Journal Clinical and Basic Research (JCBR): 2018: Vol. 2: N.3.P:25-32 Original Article

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

Maboudeh Mohammadi[1], *Akram Sanagoo[2], Abolfazl Kavosi3, Ali Kavosi[2]

1. Islamic Azad University, Sari Branch, Sari, Iran
2. Nursing Research Center, Golestan University of Medical Sciences, Gorgan, Iran
3. Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Department of Educational Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Gorgan Branch, Gorgan, Iran

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.

KEYWORDS: Parenting style, self-efficacy, resilience, gifted and normal student

Received: 2018/03/11 **Revised:** 2018/08/1 **Published:** 2018/12/1

Corresponding Author: Akram Sanagou

Address: Nursing Research Center, Golestan University of Medical Sciences, Gorgan, Iran,

Telephone: +98-1732430360 **Email:** sanagoo@goums.ac.ir

[DOI: 10.29252/jcbr.2.3.25]

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.

[DOI: 10.29252/jcbr.2.3.25]

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

Demographic characteristic		Gifted		Ordinary	
		Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Age	**14 years**	**5.8**	**7**	**5.8**	**7**
	15 years	**40.8**	**49**	**56.7**	**68**
	16 years	**44.2**	**53**	**37.5**	**45**
	17 years	**9.2**	**11**	**0**	**0**
Ethnicity	**Fars**	**98.3**	**118**	**97.5**	**117**
	Turkman	**0.8**	**1**	**0**	**0**
	Baloch	**0.8**	**1**	**0.8**	**1**
	Turk	**0**	**0**	**1.7**	**2**
Mother's education	**Illiterate/under diploma**	**0.8**	**1**	**18.3**	**22**
	Diploma/advanced diploma	**21.7**	**26**	**54.2**	**65**
	Bachelor's degree or higher	**77.5**	**93**	**27.5**	**33**

[DOI: 10.29252/jcbr.2.3.25]

Father's education	**Illiterate/under diploma**	**0.8**	**1**	**24.2**	**29**
	Diploma/advanced diploma	**14.2**	**17**	**47.2**	**59**
	Bachelor's degree or higher	**85**	**102**	**28.6**	**32**
Mother's occupation	**Unemployed/housewife**	**36.7**	**44**	**77.5**	**93**
	Governmental	**50**	**60**	**17**	**18**
	Non-governmental (engineer, doctor, etc.)	**13.3**	**16**	**7.5**	**9**
Father's occupation	**Unemployed/housewife**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	Governmental	**60.9**	**73**	**44.2**	**53**
	Non-governmental (engineer, doctor, etc.)	**39.1**	**47**	**55.8**	**67**

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

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

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

Variable	Group	P-value (t-test)	Mean ± standard deviation
Self-efficacy	Ordinary	0.000	62.77 ± 9.20
	Gifted		67.86 ± 7.71
Resilience	Ordinary	0.000	91.86 ± 8.17

[DOI: 10.29252/jcbr.2.3.25]

	Gifted		97.20 ± 8.13

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 4. Correlation between parenting styles and students' self-efficacy and resilience

Parenting style	Authoritarian		Permissive		Authoritative	
Variable	P-value	Correlation coefficient	P-value	Correlation coefficient	P-value	Correlation coefficient
Self-efficacy	0.127	-0.83	0.079	-0.12	0.005	0.94
Resilience	0. 001	-0.35	0.001	-0.21	0.001	0.30

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.

[DOI: 10.29252/jcbr.2.3.25]

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). Karimmansor concluded that the mean score of critical thinking, resilience and emotional intelligence is significantly higher in gifted students compared to ordinary students (38). Afrooz 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.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article has been derived from a Master's thesis in general psychology. The authors would like to thank the Islamic Azad University of Sari for financial support and all participants in the study for their cooperation.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There is no conflict of interest to declare.

Surgical intervention.

authoritarian parenting is a direct, strict style that contrasts with the need for autonomy present in gifted students (36). Soleimani and

REFERENCES

1. Narimani M PA, Andalib M. A comparison of parenting styles and eating disorders in normal and bright students. Journal of school psychology. 2013;2(1):155-63.[Persion]

2. Bracken BA, Brown E. Behavioral identification and assessment of gifted and talented students. Journal of Psychoeducational assessment. 2006;24(2):112-22.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282905285246

3. Gere DR, Capps SC, Mitchell DW, Grubbs E. Sensory sensitivities of gifted children. American Journal of Occupational Therapy. 2009;63(3):288-95.

https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.63.3.288

4. Baumrind D. The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. The Journal of Early Adolescence. 1991;11(1):56-95.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431691111004

5. Narimani M EM, Dehghan H,Gholamzad H, Safarinia M. A comparison of the big five personality traits and selfefficacy of gifted and normal students. Journal of School Psychology. 2013;2(3):164-80 . [Persion]

6. Seth, M and Asudani, V. Parenting styles and their impact on educational performance of children at high Scholl level: review ofliterature, Indian Streams Research Journal.2013; 3: 1- 6.

7. Dwairy M. Parenting styles and mental health of Arab gifted adolescents. Gifted child quarterly. 2004;48(4):275-86.

https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620404800403

8. Morawska A, Sanders MR. Parenting gifted and talented children: Conceptual and empirical foundations. Gifted Child Quarterly. 2009;53(3):163-73.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986209334962

9. Brigandi CB, Siegle D, Weiner JM, Gubbins EJ, Little CAJJftEotG. Gifted secondary school

[DOI: 10.29252/jcbr.2.3.25]

students: The perceived relationship between enrichment and goal valuation. 2016; 39(4):263-87.

10. Afrooz G, Arjmandnia A, Taghizadeh H, Ghasemzadeh S, Asadi R. The Comparison of Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Mental Health between Gifted and Normal Students. Middle Eastern Journal of Disability Studies. 2014;3(3):27-38. [Persion]

11. Bandura, A. Perceiving self- efficacy in cognitive development and functioning, Educational Psychology.1993; 25: 82- 91.

12. Bakhshayesh A, R. Investigating the relationship between resilience and friendship quality with life satisfaction among students. Scientific Journal Management System. 2016;7(25):145-58. [Persion]

13. Resnick B, Gwyther LP, Roberto KA. Resilience in aging: Concepts, research, and outcomes: Springer Science & Business Media; 2010.

14. Salehi Z PPF, Pashaee L,Hatami H. Relationship of Resiliency against Stress with Humor and Hope for Future in Collegiate Girls. Journal of Women and Society. 2013;6(22):99-116[Persion].

15. Rose J, steen S. The Achieving Success Everyday Group Counseling Model: Fostering Resiliency in Middle School Students. Professional School Counseling.2014;18(1):28-37.
https://doi.org/10.5330/prsc.18.1.m07lu0hr6636j1t4

16. Yu, X. N, Lau, J. T, Mak, W.W. Zhang, J. Lui, W.W. Zhang J. Factor structure and psychometric properties of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale among Chinese adolescents. Compr Psychiatry.2011; 52(2):218-24.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsych.2010.05.010

17. Riasi H MM, Salehi Abarqui M, E. Hassanzadeh Taheri E,Hassanzadeh Taheri M. A comparative study of depression in gifted and normal students in Birjand city during 2008-2009 school year. Modern Care, Scientific Quarterly of Birjand Nursing and Midwifery Faculty. 2012;9(2):95-103. [Persion]

18. Buri JR. Parental authority questionnaire. J Pers Assess. 1991;57(1):110-9.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5701_13

19. Connor KM, Davidson JRJD, anxiety. Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). 2003;18(2):76-82.

20. Sherer M, Maddux JE, Mercandante B, Prentice-Dunn S, Jacobs B, Rogers RWJPr. The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. Psychological Reports. 1982; 51(2):663-671

https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1982.51.2.663

21. Jafarzadeh N, Farokhi NA, Sohrabi F. Relationship of Parenting Styles with Resiliency and Happiness of Students, Educational Psychology.2016; 11(37):67-82. [Persion]

22. Ranjbar F KA BA, Barmas H. Resiliency and quality of life of mothers with mentally retarded children. Health and Psychology. Health and Psychology. 2011;1(1):177-87. [Persion]

23. Rajabi GH. Survey the reliability and validity of general self- efficacy scale. New educational thought. 2006; 2(1, 2): 111- 122. [Persian].

24. Jaeckel D, Seiger CP, Orth U, Wiese BS. Social support reciprocity and occupational self-efficacy beliefs during mothers organizational re-entry. Journal of vocational behavior.2012; 80: 390-399.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.12.001

25. Ford RC. Dckson DR. Enhancing customer self-efficacy in co-producing servis experiences. Business horizons. 2012; 55:179-188.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.11.005

26. Tom B, Chong A, Kadirvelu A, Khoo Y. Parenting styles and self- efficacy of adolescents: Malaysian scenario. Global journal of human social Science. 2012;12: 18- 25.

27. Heaven P, Ciarrochi J. Parenting styles, gender and the development of hope and self-esteem. European Journal of Personality. 2008;22:707- 727.

https://doi.org/10.1002/per.699

[DOI: 10.29252/jcbr.2.3.25]

28. Yosefzadeh I, Eshaghigorji M, Hojati A, Etemadi A. An investigation of the self efficacy and optimism in high school female students and their relationship with mother's parenting style. Quarterly woman & study of family. 2014;7(33):123-138. [Persion]

29. Tozandehjani H, Tavakolizadeh J, Lagzian Z. The Effect of Parenting Styles on Self-efficacy and Mental Health of Students. Horizon Med Sci . 2011; 17 (2) :56-64 [Persion]

30. Hosseini DF, Saadat S, Ghasemijobaneh R. Relationship between parenting styles, self-efficacy and attitude to delinquency among high school students. Pazhouhesh name hoghough e keyfari. 2014; 4(2): 67-88. [Persion]

31. Mirzamohammadi Z, Mohsenzadeh F, Arefi M. The Relationship between Parenting Styles, Psychological Hardiness, and Students' Resilience . QJFR. 2017; 13 (4) :97-120

32. Dabiri S DA, Sarami G,Falsafi Nejad M. Formulating Relationships Model of Parenting Styles, Personality,Self-Esteem and Happiness: Path Analysis Model. Journal of Family Research. 2012;8(2):141-59. [Persion]

33. Kamijani M MF. Comparison of parenting styles of adolescent parents with behavioral disorder and normal adolescents. Knowledge and Research in Applied Psychology. 2007;9(33):63-94. [Persion]

34. Petrowski K, Brähler E, Zenger M. The relationship of parental rearing behavior and resilience as well as psychological symptoms in a representative sample. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2014; 7(12):95. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-12-95.

https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-12-95

35. Taylor ZE, Eisenberg N, Spinrad TL, Widaman KF. Longitudinal relations of intrusive parenting and effortful control to ego-resiliency during early childhood. Child Dev. 2013;84(4):1145-51. doi: 10.1111/cdev.12054. Epub 2013 Feb 4.

https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12054

36. Pakdaman M, Khamesan A, Baratie F. The role of maternal parenting styles in adolescent social maturity (gifted, less stepwise and retarded). Journal of Educational Psychology studies. 2011;8(14):23-41. [Persion]

37. Soleimani B, Shafighi D. The Relationship between Parenting Patterns with Mental Health and Academic Achievement of Gifted and Secondary Students of Secondary School in Ardabil. Third International Conference on Science and Technology of Education in Social Studies and Psychology of Iran. 2017:21. [Persion]

38. Karimmansor F. Comparing Critical Thinking, Resilience and Emotional Intelligence in Gifted and Normal High School Students in District 19 of Tehran. First Scientific Conference on Educational Sciences and Psychology of Social and Cultural Dangers in Iran. 2014.

39. Afrooz GA, Arjmandnia AA, Taghizadeh H, Ghasemzadeh S, Asadi R. The Comparison of Self Efficacy Beliefs and Mental Health between Gifted and Normal Students. Middle Eastern Journal of Disability Studies. 2014; 3 (3):27-38. [Persion]

[DOI: 10.29252/jcbr.2.3.25]