

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY FUNCTION AND ADOLESCENT AUTONOMY IN THE RURAL AND URBAN AREA

Mulyati^{1*}, Kenty Martiastuti²

^{1,2} Family Welfare Education, Faculty of Engineering, State University of Jakarta
Rawamangun Muka, East Jakarta

*Corresponding author: imoel.muyati@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the function of families in urban and rural areas as well as its relationship with adolescent autonomy by using cross sectional study method. The data collection time was conducted in September 2016. By proportional random sampling method, there were 72 samples at SMPN 2 Bogor (representing urban area) and 72 people at SMPN 2 Parung (representing rural area). Research data includes family characteristics, family functions divided into 3 dimensions (10 sub-scales) and adolescent autonomy consisting of 3 dimensions (value, emotional and behavioral). To see the correlation, the Pearson Correlation test was used and to see differences in family function characteristics and gender-based autonomy was seen by the Independent T-test differential test. The results showed that the average score of family function in urban areas was 118.44, while in rural areas 121.12. This shows the function of families in rural areas better than in urban areas. The average score of urban adolescent autonomy is 81.21, while in rural areas it is 77.29. This difference is significant at 99% confidence level. Adolescent autonomy is positively correlated with family function of personal growth dimension with correlation coefficient of 0.207 (at 95% confidence level). This shows that the better family function then the better the adolescent autonomy..

Keywords: *adolescent, autonomy, family function, rural, urban*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis fungsi keluarga di perkotaan dan perdesaan serta hubungannya dengan kemandirian remaja dengan menggunakan metode *cross sectional study*. Waktu pengambilan data akan dilakukan pada bulan September 2016. Dengan metode *proportional random sampling*, diperoleh sampel sebanyak 72 orang di SMPN 2 Bogor (mewakili wilayah perkotaan) dan 72 orang di SMPN 2 Parung (mewakili wilayah perdesaan). Data penelitian meliputi data karakteristik keluarga, fungsi keluarga dibagi dalam 3 dimensi (10 sub skala) dan kemandirian remaja yang terdiri dari 3 dimensi (nilai, emosional dan perilaku). Untuk melihat korelasi digunakan uji *Pearson Correlation* dan untuk melihat perbedaan karakteristik fungsi keluarga dan kemandirian remaja berdasarkan jenis kelamin dilihat dengan uji beda *Independent T-test*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa skor rata-rata keberfungsian keluarga di wilayah perkotaan adalah 118.44, sedangkan di wilayah perdesaan 121.12. Hal ini menunjukkan keberfungsian keluarga di perdesaan lebih baik daripada di perkotaan. Skor rata-rata kemandirian remaja di perkotaan adalah 81.208, sedangkan di perdesaan adalah 77.29. Perbedaan ini signifikan pada taraf kepercayaan 99%. Kemandirian remaja berkorelasi positif cukup kuat dengan keberfungsian keluarga dimensi pertumbuhan personal (*personal growth*) dengan koefisien korelasi sebesar 0.207 (pada taraf kepercayaan 95%). Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa semakin baik keberfungsian keluarga maka akan semakin baik pula kemandirian remaja.

Kata Kunci: fungsi keluarga, kemandirian, remaja, perkotaan, perdesaan

Introduction

Adolescents are a group of individuals who are in the "vulnerable" phase. They are no longer a manageable kid but not a self-regulating adult. So that, a serious handling is necessary to prepare them to become self-sufficient human beings. According to Monks (1987), adolescence is often also referred to as a transitional period where at this time adolescents experience a turbulent time in search of identity. In search of identity this adolescent tends to let go from family ties and joins a wider scope, so that they will thicken new values, norms, ordinances and customs. Introducing with new things can cause shock and eventually adolescents will experience an identity crisis (Gunarsa S D & Gunarsa, 2003). Identity crises can cause adolescent problems, more commonly known as juvenile delinquency.

The development of autonomy in adolescents is one of the equally important and interesting issues to be studied seriously with issues of identity development. The importance of a serious review of the issue of adolescent development is based on the consideration that for adolescents the attainment of independence is the basis for becoming a perfect adult. Independence can underpin adults in determining attitudes, making decisions appropriately, and sharpness in determining and performing principles of truth and goodness (Budiman). Adolescent autonomy is not a single personality dimension that is consistently evident in every behavior (Hill & Holmbeck, 1986 in Santrock, 2003).

According to Steinberg (1993) autonomy is a state in which an individual has the ability to determine his or her desires, to overcome the social pressure, to think and act in a certain way and not be influenced by the views of others. The attainment of independence is very important for teenagers, as it is a sign of their readiness to enter the next phase with more diverse demands as adults. Failure to achieve independence can have a negative impact on adolescents. Dependence on others causes a teenager to always hesitate in making decisions alone, not confident, easily influenced by others until finally having difficulty to find identity. In an effort to achieve adolescent independence requires support from the people around them, especially from the family environment as the nearest environment (Rahmawati, 2005).

The family as the first and foremost environment known to the child, has a decisive role for the child in accomplishing its developmental tasks. According to Hoffman (2004) said that the treatment of parents in parenting will determine the behavior of children whether he will be a pro social or anti social person. Parents as family leaders have a responsibility to educate and help prepare the child to maturity and to be a good member of society (Soelaeman, 1994 in Ruhidawati, 2005). According Hurlock (1999) one of the factors that affect self-reliance is parental care. Democratic parenting, where parents have a role as mentors who always pay attention to the needs of their children as well as support every activity of his son, very vital role in shaping independence.

By action and by example, parents shape the lives of their children from birth through adulthood. In adolescence, the influence of friends and peers take on

greater importance, but research clearly demonstrates the continued significance of parents in shaping the behaviors and choices of teens as they face the challenges of growing up. (Borkowsky *et al*, 2002) Close parent/adolescent relationships, good parenting skills, shared family activities and positive parent role modeling all have well-documented effects on adolescent health and development (Hair *et al*, 2005). These are also areas where parents can make choices to make positive changes for their children, and where social policy can help support parents in taking such steps (Resnick, *et al*, 2004)

Methods

The research design is cross sectional study. Selection of research location conducted by Purposive Sampling that is SMPN 2 Bogor and SMPN 2 Parung. The data collection time was conducted in September 2016. By proportional random sampling method, there were 72 samples at SMPN 2 Bogor (representing urban area) and 72 people at SMPN Parung (representing rural area). The types of data collected are: (1) family characteristics (age of parent, family size, parent income, parental education, parent work, (2) sample characteristics (age, gender, religion and family order); 3) characteristics of family function (4) adolescent autonomy (emotional, behavior, values).

Family function is defined as the interaction between parent and child as well as other family members measured through the perception of the child in the family using "Family Environment Scale" from Moos and Moos (2002) divided into 3 main dimensions and 10 sub components. Family function is measured using modifications from the Family Environment Scale (FES) instrument from Moos and Moos (2002) consisting of 40 question items with 3 dimensions and 10 sub dimensions. The dimension consists of Relationship, Personal Growth and System Maintenance. Adolescent autonomy is measured using 27 items of questions consisting of 3 types of autonomy (Steinberg, 1993), namely emotional autonomy (10 items of questions), behavior autonomy (10 items of questions) and autonomy values (7 items of questions).

Findings

Family and Sample Characteristics

Samples representing urban areas amounted to 72 people consisting of 33 men and 39 women, while samples representing rural areas amounted to 72 people consisting of 37 men and 35 women. Father's education in urban areas is mostly high school graduates of 43.06 percent. A total of 6.94 percent of junior high school graduated, 34.72 percent are undergraduated graduates, 9.72 percent of master program, and 5.56 doctoral program graduated. Similar to fathers education, maternal education in urban areas is dominated by high school graduates of 54.17 percent, the rest are undergraduated and only 8.33 percent are junior high school.

Parent education in rural areas is also dominated by high school graduates, which is 44.44 percent of fathers and 38.89 percent of mothers. The difference is

that parents' education in urban areas does not have primary school graduates, but in rural areas, around 12.5 percent of primary school graduated and 19.45 percent are primary school graduated.

Family Function

Family function is defined as the interaction between parent and child as well as other family members measured through the perception of the child in the family. Family function divided into 3 main dimensions and 10 sub dimensions. The dimension consists of Relationship Dimension (cohesion, expression and conflict), Personal Growth Dimension (independence, achievement, intellectual, active recreation and moral religion) and System Maintenance Dimension (control and organization).

A. Relationship Dimension

Relationship dimension which is an evaluation of the family environment in terms of relationship (relationship) consisting of 3 sub-components, namely: (i) Cohesion (cohesion) which means obligation, support and support among family members; (ii) Expressiveness (expression) associated with the actions of family members to express their feelings directly; (iii) Conflict relates to the degree to which family members express openly their feelings of displeasure, anger and disagreement.

Table 1. Average scores of relationship dimension and different test results based on regional typology

Statement	Average		Sign
	Urban N= 72	Rural N = 72	
1. Cohession			
Family members always help and support each other	3.36	3.49	.245
We often spend time at home	2.94	2.63	.005
We devote a lot of energy to out work at home	2.96	3.07	.342
There is a feeling of togetherness in our family	3.49	3.57	.369
2, Expression			
Family members always keep their feelings	3.17	3.36	.067
We will say whatever we want at home	2.81	2.71	.484
Sometimes our complaints can offend someone in the family	2.25	2.74	.000
We talked to each other about the problems we faced	2.93	2.85	.540
3. Conflict			
We often fight in families	3.06	3.01	.769
Family members rarely get angry	2.79	2.75	.735
Sometimes we throw something when we're angry	3.04	3.39	.011
Family members often shout	2.83	3.14	.022
Relationship	35.63	36.70	.121

The mean score of urban relationship dimensions (35.63) was lower than the mean score in rural areas (36.70), but this difference was not statistically significant. The highest average score in both urban and rural areas is seen in the feeling of togetherness in the family that is 3.49 (in urban) and 3.57 (in rural).

B. Personal Growth Dimension

Personal Growth dimension is an evaluation of the family function that consisting of five sub components, namely (i) Independence means the degree to which a family member has the desire, hope and ability to make one's own decisions; (ii) Achievement Orientation relates to activities in the family that lead to achievement or compete; (iii) Intellectual-Cultural Orientation relates to the many activities undertaken in political, social, cultural and intellectual activities; (iv) Active-Recreation Orientation relates to the level of participation in recreational activities; (v) Moral-Religion Orientation relates to values, morals and religion in the family.

Table 2. Average scores of personal growth dimension and different test results based on regional typology

Statements	Average		Sign
	Urban N= 72	Rural N = 72	
1. Independence			
We rarely do things that should be our duty in the family	2.94	2.88	.592
In our family, we are very supportive to be independent	3.35	3.47	.267
We think more often of personal affairs than family affairs	3.08	3.00	.510
We come and go as we want to	3.25	3.29	.715
2. Achievement Orientation			
For us, it is important to always do our best in whatever work we do	3.40	3.53	.214
Progress in various fields is important in our family	3.22	3.17	.584
Each family member has the same right to make decisions	2.92	3.10	.146
We are happy to compete and win	2.76	2.68	.541
3. Intellectual-Cultural Orientation			
We often talk about political and social issues	2.69	2.72	.834
We rarely participate in additional activities (extracs) or to a course (exercise) or to a bookstore	2.90	2.71	.125
We love learning something new and different	2.93	3.07	.290
We are not interested in art activities	2.92	3.10	.140
4. Active-recreation Orientation			
We spent the weekend and time at night at home	2.67	2.78	.339
Friends often take turns coming to the house	2.44	2.69	.049
No one in my family is active in sports and organizations	3.00	2.79	.110
We often go to the movies, sports, camping	2.69	2.26	.005
5. Moral-religion Orientation			
Family members often go to places of worship	3.10	3.59	.000
We rarely pray or worship	3.38	3.76	.001
We believe there is something we must believe in this life	3.28	3.42	.186
Family members believe that if we sin then we will be punished	3.29	3.60	.004
Personal Growth	60.22	61.60	.167

The mean score of urban personal growth dimensions (60,22) was lower than the mean score in rural areas (61.60), but this difference was not statistically

significant. The highest average score in urban is seen in the important to always do the best (3.40) and the highest average score in rural area is rarely pray or worship (3.76).

C. System Maintenance Dimension

System Maintenance dimension relates to the family's maintenance system of values which consists of (i) Organization is the level of planning and arrangement of obligations in the family and (ii) Control is how many rules and procedures are used in family life.

Table 3. Average scores of system maintenance dimension and different test results based on regional typology

Statements	Average		Sign
	Urban n= 72	Rural n = 72	
A. CONTROL			
Family members almost never command each other	2.44	1.82	.000
Very few rules exist in our family	2.82	2.85	.815
There are certain rules to do something at home	2.93	2.96	.807
There is a strong urge to follow the rules of the family	2.89	2.88	.904
B. ORGANIZATION			
Activities in our family are always planned	2.81	2.86	.620
In general we are neat and orderly	2.89	3.39	.000
It's hard to find things if we need them at home	2.82	2.57	.056
In our family, on time is very important	3.00	3.51	.000
System Maintenance	22.60	22.88	.607

The mean score of urban system maintenance dimensions (22.60) was lower than the mean score in rural areas (22.88), but this difference was not statistically significant. The highest average score in both urban and rural areas is seen in the important to be on time that is 3.00 (in urban) and 3.51 (in rural).

Adolescent Autonomy

Adolescent autonomy is a condition in which an individual has the ability to determine his or her desires, is able to overcome the social pressure to think and act in a certain way and not be affected by the views of others against him (Steinberg). The average score of adolescent autonomy in urban areas in this study was 81.21 with standard deviation of 5.21, while in rural areas the average score of adolescent autonomy was 77.92 with a standard deviation of 4.86.

A. Emotional Autonomy

The relationship between parents and children will change very quickly especially when children enter the age of adolescence where at this age the child is able to take care of itself, so that the time spent parents to teenagers will be

reduced due to the increasingly emotional autonomy of adolescent (Berk, 1994; Rice, 1996).

Table 4. Average scores of emotional autonomy and different test results based on regional typology

Statements	Average		Sign
	Urban N= 72	Rural N = 72	
My parents' opinion is valuable because they are more experienced	3.60	3.68	.354
In my opinion, the opinion of parents is not always true	2.67	2.11	.000
In my opinion, rejecting the opinion of parents is a natural thing	2.56	1.83	.000
I used to correct the views of parents because his views are not always true	2.80	2.21	.000
I interact openly with parents just like everyone else	2.97	2.69	.031
I do not hesitate to criticize the attitude of parents	2.56	2.33	.092
Parents for me are mediators in solving problems	3.28	3.31	.087
I used to discuss with parents about things	3.25	3.19	.617
I do not hesitate to exchange ideas with parents	3.06	2.76	.016
I have the freedom to make suggestions and opinions	3.10	3.00	.395
Total	29.82	27.13	.000

The average score of adolescent emotional autonomy in urban areas (29.82) is higher than in rural areas (27.13) and this difference is statistically significant. The urban adolescent (3.60) and the rural (3.68) have the highest average score on the statement that parents' opinions are valuable because parents are more experienced.

B. Value Autonomy

Value autonomy is the ability of the individual to make decisions and set a choice. This means the individual has a set of principles about right and wrong and important and not important in looking at things viewed from the value side.

Table 5. Average scores of value autonomy and different test results based on regional typology

Statements	Average		Sign
	Urban N= 72	Rural N = 72	
I can remind each other with parents without causing misunderstandings	3.25	3.18	.397
I appreciate differences of opinion because each person has an opinion	3.38	3.38	1.000
I can accept people of different religions, races and socioeconomic levels as friends	3.39	3.46	.496
I believe that what I do is the best thing	2.90	3.15	.031
I respect the rights of others because it is the key to success in association	3.29	3.35	.547
My beliefs are true to me	3.44	3.17	.011
I strongly believe in the values of life I have	3.21	3.25	.684

Total	22.86	22.93	.850
--------------	--------------	--------------	-------------

The results showed that there is no significant differences in value adolescent autonomy between rural and urban. But there are significant differences in the value autonomy on confidence indicators to do the best and the beliefs held true indeed according to the respondents. Adolescents in rural areas have more confidence that what they do is the best thing. In this case, the average score of adolescents in rural areas is higher that is 3,15 compared to adolescents in urban area is 2,90. Conversely, urban adolescents have higher mean scores (3,44) than rural youth (3,17) in the statement that "my beliefs are true to me"

C. Behavior Autonomy

Autonomy in behavior is a dimension of autonomy in the form of an independent function of an active and tangible individual meaning an individual who has the freedom to act and act without having to rely on others (Sprinthall & Collins, 1994). Individuals who are autonomously behaviorally have the ability to make their own decisions and can carry out their decisions (Steinberg, 1993).

Table 6. Average scores of behavior autonomy and different test results based on regional typology

Statements	Average		Sign
	Urban N= 72	Rural N = 72	
I do not always ask for help from parents in solving the problem	2.26	1.97	.029
I'm asking for help to my parents only for certain issues	2.90	2.79	.358
I was able to plan for myself important things about the future	2.74	2.46	.049
I always try my own to overcome the difficulties that are being faced	2.93	2.67	.045
I am able to carry out decisions in a responsible manner	2.96	3.03	.487
I know when to ask advice / opinions from parents about the decision to be taken	3.14	3.35	.050
I am able to take a firm stance against self-harmful influences	3.21	3.22	.891
I am able to take an alternative path from the problems faced	2.72	2.92	.042
I do activities in accordance with the wishes of parents	2.67	2.22	.000
I can firmly refuse to do something that is seen to be difficult for myself	3.00	2.61	.002
Total	28.53	27.24	.005

C. Value Autonomy

The Differences of Adolescent Autonomy in Urban and Rural Areas

The results showed significant differences (99% confidence level) on adolescent autonomy in urban and rural areas. The average score of adolescent

autonomy in urban areas is 81.21, while in rural areas it is 77.29. This shows that in general urban adolescents are more independent than rural adolescents.

Table 7. Independent T test result of autonomy adolescent

Autonomy	Mean		Sign
	Urban	Rural	
Emotional	29.82	27.13	0.000**
Behavior	28.53	27.24	0.005**
Value	22.86	22.93	0.850
Adolescent Autonomy	81.21	77.29	0.000**

Relationship Between Family Function and Adolescent Autonomy

Table 8. Correlations test result

	Autonomy	Relationship	Personal Growth	System Maintenance
Autonomy	---	-0.022	0.207*	0.156
Relationship	-0.022	---	0.437**	0.230**
Personal Growth	0.207*	0.437**	---	0.436**
System Maintenance	0.156	0.230**	0.436**	---

This study shows a significant positive relationship between adolescent autonomy with dimension personal growth (in family function). It means that family interaction especially related to activities that foster self-confidence, the spirit of competition, the planting of moral values and also the positive interaction between family members will affect the formation of autonomy adolescent. The positive correlation with the correlation coefficient of 0,207 at 95% confidence level indicates that the higher the functioning of the family, especially the personal growth dimension, the higher autonomy adolescent.

Discussion

The family function in this study shows the interaction between parent and child as well as other family members as measured by the perception of the child in the family. Family function is seen in 3 dimensions of relationship, personal growth and system maintenance. In general or based on the total family function score, the research results do not show any differences in family function based on the typology of urban and rural areas. This means that in general the function of families viewed from 3 dimensions is relatively the same between in urban and rural.

The sub-dimension of cohesion indicates the magnitude of obligations, assistance and support among family members. Table 1 shows that the average score of families in rural areas is higher than in urban families on three indicators.

Families in rural areas have higher mean scores in terms of providing assistance to fellow family members, devoting their energy to home tasks and also having a sense of community, but the difference in average scores is not statistically significant.

The sub dimensions of expression relate to the actions of family members to be able to express their feelings directly. Significant differences (95% confidence level) are seen in the item "sometimes our complaints can offend a person in the family" where the family in the village (2,74) scores higher than the urban families (2,25).

The sub-dimension of conflict relates to the degree to which family members express openly their feelings of displeasure, anger and disagreement. Significant differences (at the 95% confidence level) seen in the item "sometimes we throw something when we are angry and family members often shout". In this case the average score of rural families for both items (3,39 and 3,14) is higher than in urban families (3,04 and 2,83). Nevertheless, from the test analysis of difference of mean score totally (dimension of relationship) there is no significant difference between family in urban and in rural. Or in other words, in this relationship dimension, the functioning of families in urban and rural areas is relatively no different.

The average score of personal growth dimension is an evaluation of the family environment in relation to personal growth and development consisting of 5 sub-dimensions. The subdivision of independence shows the degree to which family members have the desire, the hope and the ability to make their own decisions. In this sub dimension families in both regions have relatively similar characteristics, because there is no statistically significant difference and the average score is not too different in value.

Similarly in the sub-dimension of orientation for achievement, there is no significant difference between the two typology of the region. This sub-dimension, among others, describes all activities in the family that lead to achievement, such as important to do the best in any work done or progress in various fields becomes important for every member in the family.

In the sub-dimension of orientation on intellectual and cultural activities there is also no significant difference although there is a difference in the average score of each indicator. This sub-dimension describes all activities in the family that lead to social activities of society, culture and intellectual. Activities in question include doing art activities, talking about political and social issues, and also happy to do new things different from before.

Sub dimensions of active recreation orientation are related to the level of participation in recreation activities such as gathering with friends or family on weekends, active in organizational and sports activities or going to cinema or other recreation. Significant differences (at the 95% confidence level) are seen in the indicators of traveling to recreational areas, where families in urban areas do more often than families in rural areas. The average score of this indicator for families in urban areas is 2,69, while in rural areas it is 2,26.

The sub-dimension of the orientation of religious moral orientation relates to beliefs of moral and religious values. There are significant differences in families in urban and rural areas. Family members in rural areas visit more places

of worship than urban families. The average score of families in rural areas was 3,58 whereas in urban 3,10 (significantly different at 99% confidence level). Furthermore, families in rural areas have more conviction that if we sin then we will get punishment. Average score in rural area was 3.60 while in urban area was 3.29 (significantly different at 95% confidence level). However, if the analysis is done totally on the personal growth dimension there is no significant difference between families in urban and rural areas.

The dimension of system maintenance is related to the system of maintaining the values in the family which consists of supervision, namely how many rules are applied in the family and organizing the level of planning and arrangement in the family. In this dimension, there are several indicators that differ significantly between families in urban and rural areas.

In general, families in rural areas are more orderly and neat than urban families. The average score in rural areas is 3,389 while in urban areas it is 2,89 (significant at 99% confidence level). Families in rural areas appreciate the time because family members consider that timely becomes an important thing. The average score in rural areas is 3,51, while in urban areas it is 3,00 (significant at 99% confidence level).

However, from the analysis of the difference test the average score in total (relationship dimension) there is no significant difference between families in urban and in rural. Or in other words, on this relationship dimension, the functioning of families in urban and rural areas is relatively similar. So as on the personal growth dimensions, there is no significant difference between urban and rural families.

In general, families in rural areas are more orderly and neat than urban families. The average score in rural areas is 3,39 whereas in urban areas it is 2,89 (significant at 99% confidence level). The family in the rural area more appreciate the time because family members consider that timely becomes an important thing. The average score in rural areas is 3,51, while in urban areas it is 3,00 (significant at 99% confidence level).

Sub dimensions of active recreation orientation are related to the level of participation in recreation activities such as gathering with friends or family on weekends, active in organizational and sports activities or going to cinema or other recreation. Significant differences (at the 95% confidence level) are seen in the indicators of traveling to recreational areas, where families in urban areas do more often than families in rural areas. The average score of this indicator for families in urban areas is 2,69, while in rural areas it is 2,26.

The results of this study are in line with the research conducted by Martiastuti (2012) which shows the differences seen in the sub-scale independence ($p < 0.10$) and cultural orientation ($p < 0.05$) between rural and urban samples. For example, urban adolescent more often prefer to play a musical instrument and have one or two hobbies than teenagers in the countryside. This may also be related to the economic and social abilities of parents so as to support cultural-oriented activities undertaken by their children.

Autonomy is an important aspect of development for adolescents, because it is a sign of their readiness to enter the next phase with more diverse demands as adults. Failure to achieve independence can have a negative impact on

adolescents. Dependence on others causes a teenager to always hesitate in making decisions alone, not confident, easily influenced by others until finally having difficulty to find identity. In an effort to achieve adolescent independence requires support from the people around him, especially from the family environment as the nearest environment (Rahmawati, 2005).

This study shows that the average score of total emotional autonomy for urban is 29,82, while in rural area is 27.13. This shows that urban adolescents are more emotionally autonomy than rural. This condition can be seen among other significant different indicators such as they assume that parents' opinion is not always true so that children also have the right to correct and give opinions. Significantly, urban adolescents claim that they can interact openly with parents and also not hesitate to exchange ideas about a problem with their parents. In all these indicators, the average score of adolescents in urban areas is higher than that of adolescents in rural areas.

This study shows the differences in adolescent behavior autonomy in urban and rural areas. The average score of total urban behavior autonomy in total was 28,53, while in rural areas it was 27.24 (significant at 95% confidence level). This means that adolescents in urban areas have higher levels of behavior autonomy than adolescents in rural areas. This can be seen based on existing indicators, such as urban adolescents better able to plan things related to their future, always trying to solve their own problems. Adolescents in urban areas also have more ability to take alternative paths to the problems they face and can reject everything that feels difficult for themselves.

The results showed a significant difference (99% confidence level) on autonomy adolescent in urban and rural areas. The average score of urban autonomy adolescent is 81.21, while in rural areas it is 77.29. This shows that in general urban adolescents are more independent than rural adolescents.

Regarding achievement of autonomy, both male and female adolescents showed significant differences between the younger and older adolescents. Progress in autonomy was achieved by male adolescents more as a result of disobeying parents than was the case with female adolescents. Narcissism, separation from family, and cognitive aspects were found to be important elements in adolescent's perception of autonomy. Desire for autonomy was present since the start of puberty, achievement lagged behind desire, and the capacity to fight for autonomy was a key mediator for the achievement of personal autonomy in the transition to adulthood (Fleming, 2005).

This study shows a significant positive relationship between adolescent autonomy with dimension personal growth (in family function). This means that the better the family function, especially in the personal growth dimension, the better the adolescent autonomy. Or the other side, if the family function does not work well then the development of autonomy also can not run well. This is in line with research conducted by Garber and Stephanie 2001. This study examined the relations among maternal depression, family dysfunction, emotional autonomy, and adolescent adjustment. Participants were 145 mothers and children who were assessed in eighth grade (mean age = 13.51, SD = .57) and again in ninth grade. Results indicated that maternal depression significantly moderated the relation between emotional autonomy and adolescent adjustment. Among offspring of

depressed mothers, higher levels of emotional autonomy (detachment) significantly predicted increases in internalizing and externalizing problems, whereas among offspring of nondepressed mothers, higher levels of emotional autonomy significantly predicted decreases in adolescents' symptoms. Within families of depressed mothers, family dysfunction significantly predicted adolescent symptoms, and this relation was partially mediated through emotional autonomy. These results further highlight the importance of considering the family context in studies of adolescent autonomy.

This is reinforced also by a study in Russia in 2013 about adolescent autonomy and the relationship of the child's parents indicating that the role and functions of the adolescent-parent relations are considered as characteristics of the social situation of development. The developmental process of the value, emotional, cognitive and behavioral components of autonomy in their heterochrony are discussed. The results of the research demonstrated complicated non-linear relationship between the level of personality autonomy and child-parent relation's parameters (the level of parent's control, the adolescent's independence and self-management competence, communication and cooperation with parents). In the relationship with parents the awareness of the need for autonomy and its motivational objectification occur. The reflection of the position of the adolescent in the child-parent relationship, the awareness of nonequivalence in the field of own decision-making are the basis of the development of the autonomy motivation commitment to personal autonomy (Karabanova and Poskrebysheva, 2013)

Conclusion and Recommendation

Conclusion

The average score of family function in urban areas is 118.44, while in rural areas 121.13. This shows the functioning of rural families better than in urban areas, although it did not show statistically significant differences. The average score of adolescent autonomy in urban areas is 81.21, while in rural areas it is 77.29. This difference is significant at 99% confidence level.

Adolescent autonomy is positively correlated with family function of personal growth dimension with correlation coefficient of 0.207 (at 95% confidence level). This shows that the better the functioning of the family then the better the adolescent autonomy.

Recommendation

For the researchers, it is expected to conduct a more in-depth study of the functioning of families associated with other aspects of development in adolescents. For the parents should strengthen the relationship with their children, especially those that encourage the formation of autonomy adolescent. For the school and the community, it is expected to create an atmosphere conducive to the formation of autonomy adolescent.

References

- Fleming, M. (2005). *Gender in Adolescent Autonomy: Distinction between Boys and Girls Accelerates at 16 years of Age*. University of Porto.
- Garber, J., & Stephanie A. (2001). Emotional Autonomy and Adolescent Adjustment. *Journal of Adolescent Research* Vol 16
- Gunarsa, S.D., & Gunarsa, Y.S.D (2006). *Psikologi Perkembangan Anak dan Remaja*. Jakarta: PT BPK Gunung Mulia.
- Handayani, F. (2004). *Some Factors Associated with Types of Parenting by the Father and Emotional Intelligence of School Children*. Thesis Department of Family and Consumer Science. Department of FEMA-IPB.
- Karabanova, O.A., & Poskrebysheva, N.N. (2013). Adolescent Autonomy in Parent-child Relations. *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 86 (2013) 621-628
- Martiastuti, K. (2012). *Resilience of Adolescent based on Gender, Type of School and Regional Typology*. Bogor. Institut Pertanian Bogor.
- Monk, F.J., Knoers, A. M. P. & Haditono, S. R. (2001). *Developmental Psychology: Introduction in Different Parts*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (2002). *Family environment scale manual*. Consulting Psychologists Press
- Rahmawati, H.S. 2005. Differences of independence between the Firstborn and the youngest child in second grade students of SMA Negeri 11 Semarang in the Lesson 2004/2005. Essay. Guidance and Counseling Department. FIP. UNNES.
- Ruhidawati, C. (2005). *The Influence of Patterns of Parenting, Peer Groups and Youth Activity on Independence*. Unpublished thesis. Department of FEMA-IPB.
- Steinberg, L. (1993). *Adolescence-Third Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Borkowsky, J., Ramey, S., & Bristol-Power, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Parenting and the child's world: Influences on academic, intellectual, and social-emotional development*. New York: Springer Science.
- Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum as cited in Hair, E., Moore, K., Garrett, S., Kinukawa, A., Lippman, L. & Michelson, E. (2005). The parent-adolescent relationship scale. In K. Moore & L. Lippman (Eds.) *What do children need to flourish* (pp. 183-202).
- Hair, E., Moore, K., Garrett, S., Kinukawa, A., Lippman, L. & Michelson, E. (2005). The parentadolescent relationship scale. In K. Moore & L. Lippman (Eds.) *What do children need to flourish* (pp. 183-202). New York: Springer Science.

- Parker, J., & Benson, M. (2004). Parent-adolescent relations and adolescent functioning: Self-esteem, substance abuse, and delinquency. *Adolescence*, 39(155): 519-530.
- Resnick, M., Ireland, M. & Borowsky, I. (2004). Youth violence perpetration: What protects? What predicts? Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 35(5): 424e1-424e10.
- Sprinthall, N.A., & Collins, W.A. (1984). *Adolescent psychology: A developmental view*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley