

Comparing the Parenting Styles and Self-Efficacy

Vahid Nessai^{1*}, Davood Rastegar¹, Alireza Rajaei² and Gholamreza Khoynejad³

1. PhD candidate of General Psychology, Islamic Azad University of Zahedan, Iran
2. Assistant professor, Department of psychology, Islamic Azad University of Torbat-e Jam, Iran
3. Assistant professor, Department of psychology, Islamic Azad University of Mashhad, Iran

Received: July 24, 2015

Accepted: September 31, 2015

ABSTRACT

The propose of the present study is to make an investigation on the relationship between parenting styles with self-efficacy, as a positive psychological state among students of Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e Jam during the academic year of 2011-12 and to determine the relationship between these variables. 200 students (100 males and 100 females), were selected through cluster random sampling; the questionnaires of styles and parenting dimensions (Robinson, Mondeklo, Elson and Hart, 2001) and also a self-made questionnaire (Rajai, Khoinejad and Nesai, 2012) about positive psychological states(self-efficacy) were distributed among the participants. Analyzing the result using Cronbach Alpha and their correlation revealed a significant relationship between parenting styles and self-efficacy (P -value= 0.000). However, in authoritative parenting style (P -value=0.485) and indulgent parenting style (P -value=0.088) no significant relationship was reported with the desire to make effort as a positive psychology component and the null hypothesis is accepted.

KEYWORDS: positive psychological states, parenting styles, self-efficacy.

1. INTRODUCTION

Flexible self-efficacy or the feeling efficient steams from the dominant experience, that is to achieve a goal by resistance and overcoming the existent barriers. This feature can also improve and flourish by dealing with people who have succeed by their own effort and hard work. If people are encouraged to achieve success and reach their goals by overcoming challenges befitting their abilities, their self-efficacy (sense of efficiency) would be empowered. Eventually, the self-efficacy beliefs increase once one pursue goals in proper physical health and positive mood [1].

Self-efficacy is defined as one's self confidence and the fact that he can achieve something worthy which has a significant impact on his life, as well as his self-confidence and his abilities to compete others. Self-efficacy defines how people feel, think, motivate and behave; the results of these beliefs have various impacts on major cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes [2].

Bradly and Corwyn [3], have suggested that the environmental stimuli or encouraging people to certain behaviors van increase their self-efficacy. Bandura [4], explains about the important role of self-efficacy in determining the capacities to organize and operationalize the necessary activities to accomplish specific goals and objectives.

Prof. Albert Bandura is the self-efficacy theoretician in Stanford University: a set of ideas interwoven in his more comprehensive theory of social-cognitive character [5]. Perceived elf-efficacy includes our beliefs about the organizing ability and efficient implementation of tasks in an identified scope, leading to specific goals.

Major part of our life is directed by the self-efficacy beliefs, as we do not have any motivation for those tasks which we believe are doomed to failure. According to Bandura, our self-efficacy beliefs or our judgments about our abilities determine our expectations from the results and outcomes of our actions. If we believe we will succeed and then we reach our desired goal, this process can be a motivator for the rest of our actions. On the contrary, if we believe we will fail, this expectation would cause discouragement. In fact, our self-efficacy beliefs and our expectations about the consequences and results of our actions determine our behavioral performance and lead to specific outcomes.

Self-efficacy and self-steam are two different notions. Self-steam is related to our judgment about our personal abilities and it generally effects the mood, while self-efficacy beliefs is about our abilities to succeed in some specific tasks and determines our performance.

*Corresponding author: Vahid Nessai, Department of Psychology, General Psychology, Islamic Azad University of Zahedan, Iran; Email: nessaivahid@gmail.com; Tel: 09155219148

Measuring self-efficacy includes some indices of our beliefs about how effective we use our abilities and skills in specific situation. According to the definitions, the self-efficacy measures depends on specific situations and scopes [6]. Therefore, our self-efficacy measures in the ability to prevent sexually transmitted diseases or the ability to steer a boat in stormy conditions are different and thus we need different measurements for different situations.

1.1 Self-efficacy resources

Self-efficacy beliefs steam from four main information sources:

1. Dominance experiences;
2. Indirect or observational experiences;
3. Social encouragement;
4. Emotional and physical experiences;

Flexible self-efficacy grows from dominance experiences that is to achieve a goal by resistance and overcoming the existent barriers. This feature can also improve and flourish by dealing with people who have succeed by their own effort and hard work. If people are encouraged to achieve success and reach their goals by overcoming challenges befitting their abilities, their self-efficacy (sense of efficiency) would be empowered. Eventually, the self-efficacy beliefs increase once one pursue goals in proper physical health and positive mood [1].

1.2 Self-efficacy outcomes

Self-efficacy beliefs adjust one's function through cognitive, motivational, emotional and sectional process [4]. People with high perceived self-efficacy show more flexibility and strategic efficiency in managing environmental challenges and resourcefulness; they consider future perspectives in order to structure their life. These people instead of taking risk, emphasize on potentially beneficial opportunities, they visualize successful outcomes and apply them in problem solving to lead their efforts. People with empowered self-efficacy beliefs select their challenging targets on a motivational level; they expect their efforts to have satisfying outcomes, instead of attributing their failure to uncontrollable factors such as inability, ascribe them to inadequate effort, insufficient strategies or incompatible conditions. They believe in overcoming obstacles so they are encouraged to make effort for achieving their goal.

Self-efficacy beliefs increase immune system function and leads to better physical health, psychological and social adjustment and more flexibility against mental pressures. Growing self-efficacy beliefs in specific areas such as work, sport, weight control, smoking cessation, alcohol consumption and mental health issues can have positive outcomes [1].

Regarding Burry *et al.* [6], authoritarian parenting style among other styles including authoritarian, authoritative and indulgent, is the most favorable. Baumrind[7, 8], showed that the feature of indulgent parents is their lack of control over their children. On the contrary, authoritarian parents show high level of command and power and the authoritative parents control their children without giving them any freedom. It seems that indulgent and authoritarian parents do not impose their control on their children, but the authoritarian parent use reasoning in the education and guidance of their children.

Diana Baumrind[7] mentioned three authoritarian, authoritative and indulgent parenting styles and their different impacts on social and cognitive abilities of their children [9]. Parents' power is overemphasized in authoritative parenting style and they expect undisputed execution of their orders without providing any reason.

Parents are loving and receptive but not demanding in indulgent parenting style, they avoid any kind of control and children are the decision-makers in any age.

Parents have the most appropriate behavior in authoritarian parenting style. They have reasonable expectation from their children and these demands are implied by setting restrictions and insisting on compliance. Parents' and children's rights are respected and the relationship between them is warm, intimate and loving [10].

Parenting styles in different societies and during the history have been varied. The perspective of each culture is partially related to educating and training the children of that society and the interaction between parents and children can be the cornerstone of children's social education [11].

2 Methodology, Statistical population, sample and sampling method:

The present study is a descriptive, non-experimental and correlational study. The population is all the female and male accounting students of Islamic Azad University of Torbat-e Jam during 2011-12, according to the Educational Department of university their total number is 420. Krejcie and Morgan formula (1970), quoted by Khoynejad (2008)[12], was used randomly and clustered in order to determine the sample size. Therefore, based on the mentioned formula the sample size is 200. The content of this study is based on the field study and has been collected from books, journals, magazines, dissertations and internet websites. SPSS software has been used in both descriptive and inferential statics levels in order to analyze the data.

3. Instrumentation

- a. Self-made questionnaire of positive psychological states by Rajaei, Khojnejad and Nessai (2012).
- b. parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire by Robinson, Mandkelo, Elson and Hart (2001).

3.1 Validity of the positive psychological states questionnaire (PPS)

Professors and experts of this field have confirmed the validity of this questionnaire. Validity answers the question that into what extent the measurement instrument measure the desired characteristic. The accuracy of the collected data is not accurate without knowing the instrument's validity.

3.1.1 Reliability of the positive psychological states questionnaire (PPS)

The reliability of the questionnaire was calculated by cronbach's alpha. This method is used to calculate the internal consistency of a measuring instrument such as questionnaire. Therefore, a pilot test was conducted on 50 students and the cronbach's alpha coefficient, calculated by SPSS, was 0.837 which shows high reliability of PPS questionnaire.

3.2 The positive psychological states questionnaire (PPS)

The positive psychological states questionnaire (PPS) has been developed by Rajaei, Khojnejad and Nessai (2012) and contains 96 questions, measuring the total number of 15 positive psychological states as follow:

-Reliance on God – Optimism - Sense of efficiency – Dutifulness - Sense of control – Purposefulness – Hope - Meaningfulness of life - Life satisfaction - Positive mood and happiness – Sociability - Self-esteem and self-worth Peacefulness – Appreciation - Forgiveness

3.2.1 Scoring method

The scoring method of this questionnaire is based on the likert scale from 1 to 5 (strongly disagree to strongly agree), t- hat is strongly disagree stands for 1, disagree for 2, neutral for 3, agree for 4 and strongly agree for 5. However, note that the scale is reverse in some questions which their number come as the following:

7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21,22,23,26,27,28,29,30, 32, 38, 39, 40, 44,48,49,52,54,58,59,60,61,69,70,71, 75,78,79,80,81,82,84, 86,90,91,92,93.

3.3 The parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire

The parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire (PSDQ) is measuring perception and is answered by children. It contains 32 likert scale questions, from 1 (never), 2 (sometimes), 3 (often), 4 (frequently) to 5 (always). These questions measures three indulgent, authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles and is developed based on Baumrind parenting theory. Furthermore, it contains seven communicational dimensions; authoritative style includes communicational, reputational and autonomy dimensions. Communicational dimension or the warm and receptive dimension is stated in questions 1, 7, 12, 14 and 27, the regulatory or reasoning dimension is stated in questions 5,11,25,29 and 31 and finally the autonomy or democratic participation is stated in questions 3, 9, 18, 21 and 22.Dictatorship style includes three dimensions in this questionnaire which are physical compulsory, verbal hostility and non-explanatory - punitive dimensions. The physical compulsory dimension contains questions 2, 6, 19 and 32; verbal hostility, questions 13, 16, 23 and 30 and non-explanatory - punitive dimension, questions 4, 10, 26 and 28.Indulgence style has one neglect dimension which states questions 8,15,17,20 and 24 of the parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire. This questionnaire measures children's perception toward these three parenting styles and their dimensions.

5. RESULTS

Description of mean and standard deviation of parenting styles scores in the sample group is presented in Table 1.

a. Authoritaian parenting style and self-efficacy

Regarding the P-value=0.000, the null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between authoritarian parenting style and self-efficacy on this level. Regarding the P-value=0.000 for the component The tendency to initiate behavior, Self-empowerment (P-value=0.001) alpha is significantly meaningful on 1% level and the null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between authoritarian style and these two mentioned components on this level (Table 2).

Regarding the P-value= 0.044for the tendency to keep on the effort, and Insisting on task, alpha is significantly meaningful on 5% level and the null hypotheses is 95% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between authoritarian style and these two mentioned components on this level.

b. Authoritative parenting style and self-efficacy

Regarding the P-value=0.002, alpha is significantly meaningful on 1% level and null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between authoritative style and self-efficacy on this level (Table 3).

Regarding the P-value=0.000 for the component *Tendency to initiate the behavior* , *Self-empowerment* (P-value=0.003) and *insisting in task* (P-value=0.007) alpha is significantly meaningful on 1% level and null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between authoritative style and these three mentioned components on this level.

Regarding the P-value= 0.485 for the tendency to keep on the effort, the null hypotheses is totally accepted, that is there is no significant relationship between authoritative parenting style and this component.

c. permissive parenting style and self-efficacy

Regarding the P-value=0.000, alpha is significantly meaningful on 1% level and null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between indulgent parenting style and self-efficacy on this level (Table 4).

Regarding the P-value=0.000 for the component *Tendency to initiate the behavior* , *insisting on task* and *Self-empowerment*) alpha is significantly meaningful on 1% level and null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between permissive parenting style and these three mentioned components on this level.

Regarding the P-value= 0.088 for the tendency to keep on the effort, the null hypotheses is totally accepted, that is there is no significant relationship between indulgent parenting style and this component.

Table 1. Description of mean and standard deviation of parenting styles scores in the sample group

Parenting style	Mean	SD	Number
Authoritarian	58.2	8.8	200
Authoritative	45.6	4.3	200
Permissive	18.9	3.0	200

Table 2. Pearson correlation coefficient of authoritarian parenting style and self-efficacy

Items	Coefficient correlation	Number	P-value
The tendency to initiate behavior	0.292	200	0.000
Tendency to keep on the effort	0.143	200	0.044
Insisting in task	0.184	200	0.044
Self-empowerment	0.235	200	0.001
General self-efficacy	0.271	200	0.000

Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficient of authoritative parenting style and self-efficacy

	Coefficient correlation	Number	P-value
The tendency to initiate behavior	0.249	200	0.000
Tendency to keep on the effort	0.050	200	0.485
Insisting on task	0.189	200	0.007
Self-empowerment	0.207	200	0.003
General self-efficacy	0.218	200	0.002

Table 4. Pearson correlation coefficient of Indulgent parenting style and self-efficacy

	Coefficient correlation	Number	P-value
The tendency to initiate behavior	0.281	200	0.000
Tendency to keep on the effort	0.121	200	0.088
Insisting on task	0.371	200	0.000
Self-empowerment	0.339	200	0.000
General self-efficacy	0.354	200	0.000

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

There is a positive correlation and relationship between authoritarian, authoritative and indulgent parenting styles with self-efficacy. Authoritative style has constantly been found to be correlated with positive self-perceptions while authoritarian style has repeatedly been found to be correlated with negative self-perceptions by Buriat al.[6], Klein et al. [13], Lamborn et al. [14].

The obtained results is consistent with the previous studies such as Behpajuh[15], Talebimarand[16], Mehrafruz [17], Carr[1], Ahadi & Jomhari [18], Mohamadi Sani[19], Dulabi [20], Bagrpanah[21], SiamakiKhabushan [22], Bahreini, [23], Vanderzanden [24], Mason[10].

REFERENCES

1. Carr, A. *Positive Psychology: The Science of Happiness and Human Strengths*, 2006. Translated by: Pasha Sharifi, H. & J. NajafiZand, and B.Sanai, Tehran: Sokhan. (Original copy publication date: 2004).
2. Bandura, A. "Self-efficacy", In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, 1994. vol. 4, New York: Academic Press, pp. 71-81.
3. Bradley, R. and C. Corwyn, "Home environment and behavioral development during early adolescent: the mediating and moderating roles of self-efficacy beliefs," 2007. Retrieved on 25th April 2007 from <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/miqa3749/is200104/ain8931115>.
4. Bandura, A. "Self Efficacy: The Exercise of Control", 1995. New York: W.H. Freeman.
5. Bandura, A. Health promotion from the perspective of social cognitive theory, 1998. *Psychological Health*, 13, 623-649.
6. Buri, J.R. & P.A. Louiselle, & T.M. Misukanis, and R.A. Mueller, "Effects of parental authoritarianism and authoritarianism on self-esteem," 1988. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, vol. 14, 271-282.
7. Baumrind, D. "Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior," 1966. *Child Development*, vol 27, 887-907.
8. Baumrind, D. "The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use," 1991. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, vol. 11, pp. 56-95.
9. Berk, L. *Developmental Psychology*. 2002. Translator: Seyed-Mohamadi, Y. Tehran, Arasbaran Publication, (original book publication date, 2001).
10. Mason, P.H. & J. Kickan. K.A. Huston, and J.W. Santrak, *Growth and personality of the child*, 2004. Translated by: Yasai, M. Tehran: Markaz Publication, (Original copy publication: 1980).
11. Biriya, N. & H. Tehrani, & A. Sajedi, & A. Sabah, & F. zarean and H. Voshatti, *Developmental psychology through Islamic sources' 2005 perspective*. Tehran: Samt.
12. Khoinejad, Gh. *Research methods in Educational science*. Tehran, the organization of study and development of universities' 2008. textbooks (SAMT).
13. Klein, H.A. & K.O'Bryant, and H.R. Hopkins, "Recalled parental authority style and self-perception in college men and women," 1996. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, vol. 157, pp. 5-17.
14. Lamborn, S.D. & N.S. Mounts, & L. Steinberg, and S.M. Dornbusch, "Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families," 1991. *Child Development*, vol. 62, 1049-1065.
15. Behpajuh, A. *Principals of establishing human relations with children and adolescents*, 2005. Tehran: Nehzat Pouya.
16. TalebiMarand, Sh. *Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and social and self-efficacy skills of female students in Tehran*, 2006. Unpublished M.A dissertation. Alzahra University.
17. Mehrafruz, H. *Investigating the relationship between the mothers' parenting styles and educational progress*. M.A. dissertation, Teacher Training University (Teacher Training), Education faculty, 1999. Tehran.
18. Ahadi, H. and F. Jomheri, *Developmental Psychology*, 2001. Tehran, Arasbaran.
19. Mohamadi Sani, M. *Comparing the social incompatibility of adolescences' emotional and religious performance in incompatible, imbalanced families and moderate, traditional families*. 2008. Unpublished M.A dissertation, Islamic Azad University of Torbat-e Jam.
20. Dulabi, S. *Investigating the relationship between the parenting styles and children emotional intelligence*, 2009. Unpublished M.A dissertation, Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e Jam.
21. Baqerpanah, M. *Investigating the relationship between parenting styles with improvement motivation and educational progress and depression*. M.A dissertation, Islamic Azad University, 2005. Center Tehran.
22. Siamaki Khobshan, H. *Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and their adolescents running away from home*, 2006. Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e Jam. Unpublished M.A dissertation.
23. Bahreini, Sh. *Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and depression mental health*. 1998. M.A dissertation, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz.
24. Vanderzanden, J. *Development Psychology* 1, 2; Translted by Ganji, H. 2005. Tehran: Savalan (original copy: 2001).