Association of Parenting Style with Self-efficacy and Resilience of Gifted and Ordinary Male High School Students in Sari, Iran
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ABSTRACT

Background and objectives: Parenting style is a determinative and important factor in psychopathology and child development. The quality of parent-child relationship has a significant impact on self-efficacy, happiness and resilience of individuals. The objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between parenting style and self-efficacy and resilience of gifted and normal male students in Sari, Iran.

Methods: This descriptive correlational study was performed on 120 gifted students and 120 ordinary male high school students of Sari in 2017. Data were collected using the Baumrind’s parenting style questionnaire, Connor-Davidson resilience scale and Sherer's general self-efficacy scale. The data were analyzed by SPSS-16 using descriptive and inferential statistics (Pearson correlation coefficient and t-test).

Results: Authoritative parenting style had a significant and positive correlation with students’ resilience (P = 0.0001) and self-efficacy (P = 0.0005). There was a significant and negative correlation between the authoritarian and permissive parenting styles and students’ resilience (P = 0.0001). In addition, the mean scores of parenting styles, self-efficacy and resilience were significantly different between ordinary and gifted students (P<0.0001).

Conclusion: The results of this study indicate the important role of parenting style in the self-efficacy and resilience of students. Therefore, it is recommended to educate parents about positive and constructive parenting styles in order to prevent the consequences of unhealthy parenting styles.
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INTRODUCTION
According to studies, the majority of people have average intelligence and talent, and a minority of highly intelligent and talented individuals requires special education (1). Children require particular support during childhood when they can grow in different aspects (2). Parents are one of the factors affecting the growth and development of children and students (both gifted and normal). With an appropriate educational style, parents can contribute to motivation and academic achievement of students (3). According to Baumrind, child-rearing is a parent control function, which is divided into authoritarian, authoritative and permissive styles (4). Raising children is challenging because they are constantly exposed to various social, emotional, behavioral and educational risk factors (5). Seth and Asudani believe that parenting style can have a significant impact on the academic performance of high school students. They showed that students whose parents behave permissively perform very poorly at school. Students whose parents are oppressive behave logically and principled. However, these individuals have poor social skills and suffer from depression. Students whose parents are democratic and authoritative have a lower tendency toward drug abuse and risky behaviors (6). Dwairy also claimed that authoritative parenting of gifted students has a positive effect on the child’s mental health compared to authoritarian parenting (7). Therefore, understanding the parenting styles and their impact on behavior of ordinary and gifted students can be useful (8). Self-efficacy or self-belief in one’s own ability is important for academic achievement. Self-efficacy is a person’s expectation of being able to organize and execute the behaviors required for successful completion of a task (5). From the point of view of social cognitive theorists, individuals with a high self-efficacy level who resist against tensions and interpersonal demands are less vulnerable to social stress (9). Individuals with high self-esteem also experience anxiety and stress in classroom and social interactions. High self-efficacy with low psychological stress is correlated with greater motivation for pursuing health and education programs (10). Bandura showed that self-efficacy significantly affects the growth, cognitive function, learning, internal motivation and academic achievement of individuals through a variety of processes (11). Psychological resilience refers to the dynamic process of positive adjustment with unpleasant experiences (12) and the capacity to recover from social, financial or emotional challenges (13). Highly resilient people often return to normal state by creating positive emotions after stressful confrontations (14). The findings of Rose and Steen indicated the positive effect of resilience interventions on personal, social and educational performance of high school students (15). Yu et al. have also shown that students with low resilience are at greater risk of psychological problems, such as depression, frustration, behavioral disorders, violence, smoking, drugs and sexually transmitted infections. Moreover, in terms of academic achievement, they are weak and inadequate (16). Therefore, it seems important to promote resiliency skills in high school students (both ordinary and gifted) (17). Given the results of previous studies and the importance of parenting styles, self-efficacy and resilience on the future generations, we aimed to study the relationship between parenting style and self-efficacy and resilience of ordinary and gifted male students.
MATERIAL AND METHODS
This descriptive correlation study was conducted on gifted and ordinary male high school students in city of Sari (Iran), during academic year 2017. Given the limited number of gifted high school students in the city (198 students), 120 were selected through simple random sampling. Additionally, 120 ordinary students were enrolled via multistage cluster sampling method. All subjects were 16-18 years of age and studying at high schools of Sari during the academic year 2016-17. Exclusion criteria included failure to complete the questionnaires, occurrence of severe stressful events or acute physical and psychological crisis over the past three months (death of relatives, divorce of parents, etc.) and lack of willingness to participate in the research.

The researcher first explained the purpose of the study and ensured participants of data confidentiality. Data were collected using a demographic form (on age, grade of students, parents’ education level and occupation, ethnicity, etc.), Baumrind’s parenting style questionnaire (10 questions for each parenting style scored 0-4) (18), Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC) (25 questions scored 0-4) (19), and Sherer’s general self-efficacy scale (10 questions scores 0-4) (20). Validity and reliability of the Baumrind’s questionnaire was investigated and confirmed by Buri et al. as well as Jafarzadeh et al. in Iran (18, 21). Ranjbar et al confirmed the reliability of the CD-RISC by obtaining a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.84 (22). Validity and reliability of the Sherer’s general self-efficacy scale have been confirmed in a study by Rajabi (23).

After obtaining necessary permissions, the researchers provided all students with the questionnaires, which were immediately collected after completion. Data were analyzed by SPSS (version 16) using descriptive and inferential tests (Pearson correlation coefficient and t-test) at statistical significance level of 0.05.

RESULTS
The average age of ordinary students and gifted students was 15.31±3.94 and 15.56±3.91 years, respectively. The mean average score of ordinary students and gifted students was 18.51±1.1 and 19.62±0.6, respectively (Table 1).

### Table 1. Absolute and relative frequency distribution of demographic characteristics in ordinary and gifted students of Sari, Iran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characteristic</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th>Ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fars</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkman</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baloch</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate/under diploma</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/advanced diploma</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results showed that the parenting style differed significantly between gifted and ordinary students (P<0.05). The authoritative parenting style was significantly more common among gifted students (P<0.0001) (Table 2).

### Table 2. Comparison of mean score of parenting styles between ordinary and gifted students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenting style</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>P-value (t-test)</th>
<th>Mean ± standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>32.14 ± 4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.14 ± 5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>28.4 ± 5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.59 ± 6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>36.37 ± 4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.47 ± 3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>96.91 ± 8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.55 ± 7.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the mean scores for self-efficacy and resilience were significantly higher in gifted students (P<0.0001) (Table 3).

### Table 3. Comparison of self-efficacy and resilience scores between ordinary and gifted students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>P-value (t-test)</th>
<th>Mean ± standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>62.77 ± 9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.86 ± 7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>91.86 ± 8.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlation analysis showed a significant and positive relationship between the authoritative parenting style and students’ resilience and self-efficacy. In addition, there was a significant and negative correlation between the authoritarian and permissive parenting styles and students’ resilience (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>Permissive</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

We found a positive and significant relationship between the authoritative parenting style and students’ self-efficacy. In this parenting style, several responsibilities are shared between parents and students, which enhance students’ skills and level of performance. These students can also perform better under stressful circumstances. These findings are in line with results of Jaeckel et al. and Ford (24, 25). We also found that an authoritative parenting style may increase child's self-efficacy, which is supported by previous studies (26-30).

There was a significant and positive correlation between resilience and authoritative parenting. On contrary, there was a significant and negative correlation between authoritarian and permissive parenting and resilience of students. Under authoritative parenting, students learn that conflict is best resolved when views of the opposing party are taken into account in a friendly negotiation. This set of skills will solve the problem effectively, and creates a good relationship with peers that eventually lead to a good social support network, thus generating positive excitement and increased resilience (31). In permissive parenting however, parents may be reluctant to educate their children, thus children are more likely to act on their own, having difficulty coping with problems without the support of others and previous experience (32). Similarly, in authoritarian parenting, given that the management of affairs and decision making are the parents’ responsibility, the child is Passively involved in this regard and merely the executor of orders. Therefore, there is not enough time to gain experience, understand problems and the way to deal with them. As a result, the ability to fight and resist problems cannot be well nurtured, and the process of resilience is not properly learnt. On the other hand, punishment by harsh and strict parents can spoil children’s emotional connection with other students and reduce their resilience (33). The results of our study are consistent with the results of Petrovskii et al., which showed that exclusion and punishment are negatively associated with resilience (34). Taylor et al. also showed that authoritarian parenting could negatively affect children’s resilience (35). Jafarzadeh et al. demonstrated a negative relationship between authoritarian parenting and happiness and resilience of students. However, they found no significant relationship between permissive parenting and resilience. They also reported that authoritative parenting is positively correlated with happiness and resilience of students (21), which is in line with our findings. Contrary to our findings, Mirzamohmadi et al. revealed a positive correlation between permissive parenting and student resilience (31). This could be due to the difference in the type of questionnaires used.
The authoritative parenting style was more commonly implemented by parents of gifted students, who had better self-efficacy and resilience than ordinary students. The Shafighi stated that authoritative parenting and authoritarian parenting are more common among gifted students and ordinary students, respectively (37). Karim mansor concluded that the mean score of critical thinking, resilience and emotional intelligence is significantly higher in gifted students compared to ordinary students (38). Afroz et al. also revealed that gifted students have better mental health and self-efficacy than normal students (39), which is consistent with our findings. Ordinary students have low self-efficacy compared to gifted students and therefore require more attention by psychologists, consultants, managers and other school staff.

Since our subjects were only selected from limited areas of the city of Sari, the results may not be necessarily generalized to other schools in the country. It is suggested to use more valid assessment methods, such as interviews, and investigate this issue in both males and females.

CONCLUSION
The results of this study indicate the important role of parenting style in the self-efficacy and resilience of students. Therefore, it is recommended to educate parents about positive and constructive parenting styles in order to prevent the consequences of unhealthy parenting styles.
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