

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect



Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 116 (2014) 3793 - 3797

5th World Conference on Educational Sciences -WCES 2013

Relationship between parenting styles and hardiness in high school students

Farahnaz Mirzaei^a*, Hasanali Kadivarzare^b

^aIslamic Azad University, Tehran Markaz Branch, Tehran,1469636745, Iran ^bTechnical Highschool of Shahid Chamran of Isfehan, Tehran, 1469636745, Iran

Abstract

Aim: The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and hardiness in high school students. **Method:** in this correlational and cross-sectional study, 176 high school students (80 boys and 96 girls) were selected via Multistage cluster sampling method from Tehran. Personal Views Survey (PVS) developed by Kobasa and Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) were used for data collecting. **Results:** The results showed that there is positive and significant relationship between parenting styles and hardiness. Parenting styles can predict hardiness characteristic variance in high school students. **Conclusions:** These results suggest that parenting styles have significant role in hardiness; therefore it is essential to contrive a special training method for parents to increase mental health of students.

© 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license. Selection and/or peer-review under responsibility of Academic World Education and Research Center. *Keywords:* parenting styles, hardiness and high school students.

1. Introduction

Among child socialization researchers, it is widely recognized that parents play a critical role in relation to children's psychological and behavioral well-being. The empirical literature on parental influences on child adjustment is extensive yet characterized by considerable diversity with respect to the types of parental behaviors and attitudes that have been studied as correlates and predictors of child well-being.

Many researchers involved with the investigation of parental behavior and the relationship between various traits in children have categorized behaviors into groups to form parenting styles. A range of behaviors and labels have been used to generalize differing styles of discipline, nurturance, reinforcement and acceptance used in child-rearing (Becker, 1964; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiberman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Kelly & Goodwin, 1983; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989). The outcome of much of the research indicates that parenting behaviors which encourage autonomy and mutual respect may be associated with positive behaviors in adolescents.

The present investigation utilized the parenting styles described by Baumrind (1966, 1971, 1978, 1991), which focus on the specific behavioral styles of demandingness and responsiveness. The definitions given for demandingness and responsiveness in context for the specific parenting styles are demandingness is ". . .the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys" (Baumrind, 1991, p. 61) and responsiveness is ". . .the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation, and self-assertion by being

^{*} Corresponding Author: Farahnaz Mirzaei. Tel.: +98-919-606-8789 E-mail address: fmirzaei42@yahoo.com

attuned, supportive and acquiescent to children's special needs and demands" (Baumrind, 1991, pp. 61–62). Baumrind categorized three parenting styles based on the degree to which these behaviors were practiced or perceived. These categories are labeled as authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative.

The authoritarian style is defined through behaviors that are highly restrictive and highly demanding. Authoritarian parents tend to use punitive discipline and value conformity above individuality. A permissive parenting style is described through behaviors that are nonrestrictive, highly responsive and accepting, and the parent allows the child to be self-regulated and free from restraint. These first two categories represent the extremes of the behavioral continuum, with the third.

Authoritarian, representing a balance between those extremes. The authoritative category includes behaviors that are fairly restrictive and responsive, balanced by explanations of policy and equality between parent and child.

Maddi and Kobasa (1984) believe that the foundation of an individual's ability to successfully cope with stress and remain healthy is a personality style, which they termed "hardiness"; psychologically "hardy" individuals have a different view of themselves and the world. Moreover, according to Kobasa (1979), hardiness is defined in terms of more specific dimensions of control, commitment, and challenge characteristics that may influence both cognitive appraisal and behavior in response to stressful events. Higher control reflects the belief that persons can

exert an influence on their surroundings. Such persons feel they have the power to turn an unfortunate situation into an advantageous one. Higher commitment is defined in terms of an individual's full engagement in activities, and strongly committed people have a sense of purpose and self-understanding, allowing them to uncover meaning in who they are and value whatever activity they are engaged in; such persons seem to perform in a cheerful and effortless manner. Highly challenged individuals believe that change rather than stability characterizes life. Such persons anticipate change as affording them an opportunity for further development.

Parental love, family intimacy, and wise disciplining have been shown to enhance children's coping such that family atmosphere shapes ways in which children mobilize their competencies (Punamaki, Qouta, & El-Sarraj, 2001). Family cohesion and provision of a sense of security (Laor et al., 1997) and good parenting (Punamaki, Qouta, & El-Sarraj, 1997) increase children's hardiness.

In this paper the basic relationships between these variable investigated. These findings not only add to local scientific scope but also pare the way for International investigations regarding the increasing importance of parenting styles familial issues; the present research considers the relationship between parenting styles and hardiness in high school students. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and hardiness in high school students.

2. Method

2.1. Sample

in this correlational and cross-sectional study, 176 high school students (80 boys and 96 girls) were selected via Multi-stage cluster sampling method from Tehran. After selecting the participants and opening the goals and attracting their cooperation, questionnaires were distributed among the participants appealing them to study the questions carefully and select the answers according to their personality traits and do not leave the questions unanswered as possible. The data were summarized through descriptive statistics of mean, standard deviation and are analyzed through ANOVA test.

2.2. Data collection instruments

Personal Views Survey (PVS):

The 18 item measure developed by Maddi and Kobasa (1984) was used to measure hardiness personality (ability of individuals to turn stressful circumstance into growth inducing experiences). It consists of three dimensions such as

Commitment, Control and Challenge. The internal consistency of the total measure Was .80 in the present sample and was .74 for commitment, .78 for control, and .73 for challenge.

i) Commitment measures the extent to which individuals seek involvement rather than withdrawal. Commitment contains a vital motivational quality that compels the individual to persist in pursuing a goal even in the fact of repeat obstacles, for example, "By working hard, you can always achieve your goal". ii) Control deals with the extent to which an individual strives to exert control over their circumstances rather than feeling powerless. Perception of control or the de-agree to which a stressor is seen as under an individual control are thus important in the appraisal of threat (e.g., "Most days, life is really interesting and exciting for me". iii) Challenge measures the extent to which individuals strive to learn from experiences rather than feeling threatened, one of the examples of an item is "My mistakes are usually difficult to correct".

Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ):

The Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991) was used to measure Baumrind's permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parental prototypes. The scale consists of 30 items, and each item will be scored on a Likert-scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree). The median reliability coefficients suggest good reliability for the individual scales (.77 to .92). The reliability of the PAQ was found to be .77 to .92 in a test re-test check over a two-week period of time (Buri, 1991). Validity for the PAQ was found to be .74 to .87 for the subscales (Buri, 1991).

2.3 Data analysis

The data was analyzed by using SPSS software. To examine the data, and to make a reply to hypotheses, different descriptive and inferential statistics methods were utilized. Initially, in order to summarize the dispersed data, descriptive methods as mean, standard deviation and Cronbach's alpha were used. Then, to study the research hypotheses (H_A) against zero hypotheses (H_O), the statistical parameter of Pearson's correlation test was used.

3. Findings:

variables	Statistic index	hardiness	Parenting style	permissive	Authoritarian	authoritative
hardiness	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
parenting	Pearson Correlation	255**	1			
style	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001				
permissive	Pearson Correlation	102	.600**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.176	.000			
authoritarian	Pearson Correlation	540**	.148	176*	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.050	.020		
authoritative	Pearson Correlation	.068	.795**	.280**	319**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.367	.000	.000	.000	

Table 1. Relationship among hardiness, authoritarian, permissive and authoritative parenting style

Table 1 shows the Pearson coefficient correlation for examination of this research hypothesis. As it is seen from the table, there is a negative and significant relationship between hardiness and parenting style (r=-0/25, P<0/01). It means that with increase of hardiness, parenting style is reduced.

The other finding of this research is that there is a negative and significant relationship between Authoritarian parenting style and hardiness (r=-0/54, P>0/01). It means that the hardiness is raised with the increase of the Authoritarian parenting style.

Regarding the fact that the Purpose of this research is to predict the hardiness from Authoritarian, permissive and authoritative parenting style, the step by step regression method has been used to examine the hypothesis. As Shown in table 2, the authoritarian, permissive and authoritative parenting style can predict the hardiness significantly (P=0/000).

Variables	Statistic index	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
authoritarian	Regression	6862.889	1	6862.889	71.621	.000°
	Residual	16673.059	174	95.822		
	Total	23535.949	175			
authoritative	Regression	7809.254	2	3904.627	42.952	.000b
	Residual	15726.695	173	90.906		
	Total	23535.949	175			

Table 2. the ANOVA test

The summary information related to determine coefficient and regression analysis is seen from the table 3. According to this table it can be said that the authoritarian parenting style explain %29 of hardiness variance but with the adding authoritative parenting style, this value rises to %33. The effect coefficient (Beta) of the authoritarian parenting style is more than other variables in explaining of hardiness variable (Beta=-.54).

Model				Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		R	\mathbb{R}^2	В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.540ª	.292	102.185	2.555		39.993	.000
1	authoritarian	.340	.292	-1.369	.162	540	-8.463	.000
	(Constant)			113.265	4.241		26.708	.000
2	authoritarian	.540 ^a	.332	-1.460	.160	576	-9.121	.000
	authoritative			556	.172	204	-3.227	.001

Table 3. Regression and determination coefficients of variables

Therefore, according to above table it can be said that a great part of hardiness variance is determined by the authoritarian parenting style showing its important role in hardiness.

4. Discussion and conclusion:

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and hardiness in high school students. The results partially confirmed our hypotheses. This result showed a negative and significant relationship between hardiness and parenting style (P<0/01). It means that with increase of parenting style, hardiness is reduced. the step by step regression method showed that the authoritarian parenting style explain %29 of hardiness variance but with adding authoritative parenting style, this value rises to %33. The effect coefficient (Beta) of the

authoritarian parenting style is more than other variables in explaining of hardiness variable. Therefore, among parenting styles, the authoritative parenting style and the authoritarian parenting style have essential role in developing of hardiness personality characteristic.

The influence of the authoritative parenting style and the authoritarian parenting style on hardiness could be read in agreement with previous findings that identified a significant relationship between the authoritative, the authoritarian parenting style and the hardiness (Punamaki, R. L., Qouta, S., & El-Sarraj, E. (2001; Laor, N., Wolmer, L., Mayes, L. C., Gershon, A., Weizman, R., & Cohen, D. J. 1997). For the explanation of these results, we can say that control is a key concept in both variables of parenting styles and hardiness. In authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles, parent's method for parenting is control. Control regulates inrapsychic processes and forms control component of hardiness. The seminal definition of parenting style refers to ways in which parents support and exercise control over their children and is conceptualized as varying along two orthogonal dimensions of responsiveness and control (Baumrind, 1991).

The findings of this research suggest that parenting styles have significant role in hardiness; therefore it is essential to contrive a special training method for parents to increase mental health of students. Although these findings provide some interesting and potentially important new evidence regarding the relationship between parenting styles and the hardiness, there are some limitations which may weaken the generalizability of these findings, and which should be considered carefully. A primary limitation of the study methodology was that parenting style was assessed using students self-reports of their perceptions rather than an objective and independent evaluation of parent behaviors and characteristics.

Reference:

Buri, J. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. Journal of Personality Assessment, 57(1), 110-119.

Becker, W. C. (1964). Consequences of different types of parental discipline. In M. L. Hoffman & L. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 1, pp. 169–208). New York: Russell Sage.

Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiberman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244–1257.

Kelly, C., & Goodwin, G. (1983). Adolescents' perception of three styles of parental control. Adolescence, 18, 567-571.

Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development*, 60, 1424–1436.

Bandura, A. (1978). The self system in reciprocal determinism. American Psychologist, 33, 344–358.

Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. Child Development, 37, 887–907.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monograph, 4, 1–103.

Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. Youth and Society, 9, 239-275.

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56–95.

Maddi, S. R., & kobasa, S. C. (1984). The hardy executive. Home-wood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Maddi, S. R., & Kobasa, S. C. (1984). The hardy executive: Health under stress. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Punamaki, R. L., Qouta, S., & El-Sarraj, E. (2001). Resiliency factors predicting psychological adjustment after political violence among Palestinian children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25, 256–267.

Punamaki, R. L., Qouta, S., & El-Sarraj, E. (1997). Models of traumatic experiences and children's psychological adjustment: The roles of perceived parenting and the children's own resources and activity. *Child Development*, 68, 718–728.

Laor, N., Wolmer, L., Mayes, L. C., Gershon, A., Weizman, R., & Cohen, D. J. (1997). Israeli preschool children under Scuds: A 30- month follow-up. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 36, 349–356.