Original Article

Psychological Hardiness and Perceived Parenting Style among Higher Secondary School Students

Abida Gull[1], Dr. Amina Parveen[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Education, University of Kashmir

[2]Professor, Department of Education, University of Kashmir

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine psychological hardiness and perceived parenting styles of higher secondary students. The said variables were also compared on the basis of gender. In this Descriptive study, 1210 higher secondary school students (621 boys and 589 girls) were selected via Multistage random sampling technique from three districts of Kashmir division. Psychological hardiness scale developed by Singh and Parenting Style Scale by Gupta & Mehtani were used for data collection. The findings revealed that a sizable portion of students exhibit a moderate level of hardiness. Democratic parenting style was perceived among a significant number of students. The results also indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in parenting style of male and female higher secondary school students while on psychological hardiness the results showed that there exists statistically significant difference between male and female higher secondary school students. In comparison to their female counterparts, male students were shown to have higher challenge and control accepting tendencies, whereas female students had higher commitment levels.

Keywords: *Psychological Hardiness, Perceived Parenting Style, Higher secondary School Students & Gender.*

Introduction

Kobasa (1979) proposed the idea of "hardiness" and described it as a resource for resistance when faced with stressful circumstances. According to Jabeen (2013), "the construct of hardiness was proposed by Maddi and Kobasa with colleagues during the time they carried out a 12-year longitudinal study of managers at Illinois Bell Telephone from 1975 to 1986, which revealed that individuals exhibiting hardy dispositions were more inclined keep themselves healthy and flourish even beneath high levels of stress." hardiness construct, which had its origins in existential theory, such as those of Kierkegaard (1849/1954) M. Sheard, 2013) came forth as a result of study on individual variances in stress reactions. Conceptually, "hardiness" is a personal characteristic variable that emerges early in life and is comparatively constant over time, although being changeable in some circumstances (Maddi & Kobasa, 1984). A pattern of attitudes and abilities known as "hardiness" gives people the tactics and bravery to transform difficult situations into learning opportunities. According to Kobasa, hardiness is a personality quality that serves as a source of resistance and a shield against stressful situations. Early study on hardiness often referred to it as a personality construct composed up of the three interrelated basic tendencies of commitment, control, and challenge that act as a foundation of resistance when confronted with difficult situations. (Kobasa, S.C., et al., 1982 & Kobasa, S.C., 1979). The sensation of integrating into various facets of life, such as family, work, and interpersonal connections, is commitment. One who has this sensation has discovered meaning and purpose in their life, their career, and their families. A belief in control means that life events and their results are predictable, under one's control, and subject to change. Challenge conveys the idea that adapting to a new situation, whether it be positive or unpleasant, is a normal part of life and that such situations should be seen as opportunities for learning and progress rather than as dangers to one's security and comfort. It is well acknowledged that parents are essential to the psychological and behavioural health of their children. Parents have a profound and long-lasting influence on their children's lives (Lipps et al., 2012), as they support the development of the child's physical, mental, and emotional health.

(Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Agarwal & Alex, 2017).

The outcomes of children are influenced by a variety of patterns of parental values, practises, and behaviours, commonly referred to as parenting styles (Baumrind, 1991) (Deater-Deckard, 2005; Mahapatra & Batul, 2016). Being a parent is a challenging task that incorporates various patterns. Parents' and children's health status, can have an impact on parenting methods (Xu et al., 2005; Tahseen, & Schultz, 2009; Cheah, Leung; Woolfson & Grant, 2006) The Baumrind Classification serves as the foundation for identifying and categorising parenting style as described by (Alarcon, 1997; Yahaya & Nordin, 2006). According to him, the vast majority of parents use one of the following parenting philosophies: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, or uninvolved. **Authoritative** Parents are also attentive to the requirements of their children. As a result, they are in command without being harsh. They frequently engage actively and with great parental involvement in the lives of their children. according to K. Aunola et al. (Paulson, 1994; Grolnick and Ryan, 1989), a lot of free conversation (Maccoby and Martin, 1983), believing in the child (Pulkkinen, 1982), support for psychological independence (Ginsburg and Bronstein, 1993), and high levels of behaviour and control over monitoring, including knowledge of their kids' whereabouts, companions, and activities (Barber, 1996, Steinberg et al., 1989 & McCord, 1979). **Authoritarian** Controlling parents are demanding but unresponsive. They display less affiliate bonds than cautious parents do with their children. Their parenting is characterised by a strict control that is more adult-centered than child-centered, low levels of trust and interaction with their child, and a disincentive to open communication. (Maccoby and Martin, 1983 & Pulkkinen, 1982). **Permissive** parents are responsive yet not strict. Their approach towards their child is typically one of warmth, acceptance, and child-centeredness (Baumrind, 1989; Maccoby and Martin, 1983;). According to (Reitman, Rhode, Hupp, and Altobello 2002; Baumrind 1991), children raised by permissive parents are generally viewed as worsen, selfish, dependent, and irresponsible. They also have weak social skills and low self-esteem, rowdy and indifferent to the needs of others. (Bigner, 1994; Wenar, 1994) and antisocial. Although it lacks parental control and is characterised by non-demanding parental behaviour, from authoritative parenting in this regard. This parenting style is characterised by parents who do not demand that their children behave in a mature manner instead allowing them to act independently and autonomously (Baumrind, 1991). **Uninvolved** parenting, Parents who don't participate aren't attentive or demanding. They frequently fail to watch over or supervise the child's behaviours as well as to assist or encourage the child's ability to self-regulate (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Along with a non-controlling attitude, this is characteristic of them (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby and Martin, 1983;). These parents don't have a close relationship with their kids and don't discipline them. Instead of punishing the children for their bad behaviour, parents often act like they don't care whether their kids behave well or badly. Most of the time, these parents left their kids alone and there is very little parent-child interaction (Sigelman &Rider 2014, Koerner & Maki, 2004). According to research by Punamaki, Qouta, and El-Sarraj (2001), family dynamics influence how children mobilise their abilities and improve children's coping skills. Parenting that is effective and family cohesion that gives children a sense of security (Punamaki, Qouta, &El-Sarraj, 1997) makes children more stress resilient. Therefore, it is crucial to support the development of the child and achieving positive results to have a better understanding of how the parent's traits can affect parental styles.

Objectives set for the study:
1. To study the prevalence of psychological hardiness and perceived Parenting Style among higher secondary school students
2. To compare male and female students on the different levels of psychological hardiness
3. To compare male and female higher secondary school students on different dimensions of perceived parenting style.

Hypotheses of The Study
1. There exists no significant difference between male and female higher secondary school students on psychological hardiness.
2. There exists no significance difference between male and female higher secondary school students on perceived parenting style.

Method
Sample

The 11th class students, who were the target group for this study, were chosen using the Cluster sampling. Three districts were chosen from the Kashmir division using chit-fold method. There were 1210 higher secondary school students (621 boys and 589 girls) in these chosen districts. After choosing the participants, setting the objectives, and winning their cooperation, questionnaires were given to the participants, who were encouraged to carefully read the questions, choose their responses based on their personality traits, and not leave any questions unanswered. The data were examined using SPSS VERSION 26.Mean, standard deviation, and t-test were employed to analyze the data.

Data collection instruments
Psychological hardiness scale

The 30-item "psychological hardiness scale" by Singh (2008), was used to assess students' capacity to turn unpleasant situations into learning opportunities. There are three components to it: commitment, control, and challenge. According to scale norms, respondents who score 120 or higher on these three dimensions are thought to have a high level of psychological hardiness, respondents who score 80 to 119 are thought to have a moderate level, and respondents who score below 79 are thought to have a low level.

Parenting Style Scale

The percentage of perceived parenting styles was calculated using the "Parenting Style Scale" by Gupta and Mahtani (2017). There are four distinct types of parenting styles represented by the scale's forty-four items: democratic, autocratic,

permissive, and uninvolved. The participants with the highest scores across any of these four parenting styles are considered to have the most common parenting styles, under the scale norms.

Findings:

Table 1: Showing students with different levels of Psychological Hardiness

Levels of psychological hardiness	Frequency	% age
High level	322	26.61
Moderate level	803	66.36
Low level	85	7.02

Table 1 found that a sizeable portion of students—including 803 students, or 66.36% of higher secondary school students—fall under the category of moderate level of psychological hardiness. Similar to this, 322 students, or 26.61% of students, fall under high level of psychological hardiness. while 85 students, or 7.2% of students, fall under low level of psychological hardiness.

Table 2: Showing students with different Perceived Parenting Style

Parenting style	Frequency	% age
Democratic Parenting style	887	73.30
Autocratic parenting style	238	19.67
Permissive parenting style	56	4.63
Uninvolved parenting style	29	2.39

Table 2 revealed that a large percentage of higher secondary school students had one of the four parenting styles, with democratic parenting accounting for 887 students, or 73.30% of the total, autocratic parenting accounting for 238 students, or 19.67% of the total, permissive parenting accounting for 56 students, or 4.63%, and uninvolved parenting accounting for 19 students or 2.39% of students.

Table 3: Showing the mean comparison between male and female l students on Psychological Hardiness

Psychological Hardiness	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
Total psychological hardiness	Male	621	116.01	12.90	2.58	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	589	114.26	10.44		
Commitment	Male	621	37.76	4.77	11.94	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	589	40.87	4.23		
Control	Male	621	38.61	4.24	9.69	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	589	36.20	4.37		
Challenge	Male	621	39.70	4.37	11.65	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	589	37.08	3.37		

Table 3 demonstrated that average psychological hardiness scores for male and female higher secondary school students were 621 and 589, respectively, with a t-ratio of 2.58, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. This showed that there is statistically significant difference in the mean psychological hardiness scores of male and female higher secondary school students. Further Male and female higher secondary school students differed significantly with respect to commitment, control and challenge.

The t-value calculated as 11.94 for commitment, 9.69 for control and respectively 11.65 for challenge components of psychological hardiness which were found to be significant at 0.05 level of confidence. The t-value calculated for commitment dimension of psychological hardiness for females were found to be different as compared to male students which revealed that females are more committed than boys. It can be said that male students possess higher control and challenge ability and compared to their female counterparts, are much harder.

What emerges is that gender plays an important role in determining the psychological hardiness among male and female higher secondary school students. Therefore, the hypothesis 1 stating that there exists no significant difference in psychological hardiness of male and female higher secondary school students is rejected.

Table 4: Showing the mean comparison between male and female students on perceived Parenting Style

Parenting Styles	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
Total Parenting Style	Male	621	62.76	2.90	1.61	Not significant at 0.05 level
	Female	589	63.02	2.67		
Democratic	Male	442	35.60	15.39	1.922	Not significant at 0.05 level
	Female	445	37.25	14.42		
Autocratic	Male	122	16.42	12.27	.337	Not significant at 0.05 level
	Female	116	16.65	12.01		
Permissive	Male	37	7.94	8.02	2.01	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	19	7.12	5.91		
Uninvolved	Male	20	2.79	6.04	2.67	Significant at 0.05 level
	Female	9	1.98	1.98		

Table 4 showed that, there is no significant difference between parenting styles of male and female higher secondary school students, with mean scores of 62.76 and 63.02, respectively and with a t-ratio of 1.61, which is insignificant at 0.05 level of confidence. It was further revealed that on democratic and autocratic parenting styles no significant difference was found between male and female higher secondary school students. While as significant difference was found on permissive and uninvolved parenting styles of higher secondary school students.

Thus, it may be asserted that gender does not play any role in determining parenting styles among male and female higher secondary school students. Therefore, the hypothesis 1 stating that there exists no significant difference in parenting style of male and female higher secondary school students is accepted.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study explored the prevalence of psychological hardiness and parenting styles among higher secondary school students. The results of the investigation revealed that, the majority of students exhibit a moderate level of psychological hardiness as 66.36% followed by 26.61% students in high level of psychological and respectively 7.02% in low level of hardiness. The results further demonstrated that there was a significance differences between male and female higher secondary school students in terms of psychological hardiness. Males were found to be higher on the challenge and control dimensions of hardiness then females while as females were found to be higher in commitment dimension then males. Previous studies supporting these findings are Narad (2018), Rahul (2017) showed that male and female exhibit considerably different levels of psychological hardiness (both the overall and challenge components). Male students are substantially more likely than female students to accept challenges, and they are also much more resilient. Khaledian, Hasanvand & Pour & Dogaheh Khaledian & Arya (2013) found in their study that males are considered to be more hardy than females. Also, Kaur (2011) found significant impact of gender on psychological hardiness & its dimensions except commitment. Also, males were found to possess greater control, higher challenge accepting tendency & were found to be hardier than females.

Results also showed that democratic parenting style was found to be prevalent in majority of students followed by autocratic, permissive and uninvolved parenting styles. Also, it was revealed that insignificant difference exists between the parenting styles of male and female higher secondary school students. Results also depicted that in democratic and autocratic parenting styles no significant difference was found in male and female higher secondary school students. While in permissive and autocratic parenting styles significant difference was found. The results are in consistent with Sharma (2014) and Kaur (2017), who found no discernible differences in parenting styles between senior secondary school girls and boys. According to Akin (2012)'s research, Muslim adolescent pupils have democratic parenting styles. According to Kiran, Farooqi, and Ahmed (2019), who agreed with the study's findings, democratic parenting style comes first, then autocratic and permissive, was most common among secondary school students in Shiwal Division. This study also supports the findings of Efobi and Nwokolo (2014), who came to the conclusion that democratic parenting was most frequently used by parents in Nigeria, followed closely by autocratic, then uninvolved and permissive parenting, which was found to be the least popular parenting style.

It can be concluded that the societal roles and expectations that are placed on both genders are the main causes of these differences. In the Indian culture, males are encouraged to be assertive, while girls are taught to always be calm and submissive. Due to this predisposition towards nurturing children, male children gain greater self-reliance, motivation, and exposure than female youngsters, which may be the primary contributory factor of these findings. Fostering an atmosphere of wellness and giving both genders the same possibilities for growth are necessary to prevent these gaps.

Conflicts of interest
The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

1. Agarwal, S., & Alex, J. (2017). A comparative study between the parenting style of working and non-working mothers and their child's temperament on behavioural problems among school going children. *Indian Journal of Health and Well-being*, *8*,1335–1339. https://doi.org/10.25215/0601.016.

2. Akin, M. (2012). Exploring theology and practice in Islamic parenting [Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida Orlando, Florida].

3. Al-Tala'a, M. (2016). Spiritual intelligence and its relationship with psychological hardiness among students of the Islamic University of Gaza. [Master Dissertation, Islamic University of Gaza].

4. Aunola, K., Stattin, H., & Nurmi, J. E. (2000). Parenting styles and adolescents' achievement strategies. *Journal of adolescence*, *23(2)*, 205-222. https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2000.0308

5. Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, *67*, 3296 -3319. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1996.tb01915.x

6. Baumrind, D. (1971). Types of adolescent life-styles. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, *4*, 1-2.

7. Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*,*11*, 56–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431691111004

8. Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. The encyclopedia of adolescence.

9. Cheah, C. S., Leung, C. Y., Tahseen, M., & Schultz, D. (2009). Authoritative parenting among immigrant Chinese mothers of preschoolers. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *23*,311–320. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015076.

10. Deater-Deckard, K. (2005). Parenting stress and children's development: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Infant and Child Development*, *14*, 111–115.https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.383.

11. Desai Rahul, B. (2017). Psychological hardiness among college students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *4(3)*, 80-4. http://www.ijip.in/

12. Rezaei Dogaheh, E., Khaledian, M., & Arya. M.R. A. (2013). The relationship of psychological hardiness with emotional intelligence and workaholism. *Practice in Clinical Psychology*, *1*(4), 211-217. http://jpcp.uswr.ac.ir/article-1-129-en.html

13. Efobi, A., & Nwokolo, C. (2014). Relationship between parenting styles and tendency to bullying behaviour among adolescents. *Journal of Education & Human Development*, *3*(1), 507-521. http://www.aripd.org/jehd

14. El-Wakeel, H. (2015). Some predictors of psychological resilience among a sample of university students. [Master Thesis, Menoufia University, Egypt].

15. Fonseca, A., Moreira, H., & Canavarro, M. C. (2020). Uncovering the links between parenting stress and parenting styles: The role of psychological flexibility within parenting and global psychological flexibility. *Journal of contextual behavioral science*, *18*, 59-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2020.08.004

16. Ginsburg, G. S. and Bronstein, P. (1993). Family factors related to children's intrinsic/extrinsic motivational orientation and academic performance. *Child Development*, *64*, 1461-1474. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1993.tb02964.x

17. Golpich, Z., Soleymanian, A. A., & Darudi, H. (2012). A study of the relationships between family functioning and psychological hardiness among parents with exceptional children and normal children. *Iranian Rehabilitation Journal*, *10*(2), 56-61. http://irj.uswr.ac.ir/article-1-195-en.html

18. Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Parent styles associated with children's self-regulation and competence in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *81*(2), 143–154. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.81.2.143

19. Inam, A., Nomaan, S., & Abiodullah, M. (2016). Parents' Parenting Styles and Academic Achievement of Underachievers and High Achievers at Middle School Level. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, *38*(1), 57-74. http://pu.edu.pk/home/journal/32

20. Kaur, J. (2011). Influence of gender and school climate on psychological hardiness among Indian adolescents. *International Conference on Social Science and Humanities, IASIT Press, Singapore*,*5*, (319-323).

21. Kardum, I., Kenezevic, H.J., & Krapic, N. (2012). The structure of hardiness, its measurement invariance across gender and relationships with personality traits and mental health outcomes. *Psychological topics*, *21*(3), 487-507.

22. Khaledian, M., Hasanvand, B., & Pour, S. H. (2013). The relationship of psychological hardiness with work holism. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, *5*, 1-9. doi:10.18052/www.scipress.com/ILSHS.5.1

23. Kiran, U., Farooqi, M. T. K., & Ahmed, S. (2019). Parenting Style and Anti-Social Behaviour: An Exploratory Study of Secondary School Students. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, *8*(2), 294-308.http://www.european-science.com

24. Kobasa, S. C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.1.1

25. Kobasa, S. C. (1982). The hardy personality: Toward a social psychology of stress and health. In G. Sanders and J. Suls (Eds.) *Social psychology of health and illness*, *4*, 3-32. Hills Dale, NJ; Erlbaum.

26. Koerner, F.A., & Maki, L. (2004, July 22-25). *Family communication patterns & social support in families of origin & adult children's subsequent intimate relationships*. [Paper presented] The International Association for Relationship Research conference, Madison, WI.

27. Lamborn, S., Mounts, N., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. *Child Development*, *62*, 1049–1065. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131151.

28. Lipps, G., Lowe, G. A., Gibson, R. C., Halliday, S., Morris, A., Clarke, N., & Wilson, R. N. (2012). Parenting and depressive symptoms among adolescents in four Caribbean societies. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health*, *6(1)*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/1753-2000-6-31

29. Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). *Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. Handbook of child psychology*: formerly Carmichael's Manual of child psychology/Paul H. Mussen, editor.

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

31. Mahapatra, S., & Batul, R. (2016). Psychosocial consequences of parenting. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 21*, 10–17. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-21251017.

32. McCord, J. (1979). Some child-rearing antecedents of criminal behavior in adult men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1477-1486. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.37.9.1477

33. Mirzaei, F., & Kadivarzare, H. (2014). Relationship between parenting styles and hardiness in high school students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 3793-3797. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.843

34. Narad, A. (2018). Psychological hardiness among senior secondary school students: influence of home environment. *Man in India, 97(23)*, 775-769. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326265682

35. Lipps, G., Lowe, G. A., Gibson, R. C., Halliday, S., Morris, A., Clarke, N., & Wilson, R. N. (2012). Parenting and depressive symptoms among adolescents in four Caribbean societies. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health, 6(1)*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/1753-2000-6-31.

36. Paulson, S. E. (1994). Relations of parenting style and parental involvement with ninth-grade students' achievement. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 14*, 250-267. https://doi.org/10.1177/027243169401400208.

37. Pulkkinen, L. (1982). Self-control and continuity from childhood to adolescence. *In Life-span development and behaviour, 4*, 63-105.

38. Raisanen, E. D. (2013). The role of harness, family hardiness, and parenting self-efficacy on parenting stress in adoptive parents (Publication NO 518). [Master's thesis, University of Southern Mississippi].

39. Reitman, D., Rhode, P. C., Hupp, S. D. A., & Altobello, C. (2002). Development and validation of the parental authority questionnaire. *Revised. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 24(2)*, 119-127. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015344909518

40. Sigelman, K.C., & Rider A.E. (2014). *Life-span. Human Development.* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

41. Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D. and Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development, 60*, (6), 1424-1436. https://doi.org/10.2307/1130932

42. Woolfson, L., & Grant, E. (2006). Authoritative parenting and parental stress in parents of pre-school and older children with developmental disabilities. *Child: care, health and development, 32*(2), 177-184. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2214.2006.00603.x

43. Wenar, C., & Kerig, P. (2000). *Developmental psychopathology: From infancy through adolescence* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

44. Xu, Y., Farver, J., Zhang, Z., Zeng, Q., Yu, L., & Cai, B. (2005). Mainland Chinese parenting styles and parent-child interaction. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*, 524–531. https://doi.org/10.1177/01650250500147121.

45. Yahaya, A. Nordin, K. (2006) Relationship between self-concepts, motivation and parenting styles effected students achievements. unspecified. pp. 1-14. (Unpublished) Retrieved: 29th June 2009 from http://eprints.utm.my/5911/1/aziziyah_kendiri.