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CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Parenting a teenager is exciting, rewarding and challenging (Dinkemeyer, Mackay, Mackay & Dinkmayer Jr, 1998). Challenges related to raising a teenager suggest that responsibilities of parents are probably too many to count. Among them one can include having to think about developmental milestones as well as contemplating appropriate and acceptable ways of assisting children to reach these milestones at a normative pace (Rubin & Chung, 2006). Lesch and Jager (2013) add that both parents and peer relationships are vital social resources for adolescents, and that relationships between adolescents and their parents are important for global self-worth and well-being. According to Mohammadi, Samavi and Azadi (2013), parenting styles are effective factors which contribute to good and bad development of children and adolescents.

Researchers have found that there are four parenting styles that may be classified as authoritarian, authoritative, permissive and uninvolved (Jago, Davison, Brockman & Page, 2011). In addition to the four broad styles of parenting, Barnhart, Raval and Jansavari (2013) add that parents from varying cultures socialise boys and girls differently. Through socialisation children do not only learn values and norms of the society, they also learn how to cope with life challenges and situations. According to Mohammadi, Samavi and Azadi (2013), coping positively in life can be considered as a result of resilience.

Ballenge-Borwoning and Johnson (2010) explain that the resiliency process describes ways in which an individual adapts to traumatic life events. Common elements in resilience include the acceptance of the presence of risks or adversity as well as protective factors that allow a
person to cope successfully and adapt while overcoming risk and attaining positive results (Kabiru, Beguy, Ndugwa, Zulu & Jessor, 2012). Research focusing on resilience has produced literature that evaluated how parents promoted resilience in their children. The major finding of researchers was that parenting styles have an influence, positive or negative, on their children’s resilience (Hoffman, 2010). Resilience is associated with basic protective systems, which include problem solving, mastery, reasoning, meaning making and self-regulation (Theron, 2012). In the same vein, parenting styles and resilience are closely associated with emotional intelligence.

Schutte, Mallouff, Siminek, Mckenley and Hollander (2002) define emotional intelligence as the degree to which a person can identify and understand emotions in themselves and other people. Similarly, Sung (2010) is of the opinion that other people view it as skills which they employ to succeed as it helps the development of both personal growth and interpersonal relationships. Salami (2011) adds that a student with a high level of emotional intelligence will have self-acceptance, relate well with others, have autonomy and master their environment. Studies on human development have recorded that the developmental period of adolescents is characterised by negative emotions, self-perceptions and heightened emotionality among adolescents. Therefore emotional intelligence serves as a protective factor for adolescents going through difficult challenges in their lives. It is in this context that the relationship between parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents is investigated.
1.2 Background of the study

1.2.1 Parenting Styles

There are different reports on the role of parenting styles in adolescent lives globally and different countries perceive parenting styles differently (Michiels, Grietens, Onghena, & Kuppens 2008). Not only do parents behaviour towards their children affect the adolescent’s psychological health (Flecther, Steinberg & Sellers, 1999), they also assist their approach to deal with overwhelming situations (Werner, 1989). Dwairy et al. (2006) also reported that Arab societies employ authoritarian parenting which does not link to negative consequences on the mental health of adolescents as it is with Western liberal societies. In other situations, indulgent parenting is related to the same or has better effects for children whose parents employ authoritative parenting. Additionally, it was reported in Mexico that adolescents whose parents use authoritative and indulgent methods scored higher on competence and adjustment than adolescents whose parents are neglectful like the Arab people, who live in North and East Africa and the Middle East and tend to be authoritarian compared to those residing in the West (Dwairy & Achoui, 2006). In these cultures, the family has more influence in the individual. Children are taught to value and be loyal to families. The socialization process emphasises punishment to enforce the upholding of values, norms, as well as preferred behaviour. In South Africa, Bhana, Petersen, Mason, Mahintsho, Bell and McKay (2004) found that some parents communicated in passive aggressive and manipulative ways.
1.2.2 Resilience

For the past two decades, research on resilience has received a lot of attention with some reviewing its relationship with well-being and quality of life (Windle, 2011). Masten (2001) defines resilience as good outcomes regardless of harmful threats to development or adaption while Connor and Davidson (2003) add that it represents personal qualities that allow the individual to face and conquer adversity. Werner and Smith (1992) studied a group of children from poor backgrounds with one third of the group being classified as at risk. This study found that there are individuals who thrive even when exposed to stressful situations due to certain resiliencies. A lot of studies have described adolescents who have survived adversity as resilient (Luthar, Cicchetti & Becker, 2000). A study by Kim-Cohen, Moffitt, Caspi and Taylor (2004) found a link between poverty and resiliency with individuals who were exposed to poverty but adapting well regardless of challenges. Findings revealed that maternal warmth promoted positive adjustment for children growing up under impoverished circumstances. Lansford, Malone, Stevens, Dodge, Bates and Petit (2006) explored resiliency among children who have experienced their parents separation and found that children whose parents divorced adjusted more poorly than children whose parents did not divorce. Jaffee et al. (1990) explored resiliency among young people who witnessed intimate partner violence and found that they are able to develop positive outcomes and adjust well. According to Masten (2001) in such studies, children are perceived to be resilient because they are able to function well in areas such as behaviour and emotional competence. Neff and McGehee (2013) maintain that most adolescents face great pressures, for example, stress over academic performance. As a result, many researchers have studied the benefits of adolescents having support from adults (Massinga & Pecora, 2004). Furthermore, because parents help their adolescent children cope with these pressures (Wener, 1989) the parenting style they employ affects their adolescents’ level of resiliency. Ritter (2005) reported that high levels of
resiliency were associated with the authoritative parenting style, while low levels of resiliency were linked to authoritarian and permissive parenting.

1.2.3 Emotional intelligence

Reports exploring emotional intelligence started appearing in the twentieth century when Edward Thorndike studied what he termed social intelligence in 1920, with the aim of describing socially competent behaviour (Chapin, 1942). Emotional intelligence has been defined by Birney, Downey, Hasen, Johnston and Stough (2010), as a set of abilities that are involved with the regulation, management, controlling and using of emotions in decision-making. Salovey and Mayer viewed emotional intelligence as an entity social intelligence while the Bar-On model of intelligence maintains that those who are emotionally intelligent can make sense and express their feelings while understanding others, which helps them to cope with daily challenges (Bar-On, 2006).

According to Goleman (1995), the transition from childhood to adolescence is filled with varying emotions and that adolescents with better emotional competency can cope better with temptations of drugs, sex and alcohol. Not only is emotional intelligence negatively associated with negative behaviour such as bullying and poor academic performance (Kokkinos & Kipritsi, 2012) but learners who have scored high in emotional intelligence show less anxiety, social stress and depressive symptoms (Ruiz-Aranda, Salguero, Cabello, Palomera & Fernandez-Berrocal, 2012). A study by Brackett, Mayer and Warner (2004) revealed that low levels of emotional intelligence are linked to higher possibilities of social deviance. Their study suggests that when people can make sense of their feelings, they are able to make sense of other people’s feelings, making it easier to communicate effectively thus surviving in their environment.
1.3 Problem statement

Coleman (2003) maintains that there are links in the literature associating peer relationship and insecure parental attachment. Peer relationships of adolescents with parental attachment viewed as insecure are characterised by negative feelings during communication for example, withdrawal, aggression and low confidence (Michiels, Grietens, Onghena & Kuppens, 2008). Furthermore, Li, Chi and Zhao (2014) add that adolescents face challenges ranging from academic achievement, self-control, (Resnick, 2000) substance use and adolescent pregnancy.

1.3.1 Parent-child interaction

Methods of interactions between the parent and child are important in the development of the ‘so-called’ problem behaviours in children. For example, researchers like Schneider, Atkinson and Tardif (2001) are of the view that there are links in the literature associating peer relationships and insecure parental attachments. According to Dwairy and Achoui (2006), the psychosocial development of children depends largely on how they are raised by their parents. Furthermore, positive parenting has been proved to promote adolescent development. It is apparent that psychological autonomy, adolescent-parent relationships and the psychological health of adolescents are greatly influenced by the parenting styles employed by parents. Brown, Arnold, Dobbs and Doctoroff (2007) add that there is a significant link between parenting and aggression among children. However, a study by Ungar (2004) reported that adolescents look to adults for support. Stanton, Li, Galbraith, Cornick, Feigelman, Kaljee and Zhou (2000) add that adolescents who experience their parents as positive are less likely to experiment with substances like marijuana.
(Ramirez, Gano, Quist, Burgoon, Alvaro & Grandpre, 2004) and show a decline in school problems (Coley, Morris and Hernandez, 2004). This positive parenting helps adolescents to adjust positively to their challenges. The positive adoption is referred to as resilience.

1.3.2 Resilience allows people to rise above adversities

Neff and McGehee (2013) agree that most adolescents face great pressures such as stress over academic performance. In the same vein, Bonanno (2004) notes that adolescents are exposed to varying and threatening life events and that they cope differently with such challenges. It is in this context that Ballenge-Browning and Johnson (2010) add that the resiliency process describes ways in which an individual adapts to traumatic life events. Therefore resilience serves as a protective factor for adolescents.

Research has been conducted widely among adolescents on various aspects such as parenting styles (Martinez & Garcia, 2007), resilience (Zakeri, Jowkar & Razmjoe, 2010), and emotional intelligence (Alegre, 2011). For example, Bhana (2006) and Roman (2010) explored parenting styles among adolescents in South Africa. These studies did not explore resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents. Furthermore, Samuels and Pryce (2008) explored emotional intelligence levels among adolescents. In this study, the main focus was resilience and the study ignored other characteristics such as emotional intelligence. Lopes and Strauss (2003) conducted a study which aimed at exploring emotional intelligence among adolescents. This study did not include other factors such as parenting styles and resilience. The above mentioned studies were qualitative in nature and did not explore parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents. It is in this vein that the current study explores the relationship of parenting styles on adolescents’ resilience and parenting styles on emotional intelligence in order to close the identified gap.
1.4 Aim of the study

The aim of this study was to explore the relationship between parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents.

1.5 Objectives of the study

The objectives of the study are:

- To explore the relationship between parenting style and resilience among adolescents.
- To explore the relationship between parenting styles and emotional intelligence among adolescents.
- To determine gender differences on perceptions of parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents.

1.6 Significance of the study

The study is thus significant for:

Teachers who work with the learners because they will not only have a better understanding of how the children are brought up, will also be assisted to identify those learners who have specific behavioural needs as a result of poor parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence. Education authorities will have a better understanding of how parenting and upbringing affect learners not only emotionally but also cognitively and affectively so that appropriate strategies are developed to assist teachers.

The outcomes of this study will help educate adolescents about parenting styles and their relationship on resilience and emotional intelligence. As such, adolescents may have an understating of their own behaviour and identify behaviours that are influenced by parenting styles.
The results of this study will heighten and educate parents as well as the community about parenting styles and their relationship with resilience and emotional intelligence. By doing so, parents can become more conscious about their methods of parenting and make necessary changes to benefit the adolescent.

This study may uncover new knowledge that may be used for the practical improvement of parenting styles and for further research.

Psychologists may also have a better understanding of individuals in need of psychological services, thus treating patients accordingly.

1.7 Scope of Study

The study was conducted among Grade 10 learners at a Secondary School in Rustenburg, Moses Kotane Municipality in the North West Province.

CHAPTER TWO

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Introduction

This aim of the study was to explore the relationship between parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents. The current chapter defines the terms used in this
study, and discusses both the theoretical perspective and theoretical framework adapted for this study.

2.2. Operational definitions

2.2.1 Parenting Styles

According to Spera (2014), parenting practices are specific behaviours employed by parents to socialise children and parenting styles refer to emotional environment in which parents’ engage their children. Parenting styles are therefore defined as a “constellation of attitudes towards the child that are communicated to the child and that taken together, create an emotional climate in which the parents behaviours are expressed “(Darling & Steinberg, 1993: 488). In this study the concept parenting style refers to both the milieu in which a child is raised and all practices for child upbringing that parents may employ as measured by the parenting style questionnaire by Buri (1999).

2.2.2 Resilience

According to Ungar and Liebenberg (2011), resilience refers to an individual’s qualities which show one’s capacity to take part in processes that enable one to overcome adversity. In other words, resilience assists individuals to achieve normal levels of psychosocial development.

Van Breda (2001) adds that resilience refers to the individual’s strengths that allow them to rise above adversities. In this study, resilience refers to scores obtained on the resilience scale by Wangnild and Young (1993).

2.2.3 Emotional intelligence
Emotional intelligence has been defined by Birney, Downey, Hasen, Johnston and Stough, (2010) as a set of abilities that are involved with the regulation, management, controlling and using of emotions in decision-making. The Bar-On model takes note of five dimensions that make up emotional intelligence: self-knowledge, interpersonal skills, adaptability, stress management and general mood (Lyusin, 2006). In this study, emotional intelligence refers to scores obtained on the emotional intelligence scale by Schutte et al. (1998).

2.2.4 Adolescents

Adolescent developmental stages can be identified with significant physical and psychological development characteristics as well as socio-cultural norms (Ede, Louw & Louw, 1998). Adolescence is a developmental stage which varies with regard to when it starts and when it ends. Steinberg and Morris (2001) emphasise the challenges accompanying the time of transition during early adolescents. For example, individuals experience significant physiological, emotional, cognitive changes, and they have to deal with societal expectations regarding behaviour. In this study, the concept adolescence refers to the developmental stage which may start from age 13 and end at 19 years (Pickhardt, 2012).

2.3. Theoretical perspective

2.3.1 Parenting Styles

Adults influence adolescents’ lives in many different ways, and consequently, Bandura (1971) suggested that people usually show behaviours which are learnt either intentionally or
unintentionally. Adults in the lives of adolescents influence their identity formation process (Erikson, 1968).

The view expressed by many social commentators is that parental control is the degree to which children’s behaviour is shaped and managed by the parents. Such control may range from being very controlling to having strict or lenient rules. Similarly, parental warmth refers to the ability to accept and respond of their children’s behaviour rather than being rejecting and nonresponsive (Baumrind, 1991). Baumrind formulated four types of parenting styles; these are authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and uninvolved parenting styles.

2.3.1.1 Authoritative Parenting styles

Baumrind (1991) maintains that authoritative parents monitor and set clear expectations for their children’s behaviour. While they openly communicate to their children, they do not intrude or restrict their children. Such parents are not punitive, but rather maintain support even when implementing discipline. Furthermore, Darling (2014) states that parents who employ the authoritative parenting style are strict, consistent and loving. Authoritative parents are flexible in adjusting expectations they place on the child to suit the needs of the child. The child is given the opportunity to voice his or her views although this does not sway his or her decisions (Darling, 2014)

From the preceding discussion it can be construed that authoritative parents encourage their children to be assertive while remaining socially responsible, to be able to be self-regulated and cooperative with those around them (Baumrind, 1991). Authoritative parents are both warm and firm, and their children are encouraged to be independent within limits of their
actions. Adolescents who come from families where authoritative parenting styles are used will learn to negotiate and be part of discussions. Baumrind (1991) noted the authoritative parents want their children to live out their potentials within limits.

Children of authoritative parents are happy, able to perform and achieve success. Parents listen to their children, place limits, teach them to become accountable; encourage independence; let their children be heard, engage their children in discussions and maintain fair and consistent discipline (Maccoby, 1992). Consequently, the structure within which adolescents are raised in the authoritative parenting environment assists them to be more confident to deal with their life challenges in a more practical and realistic way. Dealing with life challenges in a practical and realistic manner provides a fertile ground for development of emotional intelligence and resilience (Maccoby, 1992).

2.3.1.2 Authoritarian parenting style

Authoritarian parents demand highly while they are not responsive to their children. Such parents are obedience-orientated and status-orientated, and they expect their orders to be obeyed with no resistance or explanation (Baumrind, 1991). Darling (2014) states that authoritarian parents are of the view that children are, have strong-will, are self-indulgent and value obedience on higher authority.

In South Africa, Bhana, Petersen, Mason, Mahintsho, Bell and McKay (2004) found that some parents are passive aggressive in their methods of communication and use manipulation to get desired behaviour. In many cases such parents are strict disciplinarians and they insist that children follow their instructions without questioning them. Authoritarian parenting is associated with aggression outside the home, exaggerated shyness, low self-esteem and difficulty taking part in social situation among children (Darling, 2014).
Although there are many disadvantages of authoritarian parenting, this parenting style has yielded positive outcomes in certain countries. For example, Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserie, and Farah (2006) found that in Arab communities that authoritarian parenting doesn’t have unpleasant effects on the adolescent’s psychological health as it does in liberal Western societies.

Baumrind (1991) noted that children of authoritarian parents learn to adjust to expectations placed upon them by their parents, such children are well behaved due to fear. This means, they perform relatively well in school, avoid 'deviant' behaviour, for example, criminal acts, they do not experiment in drugs or alcohol use, cannot make choices by themselves, and because they do not take risks they have difficulty in handling frustration.

While the preceding discussion points to authoritarian parenting style as a typical “recipe for disaster” raising of children, one cannot overlook the influence of cultural backgrounds and differences when dealing with child-rearing practices. For example, Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserie (2006), and Farah (2006) found that adolescents from different cultures react differently to authoritarian parenting. It is apparent that blanket generalisation on the disadvantages of authoritarian parenting may be relative, in some cultures it may be appropriate while in other cultures it may be counter-productive. Similarly, the development of emotional intelligence and resilience requires a structure which authoritarian parenting style may provide. In the same vein, proper socialisation implies the acceptance of values and norms of society which are fundamental for social acceptance and efficacious integration. It may thus be concluded that the structure provided by values and norms may provide a suitable foundation for the development of emotional intelligence and resilience even for children raised in authoritarian parenting style.

2.3.1.3 Permissive Parenting styles
Baumrind (1991) reported that permissive parents are very responsive and not very demanding. They are lenient and do not expect their children to behave in mature ways and avoid confrontation; they nurture and communicate with their children and relate to them as friends more than parents (Baumrind, 1991). Baumrind (1991) highlights that permissive parents value freedom, accept and respond affectively towards them, treat them as equals and are part of the decision making processes. According to Kopko (2007) adolescents of permissive parents struggle with self-control and exhibit egocentric behaviour which may interfere with the healthy development of peer relationships. It may thus be concluded that such adolescents may also struggle with the healthy development of resilience and emotional intelligence.

2.3.2.4 Uninvolved Parenting style

Adolescents of uninvolved parents accept that their parents focus more on their own lives and have some behaviour patterns which are similar to those of the permissive parents (Baumrind, 1971). The major differences are that uninvolved parents do not show any warmth or have demands and interact minimally and sometimes may be neglected. These parents do not focus on their children’s needs and interests; they do not want to be bothered by the teenagers. Kopko (2007) adds that adolescents of uninvolved parents experience difficulties with self-regulation and impulsive behaviour.

2.3.2. Resilience Theory

Resilience is a process through which individuals show positive adaptation regardless of experiences of significant adversity or trauma (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000). While resilience is
not regarded as a personality trait, the construct of resilience is concerned with enhancing abilities and strengths (Panter, Brick & Leckman, 2013). In this respect, Van Breda (2001) adds that resilience refers to the skills that allow competent functioning to commence even when one is experiencing challenges. Skills, are related to abilities, knowledge and insight that one gathers as they experience adversity and meet challenges.

It is apparent that resilience theory is concerned with strengths that enable individuals to rise above adversity. Van Breda (2001) states that resilience theory places much emphasis on strength and less on pathology. A study by Zakeri, Jowkar and Razmjoee (2010) reported a positive significant relationship between parenting styles characterised by acceptance-involvement and resilience. According to Masten and Coastworth (1998), there are adolescent characteristics that are linked to resilience which include support from adults, a sociable disposition, (Compas, Banez, Malcarne & Worsham, 1991), the ability to make decisions and spirituality (Smith & Denton, 2005). This may imply that adolescents with parents that do not show acceptance and are not involved are more likely to score low on resilience.

2.3.3 Bar-On model of intelligence

The Bar-On model of emotional intelligence stipulates that emotional social intelligence is a variety of emotional and social competencies that relate with skills which allow individuals to successfully understand and show feelings, make sense of others and engage with them, as well as cope with the daily expectations and difficulties (Bar-On, 2010).

The five dimensions are presented in the following manner: (1) self-knowledge which entails emotional self-awareness, self-confidence, self-regard, self-actualization and independence; (2) interpersonal skills which refers to whether individuals are empathetic, maintain relationships and commit to responsibilities in society; (3) adaptability which is the ability
to solve problems, test reality and indicate flexibility; (4) stress management which refers to how well individuals tolerate stress and maintain impulse control; and (5) general mood which refers to the levels of happiness and optimism (Lyusin, 2006).

Lyusin (2006) states that stress management refers to how well individuals tolerate stress and maintain impulse control. It is noted that emotional intelligence promotes efficacy in anger management and stress management. Seemingly, a poorly developed emotional intelligence is typified by temper tantrums, hysteria and emotional outbursts. A study by Alegre (2011), reports that parents with high responsiveness, emotion regulated coaching and healthy levels of demandingness are related to higher emotional intelligence scores while negative demandingness is associated with lower emotional intelligence. For this study, the expectation was that adolescents whose parents employ negative parenting styles to score low on the emotional intelligence measure and those whose parents employ positive parenting styles to score higher on the emotional intelligence measure.

2.3.4 Gender Theory

Children learn by observing the people that surround them, this notion is illustrated through the bobo doll experiment (Bandura, 1971). Children grow up around many influential figures, for example, parents, characters on TV, peer group, community members and educators. These figures exemplify behaviour to observe and to imitate, and gender differences may originate from the contrasting social positions of both women and men in society. Gender differences are a result of varying social constructs and constructions (Coleman & Hong, 2008). Social Structural Theory places great emphasis on the power of the environment and social roles that help shape gender differences. Furthermore, the theory suggests that children model themselves or imitate behaviour of the people around them (Zanden, 1990). Interestingly, Travis (1997) adds that it is through these gender differences that stereotypes
arise, for example, males are expected to be show more assertiveness, aggressive and independent behaviour while females are expected to be more sensitive, gentle, emotional and dependent. Furthermore, Hudson and Jacot (1992) explained that this difference may lead to boys supressing their urge to show affection. Interestingly, Luthar (2003) revealed that a lot of research has been carried out to evaluate the link between the adolescents’ resilience and environment. According to Hampel and Petermann (2005), females use resilient factors like seeking support more than males to cope with stressors in their environment. A study conducted by Sun and Stewart (2007) reported that females scored higher in resilience factors such as communication and empathy; furthermore, girls were better able to recognise and use positive connections such as teachers and community members. A twin study conducted by Waaktaar and Torgersen (2012) revealed that trait resilience was more prevalent in males than in females. Interestingly, a study conducted by Katyal and Awasthi (2005) reported that girls scored higher on emotional intelligence than boys. This is different from a study by Chu (2002) which reported higher levels of emotional intelligence among males than females. It may be concluded that males and females may score differently in resilience and emotional intelligence as a result of the different socialization processes of the two gender groups.

2.4. Theoretical framework
The four parenting styles namely, authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and uninvolved have been proven to be different by studying their effects on children. Authoritative parenting has been reported to be linked with adolescents' positive development by giving them the ability to negotiate and engage in discussions (Kopko, 2007). The positive influence of authoritative parenting styles has been recorded to be based on the encouragement of the ability to think independently and tackle challenges. In turn, authoritarian parenting discourages independent problem solving, and encourages the child to depend on the parent (Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000). Zakeri et al. (2010) add that authoritative parents assist their children master important environments. As such, permissive and uninvolved parenting have been reported to result in the hindering of healthy development of adolescents as they may exhibit the same type of behaviour (Kopko, 2007). This is because research (Fletcher, Steinberg & Sellers, 1999) has indicated that parenting has an effect on the adolescent’s mental health, for instance; children whose parents go through divorce are more likely to become depressed, experience anxiety and engage in antisocial behaviour. Galambos, Barker and Almeida (2003) maintained that positive aspects of parenting such as the right level of control, rules and restrictions, are associated with positive emotional adjustment.

Parents who are involved in their children’s lives are likely to have resilient adolescents (Cove, Eiseman and Popkin, 2005). Fan and Chen (2001) add that parent’s involvement affects the adolescents’ effectiveness in their environment. Interestingly, Luthar and Zelazo (2003) define resilience as a continuous transaction between the child and the environment. Furthermore, Zakeri et al. (2010) add that resilience is not just about people adapting to stress and trauma but rather they participate actively in the creation of their own environment. In a study conducted by Dumont and Provost (1999), adolescents who scored high on resilience also scored high on measures of problem solving and coping skills indicating that resilience serves as an important factor for adolescents to cope with daily life demands.
Mayer and Salovey (1997) maintained that while emotional intelligence defines one’s capacity to identify and understand emotions, it is also the ability to problem solve. One cannot ignore the possible link between resilience and emotional intelligence.

According to Ahmad, Bangash and Khan (2009), some women do not differ from men in the ability to handle stress and have the same emotional resilience; the popular belief is that men are more emotionally intelligent than women. The same belief is held in many resilient studies (Morano, 2010; Abukari & Laser, 2013; Von Soest, Mossige, Stefansen, & Hjemdal, 2010), stating that men are more resilient than females. Sandhu and Mehrota (1999) do not agree, stating that because women are socialised differently to men, the expectation is that women should score higher in measures of emotional intelligence. They maintain that women are emotionally intelligent in a different way, with females showing more empathy and being more sensitive towards their relationships with parents. It thus makes sense to make the prediction that parenting styles are linked to the development of resilience and emotional intelligence among male and female adolescents distinctively.

CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

3.1 Parenting Styles and Resilience
A lot of interest has been shown in studying parenting (Steinberg, 1999). Baumrind’s theory has provided a clear picture of the types of parenting styles and the role they play in the socialization of the child for the past 25 years (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Parenting styles are defined as behaviours which contribute to raising a child and occur over many situations (Berk, 2004). Baumrind (1971) mentioned different types of parenting styles, namely, authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and uninvolved parenting styles. Authoritative parents provide clear and firm boundaries while their discipline is characterised by warmth and communication. Authoritarian parents show less warmth and are punitive. Permissive parents show warmth but demand nothing from their children while uninvolved parents do not show warmth or have demands for them. Darling and Steinberg (1993) indicated that authoritative parents maintain a supportive parent-child relationship. Their adolescents are able to make decisions through reason and not base them on majority opinion. According to Steinberg and Morris (2001), these adolescents have been found to be more psychosocially competent than adolescents whose parents employ non-authoritative methods of parenting.

Simonsi and Conger (2007) maintain that children raised by authoritative parents have shown fewer conduct problems and adjust better emotionally when compared to those raised in non-authoritative homes. Ritchie and Buchanan (2011) add that adolescents of parents who use authoritative parenting styles are associated with higher scores in measures of competence and mental health when compared to those who perceived their parents as permissive or authoritarian. This emotional adjustment and high scores on self-esteem and mental health somehow signifies resilience. Eisenberg, Chang, Ma and Huang (2009) agree with this notion, and maintain that in many samples, the authoritative parenting style is associated with positive developmental outcomes such as less behavioural problems. According to Baumrind (1971), the adolescents of the authoritarian parent do not have a sophisticated understanding of other people’s needs and feel like their needs are not
considered. Adolescents of permissive parents do not take rules seriously and develop egocentric tendencies while adolescents of uninvolved parents may struggle with impulsivity.

According to Zakeri et al (2010), parents facilitate positive adjustment of children during their exposure to threatening or stressing conditions by emotional and behavioural supports. From this study, it was revealed that children whose mothers showed acceptance, kindness, control and support showed higher levels of resilience than those whose mothers did not. Interestingly, Ritter (2010) refers to resilience as the ability to bounce back and continue functioning or successfully adapt irrespective of challenges or unfavourable circumstances, good outcomes irrespective of circumstances with risks, sustained competence under threat. One cannot ignore the possible role that parenting styles play on resilience. A study conducted by Zakeri et al (2010) found a positive and significant relationship between acceptance-involvement parenting styles and resilience, suggesting that a parenting style characterised by warmth and support can be linked to the development of resilience. Such parents have substantial knowledge regarding appropriate behaviour towards children. Parents teach their children to cope with stressful situations by having close and healthy relationships with them. According to Steyn (2006), adolescents who have been found to be resilient in South Africa are usually in emotionally supportive friendships.

A study by Choe, Zimmerman and Devnarian (2012) found that positive adult involvement is a protective factor of resilience by moderating the effects of violent behaviour among South African youth. This is because the attitude of South African youth towards violence is more likely to be influenced by those around them (Choe, 2012). Moreover, high parental care and low parental overprotection contribute positively to increasing resilience among a sample of adolescents who experienced trauma (Sun, Fan, Zheng & Zhu, 2012). These studies indicate that some form of relationship exists between parenting styles and resilience. However, other
researchers reported a different view. For example, Gera and Kaur (2015) found that the relationship between parenting styles and resilience is not significant.

Both paternal and maternal permissive parenting styles are more positively related to physical aggression among girls than boys (Braza et al., 2015). Children with aggression have difficulties in regulating their emotions indicating poor emotional intelligence. In addition to aggression, higher frequencies of school misconduct and substance use are recorded among adolescents of permissive parents (Querido, Warner & Eyberg, 2002). These adolescents also exhibit low self-esteem (Ginsburg & Bronstein, 1993).

Authoritarian maternal parenting style has a positive relationship with externalising and internalising problems among children (Braza et al., 2015). This indicates the inability to deal with challenges emotionally. Maccoby and Martin (2000), these children are more likely to be anxious and generally in an unhappy mood; they become hostile and as a result engage in deviant behaviour. Such children are unable to handle challenges in life demonstrating poor resilience.

Steyn (2006) indicated that adolescents who have been found to be resilient in South Africa are usually in emotionally supportive friendships. Williams, Lindsey, , Kurtz, and Jarvis (2001) also added that some adolescents experience persistently poor parenting, and that their willingness and ability to move away from negative relationships with their parents can be important for good outcomes. Werner and Smith (1992) explained that when parental care is poor, then adolescents who have formed trusting and supportive relationships with adults who are not in their family are able to sustain progress regardless of exposure to risk.

3.2 Parenting Styles and Emotional Intelligence
Assadi, Smetana, Shahmansouri and Mahammadi (2011) maintain that adolescence is a period of changes in parent-child relationships during which disagreeing and bickering increase. Emotional intelligence provides a cushion to entrench parent-child relationships. Emotional intelligence refers to the capacity to create positive effects in relationships with oneself and others, and it is a broad term, consisting of interpersonal and intrapersonal skills (Awasthi & Katyal, 2005). In the same vein, Naghavi and Redzuan (2011) found that emotional intelligence can assist adolescents in identifying emotions negative or positive which will enable them to correctly appraise, understand, express and use appropriate emotions in their thinking and actions. One may thus conclude that emotional intelligence acts as a protecting factor against social damages.

According to Alegre (2013), emotional intelligence is a combination of different abilities. Bar-On (2006) explains that it is the ability to understand oneself, notice other people’s feelings and relate to them, handle negative feelings and control impulses as well problem solving skills. According to Sung (2010), people who score high on emotional intelligence scales are more likely to succeed because they are aware of their emotions, manage them, think and understand them. Alegre (2013) adds that adolescents who achieve high scores of emotional intelligence internalize and externalize problem less than those who score low in emotional intelligence. This is because parenting styles and practices are able to predict many developmental outcomes, that one might assume that they are likely to predict children’s emotional intelligence. Interestingly, Simonsi and Conger (2007) suggest that adolescents whose parents employ varying parenting styles, that is, authoritarian and non-authoritarian styles are more likely to internalise distress when compared to those whose parents employ authoritarian parenting style. This internalisation of stressors can be related to poor emotional intelligence.
Amirabadi (2011) explored the relationship between parenting styles and emotional intelligence among Iranian school children and reported no significant relationship between the two factors. A study by Alegre (2010) among 329 participants suggests that adolescents with parents continuously ignoring them when they are in need of emotional support develop lower emotional intelligence. Furthermore, lower emotional intelligence is developed by controlling parents who use negative and harsh discipline. These adolescents struggle with the ability to understand and regulate their own emotions. Additionally, in Andhara Pradesh, a study conducted among 120 adolescents by Devi and Uma (2013) found that children whose parents employ the authoritative parenting style scored better on emotional intelligence compared to children whose parents employed the authoritarian and permissive parenting style. This is because children whose parents employ the authoritative parenting style show reason behind parental policies. Furthermore, recently, Batool and Bond (2015) also conducted a study among 225 adolescents and found that parents with higher emotional intelligence employ the authoritative parenting styles and their children scored lower on aggression; and authoritarian parents scored lower on emotional intelligence and their children scored high on measures of aggression from peers. Downey, Jonhnston, Hansen, Birney and Stough (2010) concluded that low levels of emotional intelligence have been linked to adolescents’ involvement in problem behaviours. Cleveland (2014) conducted a study among 215 females which found a link between high levels of aggression and low levels of emotional intelligence. The study further found a positive correlation between aggression and authoritarianism which suggests a link between emotional intelligence and authoritarianism.

3.3. Gender differences on parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence

According to Barnhart, Raval, Jansari & Raval, (2013), parents across varying cultures have different socialization goals for girls and boys which affect parenting styles. According to
Punamaki, Quota and Sarraj (1997), there is more warmth and responsiveness in mother–child than father–child interactions, while father-child interactions are likely to be more firm and restrictive towards children. Parents employ different parenting styles according to the gender of the child, particularly fathers. Boys are more likely to be punished and disciplined while parents remain emotionally involved with their daughters. In a study conducted by Assadi, Smetana, Shahmansouri and Mohammadi (2011) it was found that mothers viewed parents as having authority over rules. Traditional Asian cultures encourage mothers to be nurturing and fathers to have little involvement in childrearing. In Asian cultures, males felt rejected by their parents and also indicated low levels of warmth while females indicated more warmth (Barhart, Raval, Jansari & Raval, 2013). Interestingly, Lesch and Jager (2013) found that in South Africa, traditional gender roles are still important in many communities. Males are still expected to be providers, which defines masculinity while women are expected to care for the family. According to these traditional gender roles, it is more accepted for women to show more affection and nurturance than men.

There are differences in the way boys and girls express their resiliency. For example, McEvie (2014) examined the impact of bullying among youth and found that girls are more resilient compared to boys by showing less involvement in violent behaviour and boys are more resilience than girls in developing anxiety and depression. Different findings have been reported regarding gender differences in resilience among adolescents. Some studies indicate that males show more resilient than females. Among a youth sample that have been exposed to earthquake, it was reported that males were reported to be more resilient compared to females (Stratta.et al., 2013). In Botswana, a study conducted by Shehu and Mokgwathi (2008) among a sample of 1700 adolescents conveyed that female adolescents are more resilient than male adolescents and this resilience was positively correlated to internal locus of control.
Furthermore, a study conducted among a sample of Canadian youth who experienced maltreatment revealed no gender differences on resilience (Collin-Vézina, Coleman, Milne, Sell & Daigneault, 2011). Recently, Gera and Kaur (2015) also found no differences on resilience among male and female adolescents.

Alumran and Punamaki (2008) investigated the relationship between gender, age, academic achievement, emotional intelligence and coping styles amongst Bahrani adolescents. In their study, female adolescents scored better than male adolescents in abilities to perceive emotions, regulate others’ emotions and use emotions to build relationships. Their findings also indicated significant association between certain dimensions of emotional intelligence and coping style and in this way revealing the key aspects of emotional intelligence which contribute positively to the successful handling of the environment and coping with stress.

In India, a study conducted with a sample of 198 adolescents found that male adolescents reported higher emotional intelligence scores than female adolescents (Kaur, 2010). Furthermore, the study of a sample of 150 adolescents in Chandigarh found that girls had higher emotional intelligence than males (Katyal & Awashi, 2005). According to Bajgar, Chan and Cirrochi (2000), higher levels of emotional intelligence were obtained among female adolescents than male adolescents, and they were found to be positively associated with skills required to identify emotional expressions and social support levels.

According to Naghavi and Redzuan (2011), parents provide more information about feelings to their female children than to their male children, and therefore girls have more experience on experiencing and expressing their feelings. Through the information they gathered, girls also become better with words to label emotions while boys are unaware of their emotions as well as those of others.
Furthermore, Awasthi and Katyal (2005) add that this might be because emotional intelligence deals primarily with the management and expression of emotions, and females are said to be emotional and intimate in relationships. Expression of emotions retracts from differences in the ways girls and boys are socialized. Fernandez-Berrocal, Latorre, Montanes and Sanchez-Nunez (2008) add that stories are often used as socialisation tools. While parents use more emotionally charged words when reading to girls than when they read to boys, they do teach boys problem-solving skills which they teach to girls when the need arises. Many studies carried out in South Africa which focus on the importance of emotional intelligence in the work place also confirm that emotional intelligence has an influence on performance and leadership success (Murphy, 2008; Murphy & Janeke, 2009; Hayward, Amos & Baxter, 2008). This can also be applied to emotional intelligence among a sample of adolescents.

3.4. Hypotheses

1. There will be a positive relationship between parenting styles and resilience among adolescents.

2. There will be a positive relationship between parenting styles and emotional intelligence among adolescents.

3. Male adolescents will score significantly higher on resilience and emotional intelligence than female students.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
4.1. Research methodology

4.1.1. Research design

A quantitative research approach was used in the study. For the purpose of this study, a correlation design was used because it explores the degree to which two factors are related (Gravetter & Forzano, 2006) and thus appropriate in order to explore the possible relationship between parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescence. In the study, parenting styles were presented as the independent variable and both resilience and emotional intelligence as dependent variables.

4.1.2. Participants

A total of four hundred and twenty six (n = 426) adolescents participated in the study. Their ages were 15-16 years (239, 56.1%) and 17-18 years (157, 43.9%). The majority of the participants are from Tswana ethnic group 34.8 (81.7%), followed by 12 (2.8%) White, 12 (2.8%) Coloured, 5 (1.2%) Pedi, 11 (2.6%) Zulu, 10 (2.3%) Sotho, 2 (0.5%) Venda, 1 (0.2%) Afrikaans, 9 (2.1%) Tsonga, and the remaining 16 (3.8%) are from other ethnic groups. In terms of family dynamics, 159 (37.3%) of the participants parents were married, 71 (16.7%) unmarried parents, 114 (26.8%) and single mothers, 10 (2.3%) and single fathers, 7 (1.6%) whereas 6(1.4%) from divorced mothers, 6 (1.4%) divorced fathers. All participants were in grade 10.

Table 4.1.2 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants

Table 4.1.2: Percentage of responses by personal demographic variables (n = 426)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16 years</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 years</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedi</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family dynamics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married parents</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried parents</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent (Mother)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent (Father)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced (Mother)</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced (Father)</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3. Sampling method
A purposive sampling method was employed to select participants for this study. This sampling method was adopted due to the developmental stage that the researcher focused on. The focus of the study was in adolescence, as such the researcher administered the instruments to participants that were within that developmental stage.

All grade 10’s were thus selected to be part of the study. The researcher made a list of all the schools in the area and placed their names in a bag. A name was drawn from the bag and that school was selected for sampling.

4.1.4. Measures

A questionnaire with four sections was used to collect data from the participants. Section 1 included participants’ biographical information, section 2 included parenting style scales, section 3 covered items on resilience scale and section 4 included items on emotional intelligence scale.

4.1.4.1 The Parenting Authority Questionnaire

A Parenting Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) designed by Buri (1991) to measure parental authority, or disciplinary practices, from perspectives of children of varying ages was used. The initial questionnaire consisted of 48 items, of that number 36 met the criteria, that is, chosen by 95% of participants. Of that 36, 30 were combined to form the final PAQ. Buri (1991) explains that the PAQ had three subscales: permissive (P: items 1, 6, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24 and 28), authoritarian (A: items 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 16, 18, 25, 26 and 29), and authoritative or flexible (F: items 4, 5, 8, 11, 15, 20, 22, 23, 27, and 30). For example “While I was growing up my parents felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do, “Whenever my parents told me to do something as I was growing up, they expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions”, are
items in the scale. In the use of PAQ, scores vary from 10 to 50, with an assumption that the higher the score the greater the parental style being measured (Buri, 1991). Cronbach’s alpha scores in this study are, .64 for the permissive parenting style subscale, .67 for the authoritarian parenting style subscale, and .63 for the authoritative parenting style subscale.

**4.1.4.2 The Resilience Scale**

The 25 item Resilience scale by Wagnild and Young (1993) was developed to identify the individual degree of resilience. The measure has been administered to children as young as 12 and people as old as 71. For example, “I usually manage one way or another, I usually take things in stride, I can get through difficult times because I’ve experienced difficulty before”. Items are scored on a 7 point Likert scale were created with ranges from 1 to 7, 1 representing disagree and 7 strongly agree. One may score ranging from 25 to 175, high scores indicate higher degrees of resilience and lower scores represent lower scores of resilience (Wagnild & Young, 1993). The Cronbach’s alpha of this scale in this study is .73.

**4.1.4.3 The 33 item emotional intelligence scale**

The 33 item emotional intelligence scale created by Schutte (1998) was used in this study. The measure was used by Ciarrochi, Chan and Bajgar (2001) to determine emotional intelligence levels among adolescents (13 to 15 years old). “When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them”, “I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people”, are examples of items in the scale. The scale consists of 33 items. I know when to speak about my personal problems to others. Items are scored on a 5 point scale with ranges from 1 to 5, 1 representing strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree. Items 5, 28 and 33 are reverse scored. A total score is obtained from combining item responses on the Likert scale (Petrides & Furnham, 2000). The Cronbach’s alpha of this scale in this study was .80.
4.1.5. Procedure

The researcher first visited the school to have face-to-face meetings with the school principal. The purpose and process were explained to the principal and the teachers who agreed to help facilitate the collection process; the estimated time learners might have taken to complete the questionnaire was agreed on as well as a date that the grade 10’s would be available as their age ranged from 15 to 18 which lie within the adolescence stage of development.

On the day of data collection, teachers were available to assist with the handing out and collection of the questionnaires. Students assembled in their classes with their class teachers. Each participant was given a questionnaire to fill out. Participants completed the questionnaires at their desks and handed in upon completion. The researcher explained the purpose of the research to the participants. It was also explained to them that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any point they felt uncomfortable with the process. Furthermore, students were informed of their anonymity and that the data collected would only be used for academic purposes.

Every learner was given the opportunity to be part of the study. Due to the number of questionnaires administered to each learner (three), numerical coding was done prior to the administration to ensure that the same three questionnaires were completed by one learner. This assisted with data capturing.

4.1.6 Ethical considerations
4.1.6.1 Confidentiality

Gravetter and Forzano (2006) define confidentiality as the ability to keep information collected from individuals when conducting a private study. Participants were informed that they would be treated as anonymous which ensured that every respondent remained unknown and that the information they had given also remained private. The set of questionnaire was coded numerically; participants were identified by the codes written on the questionnaires. Participants were also told that the information was for research purposes and that their identity would not be disclosed. The participants completed the questionnaires in the presence of the researchers and teachers. The researcher and teacher were available to assist those who needed clarity with the questions.

4.1.6.2 Avoiding harm

Participants received explanation about the study, its procedure and why their participation was needed. Counselling services were made available to learners should there be a need for such services to avoid harm.

4.1.6.3 Consent form

Ethical approval was granted by the North-West University Ethics Committee (NWU-00404-14-A9). A consent form contains a written statement by the researcher which entails the elements of informed consent and a line of the participant’s signature. The researcher did send consent forms to participants and their parents before the study with the purpose of inviting them to participate, as well as sharing the information they needed to make informed decisions before participating. The researcher agreed with the principals of the schools to keep the consent letters in participants’ files.

4.1.7 Data analysis
The data that were collected were analysed using the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS 22). Different statistical techniques such as Pearson R correlation, multiple regression and t-test were employed to test the study hypotheses.
RESEARCH RESULTS

5.1. Introduction

The data that were analysed were recorded in tables and graphs in the document. The following chapter focuses on the results and the hypotheses of the study. This study aimed at exploring the relationship between parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents. The results are presented below.

5.2. Hypothesis one: Relationship between parenting style and resilience among adolescents

Table 5.2.1: Correlation among study variables (n = 426)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>PPS</th>
<th>APS</th>
<th>APSa</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>127.68</td>
<td>18.691</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>128.3302</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td>36.08</td>
<td>6.509</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td>.509**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSa</td>
<td>36.79</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.135*</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.136**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.137**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Key: EI = emotional intelligence, PPS = permissive parenting style, APS = Authoritarian parenting style, APSa = Authoritative parenting style
Hypothesis one which stated that, “There will be a positive relationship between parenting styles and resilience among adolescents”, was tested using Pearson R correlation. The results (Table 5.2.1) of the analysis indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between resilience and permissive parenting style (r = .312, p < .01), between resilience and authoritarian parenting style (r = .370, p < .01) and between resilience and authoritative parenting style (r = .478, p < .01) among adolescents. Hypothesis one is thus accepted.

A further analysis was done to assess the influence of the different parenting styles on resilience. The results are presented in Table 5.2.2 below.

**Table 5.2.2 : Multiple Regression Analysis Showing Parenting Styles as Predictors of Resiliency among Adolescents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissive parenting style</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>37.459**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian parenting style</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>37.459**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative parenting style</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>6.324</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** F-ratio is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). n.s not significant

The results in Table 5.2.2 indicated a significant joint influence of permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles respectively on resiliency among the adolescents who participated in this study (R² = .246; F(3, 345) = 37.459; p < 0.01). The relative contributions also showed that permissive parenting style (β = .096; t = 1.741; p n.s) and authoritarian parenting style (β = .093; t = 1.500; p n.s) were not significant predictors of resiliency.
However, authoritative parenting style ($\beta = .379; t = 6.324; p < .01$) was a predictor of resiliency.

**5.3 Hypothesis two: Relationship between parenting style and emotional intelligence**

Hypothesis two stated that “There will be a significant positive relationship between parenting styles and emotional intelligence among adolescents”. This hypothesis was tested using Pearson R correlation. The results of the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between permissive parenting style and emotional intelligence ($r = .462$, $p < .01$), authoritarian parenting style and emotional intelligence ($r = .517$, $p < .01$) and authoritative parenting style and emotional intelligence ($r = .528$, $p < .01$) (See Table 2 above).

A further analysis of the results revealed a significant joint influence of permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles on emotional intelligence ($R^2 = .369$; $F (3, 345) = 60.628; p < 0.01$). This shows that the three parenting styles jointly account for about 37% of variance in emotional intelligence of adolescents. The independent predictions showed a significant independent influence of permissive parenting style ($\beta = .212; t = 3.943; p < .001$), authoritarian parenting style ($\beta = .222; t = 3.618; p < .001$), and authoritative parenting style ($\beta = .2295; t = 5.062; p < .001$) on emotional intelligence (See Table 4 below). Hypothesis two is accepted.
Table 5.3: Multiple Regression Analysis Showing Parenting Styles as Predictors of Emotional Intelligence among Adolescents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>ß</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissive parenting style</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>3.943</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian parenting style</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>3.618</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>60.628**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative parenting style</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>5.062</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F-ratio is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

**5.4. Hypothesis three: Gender differences**

Hypothesis three which stated that “male adolescents will significantly score higher on resilience, emotional intelligence and parenting styles than female adolescents”, was tested using t-test for independent sample. The results are presented in Table 5.
Table 5.4: t-test Analysis Showing Gender Differences on Parenting Styles, Resiliency and Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  M  S.D</td>
<td>N  M  S.D  Df  t  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>156 130.49 17.76</td>
<td>193 125.41 16.89 347 2.544 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>129 129.71 16.89</td>
<td>186 127.38 17.51 313 1.178 n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive parenting</td>
<td>181 36.07 6.61</td>
<td>245 34.20 6.81 424 2.838 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian parenting</td>
<td>181 36.10 6.97</td>
<td>245 36.08 6.16 424 0.028 n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative parenting</td>
<td>181 37.76 6.11</td>
<td>245 36.08 6.04 424 2.822 .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.s = not significant

The results showed a significant statistical difference between male and female adolescents on resilience (t = 2.544; df = 347; p < .01), with males scoring higher on resiliency (Mean = 130.49, SD = 17.76) compared to female (Mean = 125.41, SD = 16.89). Also, there was a significant difference between male and female adolescents on permissive parenting style (t = 2.838; df = 424; p < .01), with males scoring higher on permissive parenting style (Mean = 36.07, SD = 6.61) compared to females (Mean = 34.20, SD = 6.81). Similarly, there was a significant difference between male and female adolescents on authoritative parenting style (t = 2.822; df = 424; p < .01), with males scoring higher on authoritative parenting style (Mean = 37.76, SD = 6.11) compared to females (Mean = 36.08, SD = 6.04). However, there was no significant difference between male and female adolescents on emotional intelligence (t =
1.178; df = 313; p = n.s). Lastly, there was no significant difference between male and female adolescents on authoritarian parenting style (t = 0.028; df = 313; p = n.s). Therefore, the hypothesis which stated that, “male adolescents will significantly score higher on resiliency, emotional intelligence, and parenting styles than female adolescents”, is partially accepted.
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

This chapter includes a discussion of the study results, conclusions drawn, recommendations and limitations of the study, as well as implications for future study. The aim of this study was to explore the relationship between parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents.

The study had the following objectives:

- To explore the relationship between parenting style and resilience among adolescents.
- To explore the relationship between parenting styles and emotional intelligence among adolescents.
- To determine gender differences on perceptions of parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents.

6.2. Discussion of results

6.2.1. Hypothesis one: Relationship between parenting style and resilience

Hypothesis one which stated that there will be a positive relationship between parenting styles and resilience among adolescents was accepted. Analysis of the results showed that there is a significant positive relationship between resilience and permissive parenting style, authoritarian parenting style and authoritative parenting style among adolescents. These results are not consistent with a study conducted by Zakeri et al (2010) which revealed a positive and significant correlation between parenting styles characterised by acceptance-involvement and resilience. This is because authoritative parents help children develop better emotional adjustment (Simonsi & Conger, 2007) and mental health (Ritchie & Buchanan,
2011) when in stressful situations. Authoritative parents are warm and communicate with their children helping them deal better with challenges (Baumrind, 1971). They are accepting of their adolescents and show involvement by engaging in discussions and listening to their opinions (Kopko, 2007). This lays a foundation for the development of resilience. A study by Choe, Zimmerman and Devnarian (2012) also found that positive adult involvement is a protective factor of resilience further supporting this finding.

From a parenting style theory, Baumrind (1991) indicated that authoritative parents encourage assertive communication and socially responsible behaviour, self-regulation and cooperative behaviour among their children. This serves as an explanation of the important role played by parenting style in the development of resilience among adolescent. Results indicated no significant difference between the different parenting styles and resilience. This, according to Hammen (2003) may be explained by various protective factors, example; a positive self-concept, social competence and positive peer relationship Bukowski (2003).

The results of this study indicated a joint influence of permissive, authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles on resilience among adolescents. The results also reveal that the permissive parenting style and the authoritarian parenting style are not significant predictors of resiliency, while the authoritative parenting style is a predictor of resiliency. These results are consistent with Zakeri, Jonkar and Razmjee’s (2010) study which reported a positive and significant relationship between acceptance-involvement parenting styles and resilience, suggesting that a parenting style characterised by warmth and support can be linked to the development of resilience. Such parents have a lot of knowledge regarding appropriate behaviour towards children. Parents teach their children to cope with stressful situations by having close and healthy relationships with them.
6.2.2. Hypothesis two: Relationship between parenting style and emotional intelligence

Hypothesis two stated that there will be a significant positive relationship between parenting styles and emotional intelligence among adolescents. The results of the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between permissive parenting style, authoritarian parenting and authoritative parenting style and emotional intelligence.

These study results are consistent with the work of Allegre (2011) who found that there is a positive relationship between parental warmth and emotional intelligence. A study by Devi and Uma (2013) also found that children whose parents employ the authoritative parenting style scored better on emotional intelligence scores compared to children whose parents employed the authoritarian and permissive parenting style. This may be because parental warmth and nurturance have been proved to affect adolescent’s emotion knowledge positively (Bennett, Bendersky & Lewis, 2005). It has been found that parental monitoring is also positively linked to emotional intelligence (Liau, Liau, Teoh, & Liau, 2003). Authoritative parents are warm and monitor their adolescents to reasonable degree.

The Bar-On model of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 1980) states that emotional intelligence determines how effectively individuals understand and express themselves, understand others and relate with them while coping with daily demands, challenges and pressures. Furthermore, Alegre (2010) found that parents with high responsiveness, emotion regulated coaching, and positive demandingness are related to higher emotional intelligence while negative demandingness is related to lower emotional intelligence. The above statements highlight the importance of parents’ role in the development of emotional intelligence.

According to Brand and Klimes-Dougan (2010), emotions help the individual to adapt throughout life and the way in which parents approach emotions in their children’s
upbringing has consequences on their adolescent development. In this regard, the results accepted the hypothesis.

The results of this study indicated a joint influence of permissive, authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles on emotional intelligence among adolescents. The results also revealed that all three parenting styles namely, permissive parenting style, authoritarian parenting style and authoritative parenting style were predictors of emotional intelligence. The results in this study are not consistent with Amirabadi’s (2011) study which explored the relationship between parenting styles and emotional intelligence among Iranian school children and; reported no significant relationship between the two factors. Devi and Uma (2013), however, found that children whose parents employ the authoritative parenting style scored better on emotional intelligence scores compared to children whose parents employed the authoritarian and permissive parenting style.

6.2.3. Hypothesis three: Gender differences on resilience, emotional intelligence and parenting styles

Hypothesis three which stated that male adolescents will score significantly high scores on resilience and emotional intelligence was tested using independent sample t-test. The results showed a significant statistical difference between male and female adolescents on resilience with males scoring higher on resilience compared to females. These results are consistent with the work of Stratta et al. (2013) who found that males reported more resilience compared to females among a sample of youth who had been exposed to earthquake. These results are not surprising because, according to McEvie (2014), boys and girls express their resiliency differently. For instance, the study of the impact of bullying among youth found that girls are more resilient compared to boys by showing less involvement in violent behaviour and boys are more resilient than girls in developing anxiety and depression.
Inconsistent to the result of this study, Shehu and Mokgwathi (2008) found that female adolescents were more resilient than male adolescents and this resilience was positively correlated to internal locus of control. The general review is, however that, males are more resilient than females.

There was no significant difference between male and female adolescents on emotional intelligence. These results are surprising because research has shown that females score higher on emotional intelligence than males. For example, a study by to Bajgar, Chan and Cirrochi (2000) measured emotional intelligence in adolescents and higher levels were obtained for females than males. Alumran and Punamahati (2008) investigated the relationship between gender, age, academic achievement, emotional intelligence and coping styles amongst Bahrani adolescents, and also found that female adolescents scored better than male adolescents. According to Bandura’s Social Theory (Bandura & Bussey, 1999), children observe the people around them behaving in various ways. Travis (1997) explained that this gave rise to gender differences which led to stereotypes, for example, males are expected to show more assertive, aggressive and independent behaviour while females are expected to be more sensitive, gentle, emotional and dependent. This notion highlights the expectation of girls scoring higher on emotional intelligence measures.

Differences in socialization may also explain differences in parenting styles among boys and girls respectively. The results of this study revealed a significant difference between male and female adolescents on permissive parenting style with males scoring higher on permissive parenting style compared to females. Similarly, there was a significant difference between male and female adolescents on authoritative parenting style with males scoring higher on authoritative parenting style compared to females. A significant gender difference was consistent with the literature because, according to Bandura (1971), parents across varying cultures have different socialisation goals for girls and boys which in turn affect their
parenting styles. The results however indicated that males scored higher on authoritative parenting which is not consistent with what Lesch and Jager (2013) found, which is, that in South African men are still expected to be more masculine than women. Bandura (1971) adds that even in western cultures parents have reported using authoritarian parenting with boys while authoritative parenting was used for girls. In this regard, the results partially accepted the hypothesis.

6.3. Conclusion

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

- There is a positive relationship between parenting styles (permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative) resiliency among adolescents,

- There is a positive relationship between parenting styles (namely; permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative) on emotional intelligence among adolescents,

- There is a significant difference between male and female resiliency with males scoring higher, and no significant difference between male and female emotional intelligence. There is also a significant difference between male and female perception on parenting styles.

6.4. Limitations of the study

This study has several limitations. Some of the learners were absent during the research which reduced the population the researcher was hoping to obtain. The questionnaire was long and led to participants filling in the questionnaire quickly without reading with attention. This may have affected the results as responses may have been random. The results of this study cannot be generalised to adolescents who are not in school because the study focused on school going adolescents.
6.5. Recommendations

From the results of this study, it is recommended that:

- Parents should accept and respond to their children’s developmental needs by listening to their children, placing limits while holding them accountable for their behaviour. By giving their children responsibilities, parents will teach them independence.

- The different upbringing style of boys and girls has an effect on their resilience and emotional intelligence. As such, programmes for training parents on providing boys and girls with equal opportunities through exposure to the same parenting may produce more sensitive people who are aware of their strengths and emotions.

- The emotional and social competences of adolescents should be nurtured so that they are enabled to conceptualise the five meta-components of emotional intelligence namely: self-knowledge, interpersonal skills, adaptability, stress management and general mood. Integrated development is inferred in the preceding discussion so as to promote emotional stability and resoluteness in adolescents.

- Adolescents should be assisted to develop resilience. In an age of multiple stressors and widespread insecurity it is necessary.

- Lessons on effective parenting should accentuate the fact that parents guide positive adjustment of children during their exposure to threatening or stressing conditions by providing their children with emotional and behavioural support.

- Parents, caregivers and teachers should be able to teach adolescents problem solving skills.

- Educational programmes aimed at empowering youth with resiliency and emotional development need to be formulated.
Clinical psychologists, educational psychologists and other professionals working with children should consider formulating intervention methods that empower both the adolescent and his/her parents/caregivers.

6.6. Implications for future research

- This study has implications for future research. It provides insight on how parenting styles influence resilience and emotional intelligence among adolescents. The school should consider forming an alliance with the Department of Education to incorporate programmes that help with the development of resilience and emotional intelligence.

- Future studies should explore the relationship between parenting styles, resilience and emotional intelligence among diverse sample of adolescents to allow generalisation ability of the findings.

- More variables such as coping skills of adolescents should also be explored.

REFERENCES


Businessdictionary.com/definition/hypothesis.html#ixzz3Od5dY4N2.


Chu, J. (2002). *Boys development*. Readers Digest, USA.


Darling, N. (2014). There's a big difference between discipline and punishment. Published on September 18, 2014 by Nancy Darling, Ph.D. in Thinking About Kids.


*Preventive Medicine*, 52, 44-47.


