

Research Paper

Parenting Style and Coping Strategies among Adolescents

Dr. Renuka Joshi^{1*}, Vandana Surira²

ABSTRACT

The present study was an attempt to investigate the effect of parenting style on coping strategies among adolescents. The total sample was consisted of 300 subjects equally divided into three parenting style and further equally divided into boys and girls. All the subjects were chosen by using stratified random sampling technique. Keeping in mind the main objectives of the study 3*2 factorial design was formulated where 3 levels of parenting style was matched with two levels of sex (boys and girls) to yield 6 conditions. Parental Authority Questionnaire developed by John R. Buri (1991) was used to identify subjects of all the three parenting style namely: Authoritative, Permissive and Authoritarian. Ways of Coping Scale developed by Folkman and Lazarus (1988) was assessed coping style of the subjects. Different coping strategies measured by the scale are Confrontive Coping, Distancing, Self-control, Seeking Social Support, Accepting Responsibility, Escape Avoidance, Planful Problem Solving and Positive Reappraisal. Means, SD's & F value were computed to analyse the data. Gender differences were found on few dimensions of coping Strategies. Parenting Style was significant on certain dimensions of coping Strategies.

Keywords: *Parenting Style, Coping Strategies and Adolescents.*

Parenting is the process of raising children and providing them with protection and care in order to ensure their healthy development into adulthood. (Kretchmar-Hendricks, M. 2017, January 31). A **parenting style** is a psychological construct representing standard strategies that parents use in their child rearing. Richard Lazarus and Susan Folkman scientifically defined coping as the sum of cognitive and behavioural efforts, which are constantly changing, that aim to handle particular demands, whether internal or external, that are viewed as taxing or demanding. A study by Kheradmand, M. & Ghahhari, S. (2018) revealed that mindfulness and emotion regulation are modulators in the relationship between parenting stress and coping strategies and parenting styles and coping strategies. A study by Nijhof, K. S., & Engels, R. C. (2007) revealed that students raised by authoritative and permissive parents experienced more homesickness with stronger feelings of homesickness than students raised by authoritarian or uninvolved parents. Piko, B. (2001) showed that passive and support-seeking ways of coping were more common among girls, however, this latter way of coping proved to be a more significant correlate of psychosocial health among boys. Both among boys and girls, passive and risky coping factors played a negative role,

¹HOD Psychology Dept., DAV College, Dehradun, India

²Research Scholar HNB Garhwal University Srinagar

*Corresponding Author

Received: October 06, 2022; Revision Received: November 13, 2022; Accepted: November 17, 2022

and problem-analyzing and support-seeking coping factors played a positive role in psychosocial health. Oláh, A. (1995) examined that across cultures girls reported significantly more accommodative, emotion-focused solutions than boys, whereas boys significantly more often mentioned problem-focused or assimilative strategies. Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (1991) study revealed that clear differences were found between the ways in which boys and girls cope. Girls seek more social support and generally are more likely than boys to focus on relationships.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample:

The total sample was consisted of 300 subjects equally divided into three parenting style namely: authoritative, permissive and authoritarian and further equally divided into boys and girls. All the subjects were chosen by using stratified random sampling technique from the schools of Dehradun district. Further Socio-economic status (SES) and educational level of the subjects was matched.

Research Design:

Keeping in mind the main objectives of the study 3*2 factorial design were formulated where 3 levels of parenting style namely: authoritative, permissive and authoritarian were matched with two levels of sex (boys and girls) to yield 6 conditions.

Tools:

1. Parental Authority Questionnaire developed by John R. Buri (1991) were used to identify subjects of all the three parenting style namely: authoritative, permissive and authoritarian.
2. Ways of Coping Scale developed by Folkman and Lazarus (1988) was assessed coping style of the subjects. Different coping strategies measured by the scale are Confrontive Coping, Distancing, Self-control, Seeking Social Support, Accepting Responsibility, Escape Avoidance, Planful Problem Solving and Positive Reappraisal.

Hypotheses:

Considering the main objectives following hypothesis were framed:

1. The subjects of all the three-parenting style will differ significantly from each other on coping strategies and its dimensions.
2. Boys and girls will differ significantly from each other on coping strategies and its dimensions.

Procedure

Rapport was established. Individual tests were done. Total 300 students were selected divided equally into three parenting style namely: authoritative, permissive and authoritarian and further equally divided into boys and girls. All the important and necessary instructions were given to them. Parental Authority Questionnaire and Ways of Coping Scale were given to each subject. After completing both the questionnaire, the sheet was collected from them and the scoring was done by using the respective manual of the scale. The obtained raw data was processed by using Means, SDs and Anovas for parenting style and all the dimensions of ways of coping to test the proposed hypothesis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

To test the first hypothesis Means, SDs and ANOVAs were computed shown in table no. 1 to 3 and the following results were obtained:

Table :1 Showing Means and SDs of total Authoritative, total permissive and total authoritarian.

Variables	Authoritative		Permissive		Authoritarian	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Parenting Style	71.25	10.25	66.67	9.38	70.97	9.23
Confrontive Coping	9.45	3.23	8.59	3.00	8.32	3.22
Distancing	8.63	3.20	7.68	3.12	8.12	8.33
Self-Control	10.59	4.24	9.12	3.57	8.79	3.50
Seeking Social Support	10.57	4.00	8.95	3.14	8.42	3.13
Accepting Responsibility	7.41	3.02	5.74	2.58	5.54	2.57
Escape-Avoidance	12.15	4.61	9.83	3.14	10.29	3.81
Planful Problem – Solving	8.81	3.56	8.37	2.80	8.09	3.24
Positive Reappraisal	11.55	4.36	9.97	3.47	10.19	3.78
Total WC	76.16	21.72	68.25	14.36	67.76	18.59

Table 2: Showing Means and SDs of Total boys and Total girls on all the Variables.

Variables	Boys		Girls	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Parenting Style	69.59	9.49	69.76	9.30
Confrontive Coping	8.98	3.23	8.59	3.12
Distancing	8.33	6.98	7.95	3.30
Self-Control	9.60	3.99	9.40	3.73
Seeking Social Support	10.31	3.67	8.65	3.23
Accepting Responsibility	5.90	2.82	5.89	2.69
Escape-Avoidance	10.51	3.75	10.34	4.10
Planful Problem- Solving	11.64	3.32	8.21	3.11
Positive Reappraisal	10.57	3.76	10.57	4.12
Total WC	72.85	19.65	69.60	17.92

Table 3: Analysis of Variance of all the Variables.

Dimensions	F for A/P/A	F for B/G	Interaction
Confrontive Coping	3.38*	0.94	1.22
Distancing	0.70	0.32	0.61
Self-Control	6.57**	0.29	0.55
Seeking Social Support	3.89*	3.90*	3.20*
Accepting Responsibility	3.73*	0.00	1.52
Escape-Avoidance	3.86*	0.13	0.72
Planful Problem- Solving	1.14	4.10*	0.75
Positive Reappraisal	4.53*	0.00	0.01
Total Ways of Coping	6.27**	1.02	0.06

The F value (table 3) for group was found to be significant at 0.01 level highly significant for total coping strategies indicating that subjects of all the three parenting style differ significantly from each other on overall coping strategies. Observation of mean values (table 1) indicates that in total ways of coping authoritative group obtained higher mean values followed by permissive and authoritarian group. It means that in all the three parenting style impact of authoritative group was found to be higher on overall coping strategies whereas the mean values of authoritarian group were found to be lowest than authoritative and permissive group indicating that on overall coping strategies impact of authoritarian group was found to be lowest. Further the hypothesis was tested for all the dimensions of coping strategies. F value (table 3) for group was found to be significant at 0.05 level for confrontive coping a dimension of ways of coping indicating that subjects of all the three parenting style differ significantly from each other on the level of confrontive coping. Observation of mean values (table 1) indicates that on confrontive coping authoritative group obtained higher mean values followed by permissive and authoritarian group. It means that confrontive coping was highly used by authoritative group whereas authoritarian group mean values were found to be lowest indicating that confrontive coping was used in least manner by authoritarian group. F value (table 3) for group was found to be significant at 0.01 level highly significant for self-control a dimension of ways of coping indicating that subjects of all the three parenting style differ significantly from each other on the level of self-control. Observation of mean values (table 1) indicates that on self-control authoritative group obtained higher mean values followed by permissive and authoritarian group. It means that self-control was highly used by authoritative group whereas authoritarian group mean values were found to be lowest indicating that self-control was used in least manner by authoritarian group. F value (table 3) for group was found to be significant at 0.05 level for seeking social support a dimension of ways of coping indicating that subjects of all the three parenting style differ significantly from each other on the level of seeking social support. Observation of mean values (table 1) indicates that on seeking social support authoritative group obtained higher mean values followed by permissive and authoritarian group. It means that seeking social support was highly used by authoritative group whereas authoritarian group mean values were found to be lowest indicating that seeking social support was used in least manner by authoritarian group. F value (table 3) for group was found to be significant at 0.05 level for accepting responsibility a dimension of ways of coping indicating that subjects of all the three parenting style differ significantly from each other on the level of accepting responsibility. Observation of mean values (table 1) indicates that on accepting responsibility authoritative group obtained higher mean values followed by permissive and authoritarian group. It means that accepting responsibility was highly used by authoritative group whereas authoritarian group mean values were found to be lowest indicating that accepting responsibility was used in least manner by authoritarian group. F value (table 3) for group was found to be significant at 0.05 level for escape-avoidance a dimension of ways of coping indicating that subjects of all the three parenting style differ significantly from each other on the level of escape-avoidance. Observation of mean values (table 1) indicates that on escape – avoidance authoritative group obtained higher mean values followed by authoritarian and permissive group. It means that escape-avoidance was highly used by authoritative group whereas permissive group mean values were found to be lowest indicating that escape-avoidance was used in least manner by permissive group. F value (table 3) for group was found to be significant at 0.05 level for positive reappraisal a dimension of ways of coping indicating that subjects of all the three parenting style differ significantly from each other on the level of positive reappraisal. Observation of mean values (table 1) indicates that on positive reappraisal authoritative group obtained higher mean values followed by authoritarian and permissive group. It

means that positive reappraisal was highly used by authoritative group whereas permissive group mean values was found to be lowest indicating that positive reappraisal was used in least manner by permissive group whereas no significant difference was found on distancing and planful problem-solving. Thus the proposed hypothesis is partially accepted that the subjects of all the three parenting style differ significantly from each other on confrontive coping, self-control, seeking social support, accepting responsibility, escape-avoidance, positive reappraisal and overall coping strategies but no significant difference was observed on distancing and planful problem-solving. Previous study revealed that parenting style correlated with adolescents coping capability. (Lin, T.E. & Lian, T.C. 2011). The present study revealed that the subjects of all the parenting style effects the coping strategies.

To test the second hypothesis Mean, SD and ANOVA were computed shown in table no. 1 to 3 and the following results were obtained:

F value (table 3) for sex for seeking social support was found to be significant at 0.05 level showing that gender difference exists between boys and girls on seeking social support a dimension of ways of coping. Observation of mean values (table 2) for seeking social support boys obtained higher mean values than girls indicating that seeking social support was highly used by boys than girls. F value (table 3) for sex for planful-problem solving was found to be significant at 0.05 level showing that gender difference exists between boys and girls on planful problem- solving a dimension of ways of coping. Observation of mean values (table 2) for planful problem- solving boys obtained higher mean values than girls indicating that planful-problem- solving was highly used by boys than girls whereas no significant difference was found confrontive coping, distancing, self-control, accepting responsibility, escape- avoidance, positive reappraisal and total ways of coping. Thus the proposed hypothesis is partially accepted that boys and girls differ significantly from each other on seeking social support and planful problem-solving but no significant difference was observed on confrontive coping, distancing, self-control, accepting responsibility, escape-avoidance, positive reappraisal and overall coping strategies. Previous studies revealed that there was no gender difference in adolescents' coping styles (Lin, T.E. & Lian, T.C. 2011). Adolescents in all age groups varied their strategies in relation to the type of stressor, but there were no significant gender differences. (Williams, K., & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. 1999). There were no some statistically significant differences in the analysis of coping strategies in the sample in relation to gender. (Caycho, T.P. 2016). The present study revealed that no gender difference was observed on overall coping strategies.

CONCLUSIONS

Finally, it can be concluded that the subjects of all the three parenting style namely authoritative, permissive and authoritarian differ significantly from each other on overall coping strategies and its dimensions. Authoritative group was high on confrontive coping, distancing, self-control, seeking social support, accepting responsibility, escape-avoidance, planful problem-solving, positive reappraisal and overall coping strategies followed by permissive and authoritarian group. Boys and girls no significant difference was observed on overall coping strategies except seeking social support and planful problem-solving. Boys were found to used seeking social support and planful problem-solving in high manner as compared to girls.

REFERENCES

- Caycho, T. (2016). Relationship with parents and coping strategies in adolescents of Lima. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 4(1). 11-59. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2016.v4n1.86>

- Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (1991). Adolescent coping: the different ways in which boys and girls cope. *Journal of adolescence*, 14(2), 119–133. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971\(91\)90025-m](https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971(91)90025-m)
- Kheradmand, M. & Ghahhari, S. (2018, October 17). The Relationship of Parenting Stress and Parenting Styles with Coping Strategies in Adolescents: *The Role of Modulators of Emotion Regulation and Mindfulness*. Vol. 12 (4), 1-5.
- Kretchmar-Hendricks, M. (2017, January 31). *parenting*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/parenting>
- Lin, T. E., & Tam, C. L. (2011). Relationship between perceived parenting styles and coping capability among Malaysian secondary school students. In C. H. Lin (Ed.), *IPEDR Proceedings* (Vol. 5, pp. VI20 - VI24). International Association of Computer Science and Information Technology.
- Nijhof, K. S., & Engels, R. C. (2007). Parenting styles, coping strategies, and the expression of homesickness. *Journal of adolescence*, 30(5), 709–720. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2006.11.009>
- Oláh, A. (1995). Coping strategies among adolescents: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 18(4), 491–512. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.1995.1035>
- Piko, B. (2001). Gender differences and similarities in adolescents' ways of coping. *The Psychological Record*, 51(2), 223-235.
- Sarah Mae Sincero (Nov 13, 2012). Stress and Coping Mechanisms. Retrieved Sep 08, 2022 from Explorable.com: <https://explorable.com/stress-and-coping-mechanisms>
- Wikipedia contributors. (2022, September 1). Parenting styles. In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved 04:22, September 6, 2022, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Parenting_styles&oldid=1107974425
- Williams, K., & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. (1999). Coping strategies in adolescents. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20(4), 537–549. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0193-3973\(99\)00025-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0193-3973(99)00025-8)

Acknowledgement

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interests.

How to cite this article: Joshi, R. & Surira, V. (2022). Parenting Style and Coping Strategies among Adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 10(4), 498-503. DIP:18.01.046.20221004, DOI:10.25215/1004.046