation rate. And 30% of students experience difficulties in adapting to school, which is a violation from a normal process of adaptation. Gender analysis showed that girls have higher rates on all scales. Significant differences are observed on the scale of “learning activity”, “acquisition of knowledge”, “break-time behavior”, “relationships with peers”. Girls are more organized, more responsible, and more diligent than boys. The results are confirmed by Student’s t test and range from 2.1 to 2.4, with  $p < 0.01$ .
5. Parent included in the study sample proved to be benevolent, caring. This is also confirmed by the results of the method of V.S. Ivashkin and V.V. Onufriev demonstrating the relationship of an adult to a child. According to the scales “overprotection”, “control”, “care”, “anxiety”, “indulgence”, “accusation” this sample of parents have the average score 3-4 points, which corresponds to the average level and is manifested in reasonable control, care, moderate



anxiety, as well as indulgence and blaming of their children. On the scales of “permissiveness”, “detachment”, “indifference”, “negligence”, “punishment”, “pressure”, the average scores are within the low level, the numerical indicator is within 1.3 points to 1.9 points. This means that the sample as a whole does not show permissiveness, punishment, and pressure, they try not to punish the child: y try to be aware of his problems, to understand and help out in difficult situations.

6. Mothers and fathers have significant differences in relation to their children, which manifest itself on the scales of “anxiety”, “indulgence”, “detachment”, “negligence” and “pressure”. Numbers on mothers on the scales “anxiety”, “indulgence”, and “pressure” prevail. On the other indicators, the prevalence of fathers is observed, which confirms Student’s t criterion between 0.5 and 2.5. This fact indicates that mothers are worried about their children; as a rule they punish them less than fathers do. According to the indicators “overprotection”, “control”, “care”, “permissiveness”, “indifference”, “punishment” and “accusation”, the difference between mothers and fathers is insignificant.
7. The influence of the type of family relationships on the adaptation of the first-grader to school showed that guarding and protecting the child contributes to his adaptation. This is demonstrated by the “overprotection” scale, which closely correlates with emotional state  $r = 0.37$   $p < 0.05$ , the “care” scale correlates with the indicator break-time behavior  $r = 0.51$   $p < 0.01$ , emotional state  $r = 0.59$   $p < 0.01$ ; the “anxiety” scale correlates with the indicator emotional state  $r = 0.67$   $p < 0.01$ ; the “permissiveness” scale correlation coefficient is from 0.34 to 0.51. This indicator interacts with the scale attitude towards the teacher  $r = 0.34$   $p < 0.05$ , socially adaptive behavior  $r = 0.36$   $p < 0.05$ , the scale of “detachment” correlation coefficient is 0, 37 to 0.70. It has a feedback connection with indicators learning knowledge  $r = -0.43$   $p < 0.05$ , break-time behavior  $r = -0.85$   $p < 0.01$ , relationship with peers  $r = -0.91$   $p < 0.01$ , attitude to the teacher  $r = -0.42$   $p < 0.05$ , emotional state  $r = -0.51$   $p < 0.01$ .

In conclusion, on the basis of the foregoing, we can state that the type of family relationships has significant effect on the process of child’s adaptation to school during his first year of schooling.

## References

- [1] Yu.P. Azarov, “Pedagogy of love and freedom”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <https://itexts.net/avtor-yuriy-petrovich-azarov/138543-semeynaya-pedagogika-yuriy-azarov/read-1.html>
- [2] A. Arkin, “Parents about education”, Moscow: Sphere, 2009, p. 251.
- [3] K.V. Bardin, “How to teach children to learn”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <https://azbyka.ru/deti/podgotovka-rebenka-k-shkole-psihologicheskie-aspekty-bardin-k-v>
- [4] K.V. Bardin, “Ensure successful learning of the child”, Moscow: Enlightenment, 2007, p 207.
- [5] A.S. Belkin, “Prevent child’s misconduct”, Moscow: Education, 2008, p 197.
- [6] A.A. Bodalev, “Personality and communication”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <https://nsportal.ru/vuz/psikhologicheskie-nauki/library/2014/03/30/aabodalev-lichnost-i-obshchenie>
- [7] I.I. Budnitskaya, A.A. Kataeva, “The child goes to school”, Saint-Petersburg: KARO, Delta, 2005, p 384.
- [8] A.L. Wenger, “Features of the mental development of children 6-7 years of age”, D.B. Elkonina, ed., [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <http://psychlib.ru/mgppu/opr/opr-001-.htm#p1>
- [9] N.F. Vinogradov, “Discussing the problem of monitoring and evaluating in primary school”, Primary School, No.8, pp.93-98, 1999.
- [10] T.V. Volikova, “The teacher and the family: a manual for teachers”, Moscow: Unity, 2006, p 325.
- [11] M.A. Resurrection, “Patient love”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: [https://cat.libnvkz.ru/CGI/irbis64r\\_14/cgiirbi](https://cat.libnvkz.ru/CGI/irbis64r_14/cgiirbi)
- [12] M. Zemska, “Family and personality”, Moscow: Progress, 2009, p 133.
- [13] M.D. Levitov, “Psychological states”, Moscow: Education, 2004, p 344.
- [14] P.F. Lesgaft, “Family education and its value”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <https://psychojournal.ru/books/1936-lesgaft-p-f-semeynoe-vospitanie-rebenka-i-ego-znachenie.html>
- [15] A.I. Lipkina, “Self-esteem of the pupil”, <http://ru.b-ok.org/book/2992280/8cfd3c>
- [16] M.I. Lisina, “Problems of communication ontogeny”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <http://psychlib.ru/mgppu/LOI-1997/LOI-0172.htm#p17>
- [17] A.I. Lunkov, “How to help your child in school and at home”, Moscow: Axis-89, 2006, p 35.
- [18] M.F. Lyatetskaya, “How to help children to study well”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <http://zolushka-new.com/psihologicheskij-dom/kak-pomoch-rebjonku-horoshu-uchitsja-v-shkole.html>
- [19] I. Medvedev, “To kill the dragon. How to overcome childhood phobias”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <http://gopsy.ru/strahi-i-fobii/detskie-strahi.html>
- [20] G.M. Minkovsky, K.E. Igoshev, “Family, children, school”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <https://www.ozon.ru/context/detail/id/4834265/>
- [21] The world of childhood: The younger student, Ed. Khripkova A.G. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <http://lib26.ru/index.php?id=65370>
- [22] Wisdom of education: a book for parents, Comp. B.M. Bim-Bad, E.D. Dneprov, TB Cornets. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: [http://ephyr.ru/mudrost\\_vospitania](http://ephyr.ru/mudrost_vospitania)
- [23] B.I. Naumov, “Encouragement and punishment in the family”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: <http://mirznani.com/a/180753-14/osobennosti-primeneniya-metodov-pooshchreniya-i-nakazaniya-v-rabote-s-trudnovospituemymi-detmi-14>
- [24] L.A. Nikitina, “I am learning to be a mother”. Moscow: Scooter, 2016, p. 368.
- [25] A.M. Parishioners, “Diagnosis of emotional-axiological self-attitudes of children 5-9 years old”. [Electron resource]. Retrieve from: [http://www.vuzlib.ru/books/7603-Diagnosis\\_of\\_social\\_development\\_of\\_the\\_child/11-Diagnosis\\_of\\_emotional-value-relationship\\_to\\_selling](http://www.vuzlib.ru/books/7603-Diagnosis_of_social_development_of_the_child/11-Diagnosis_of_emotional-value-relationship_to_selling)
- [26] “The workbook of the school psychologist”, Ed. I.V. Dubrovina, Moscow: Yurayt, 2018, p 376.
- [27] E.I. Horns, “Handbook of practical psychologist”, Moscow: Yurayt, 2014, p. 480.