

## Comparison between Parenting Styles and Hope

Vahid Nessai<sup>1\*</sup>, Davood Rastegar<sup>1</sup>, Alireza Rajaei<sup>2</sup> and Gholamreza Khoynnejad<sup>3</sup>

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 hope, 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 (Rabinson, Mondeklo, Elson and Hart, 2001) and also a self-made questionnaire (Rajaei, Khoynnejad and Nessai, 2012) in positive psychological states' filed (hope) were distributed among the participants. Analyzing the result using Cronbakh Alpha and their correlation revealed a significant relationship between parenting styles and hope (P-value= 0.000).

**KEYWORDS:** Positive Psychological States, Parenting Styles, Hope.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

According to Rick Snyder [1]definition, hope is the ability to design pathways toward the desired objectives despite obstacles and barriers, and also agent motivations to apply these pathways [3].

Based on this conceptualization, hope is a powerful tool, once it contains valuable goals which despite challenging, and not insurmountable, barriers are achievable within time. Hope is meaningless once we are sure about obtaining something or achieving on objective, and on the hand when we are sure about the impossibility of reaching to something, we would be frustrated and hopeless. Regarding the mentioned conceptualization, the positive and negative emotions are byproducts of hope and frustration purposeful thinking [1,3].

Snyder's hope theory [1,2,4, 5] has been initiated based on purposeful human actions, but he clearly emphasized roles of the barriers, stressful factors and emotions. Hopeful thinking requires understanding the capacities to face applicable and practical pathways and the energy focused on the target. One experiences a stressful situation when faces a barriers on his way to reach the goal and in most cases people try to find another way toward their goals. It is also quite common to believe that they are able to find alternative ways by themselves [6].

Hopeful adults have distinct psychological profiles [1]. Adults with high level of hope have experiences as much failures as other but they believe in adjustment with challenges and overcoming adversities. They apply positive internal dialogues such as "I can do it" or "I will not give up" and when they face a barrier on the way toward their valuable goals, they seek new and alternative ways or try to be flexible and adopt more accessible goals.

On the other side, the emotional sequence of people with little hope follow a relatively predictable proves of hope to anger, anger to frustration and frustration to apathy. When people with high level of hope face a problem during their adulthood, they try to breakdown major and important issue into smaller, lighter and more manageable issues [3].

Hope is usually the main topic of lecturers, politicians and advertisers. The concept of Learned Optimism, brought hope to the laboratories. The effort to discover permanent and universal reasons for good events and temporary and specific causes for misadventures is the art of hope and relating good events to temporary and specific reasons is hopelessness [3].

You expect the best from future and all your effort and planning is to achieve the bests. Hope, optimism and familial perspectives are capabilities which show a positive state toward future. Expecting good events, the feeling of successful establishment in case of serious effort and planning for future would lead to sustainable happiness in the present and a purposeful life [3].

Diana Baumrind (1972)has mentioned three permissive, authoritarian and authoritative parenting style which have different impacts on children's cognitive and social abilities [8].

---

\*Corresponding author: Vahid Nessai, Department of Psychology, Genral Psychology, Islamic Azad University of Zahedan, Iran; Email: [nessaivahid@gmail.com](mailto:nessaivahid@gmail.com); Tel: 09155219148

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 permissive 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 [9].

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 [10].

## **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 Khojnejad[11], 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 statistics levels in order to analyze the data.

### **3. Instrumentation**

- a. Self-made questionnaire of positive psychological states by Rajaei, Khojnejad and Nessai (2012).
- b. Questionnaire of styles and dimensions of parenting 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 0.876 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), that 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.

#### 4. RESULTS

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

##### 4.1 Authoritarian parenting style and hope

Regarding the P-value=0.001, alpha is significantly meaningful on 1% level and null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between authoritarian style and hope on this level (Table 2).

##### 4.2 Authoritative parenting style and hope

Regarding the P-value = 0.003 alpha is significantly meaningful on 1% level and null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between authoritative style and hope on this level (Table 3).

##### 4.3 permissive parenting style and hope

Regarding the P-value = 0.001 alpha is significantly meaningful on 1% level and null hypotheses is 99% rejected, that is there is a significant relationship between permissive style and hope on this level (Table 4).

**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 hope

	correlation coefficient	number	P-value
hope	0.234	200	0.00

**Table 3.**Pearson correlation coefficient of authoritative parenting style and hope

	Correlation coefficient	number	P-value
Hope	0.212	200	0.003

**Table 4.**Pearson correlation coefficient of Indulgent parenting style and hope

	Correlation coefficient	number	P-value
Hope	0.235	200	0.001

#### 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Lekander[12] in his research showed that the low level of hope has a significant relationship with negative psychological states such as loneliness, low self-confidence, depression and suicide. However, the high level of hope can solve barriers which normally seems hard. The present study has shown a positive correlation and relationship between the authoritarian, authoritative and indulgent parenting styles and hope. This results are consistent with the results of the previous study, Principals of establishing human relations with children and adolescents,[13]. Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and social and self-efficacy skills,[14], Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and their adolescents running away from home, [15], Investigating the relationship between the mothers' parenting styles and educational progress, [16], The Science of Happiness and Human Strengths, (Carr, 2006)3, "Life? Spam human development, [17], Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and depression mental health,[18], Investigating the relationship between parenting styles with improvement motivation and educational progress and depression,[19], Investigating the relationship between the parenting styles and children emotional intelligence,[20], Handbook of positive psychology[4].

## REFERENCES

1. Snyder, C.R. Genesis: The birth and growth of hope. In C.R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications* (pp 25-38). 2000. San Diego: Academic Press.
2. Snyder, C.R. Hope theory Rainbows: in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2002. 13(4), 249-275.
3. Carr, A. *Positive Psychology: The Science of Happiness and Human Strengths*. Translated by: Pasha Sharifi, H. & J. Najafi Zand, and B. Sanai, 2006. Tehran: Sokhan. (Original copy publication date: 2004).
4. Snyder, C.R. and S.J. Lopes, *Handbook of positive psychology* Oxford: 2002. Oxford University press.
5. Snyder, C.R. Teaching: The lessons of hope, 2005. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(1), 72-84
6. Snyder, C.R. *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here*. 1994. New York: Free Press.
7. Seligman, M. *Inner happiness of positive psychology at the service of sustainable satisfaction*, 2010. Translated by: Tabrizi, M. & R. Karimi, and A. Nilufari, Tehran: Danjeh.
8. Berk, L. *Developmental Psychology*. 2002. Translator: Seyed-Mohamadi, Y. *Research Methods in Education* (original book publication date, 2001).
9. 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 Publization, (Original copy publication: 1980).
10. Biriya, N. & H. Tehrani, & A. Sajedi, & A. Sabah, & F. zarean and H. Voshatti, *Developmental psychology through Islamic sources' perspective*, 2005. Tehran: Samt.
11. Khojnejad, gh. *Research Methods in Education*. Tehran: 2008. Research and Development Center for Humanities, SMT.
12. Lekander, B.J. *The relationship of coping, hope, loneliness and spiritual perspective in adult family caregivers of hospitalized adults*, 2000. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota).
13. Behpajuh, A. *Principals of establishing human relations with children and adolescents*, 2005. Tehran: Nehzat Pouya.
14. Talebi Marand, 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.
15. 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.
16. Mehrafray, H. *Investigating the relationship between the mothers' parenting styles and educational progress*, 1999. M.A dissertation, Teacher Training University (Teacher Training), Education faculty, Tehran.
17. Seligman, M. "Life? Spam human development". Brooks Cole publishing Company, 1999. p. 267-196.
18. Bahreini, Sh. *Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and depression mental health*. 1998. M.A dissertation, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz.
19. Bagerpanah, M. *Investigating the relationship between parenting styles with improvement motivation and educational progress and depression*, 2005. M.A dissertation, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Center.
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.