

## Parenting Styles and Hardiness of Students in a Thai Military Academy

Tikumporn Hosiri MD<sup>1</sup>, Kamonnet Wannasewok MD<sup>1</sup>, Pornthida Chaiarn MSc<sup>1</sup>,  
Sucheera Phattharayuttawat PhD<sup>1</sup>, Vichai Manussirivithaya MD<sup>2</sup>, Thienchai Ngamthipwattana MD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

<sup>2</sup> Naval Medical Department, Royal Thai Navy, Bangkok, Thailand

**Objective:** To study the correlation between parenting styles and hardiness of a Thai military students and the predictive role of parenting styles to the hardiness.

**Materials and Methods:** The military students in total of 319 students responded to the parenting style rating scale and Thai version of the dispositional resilience scale [DRS15]. The statistical analysis included descriptive statistic, One-way ANOVA, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and stepwise multiple regression.

**Results:** Most military students received authoritative parenting style (69.93%) and scored higher than the mean score of hardiness (54.69%). The differences in parenting styles resulted in differences in hardiness had a statistical significant. Authoritative parenting style had moderate positive correlation with hardiness ( $r = 0.323$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Authoritarian and neglectful parenting style had low negative correlation with hardiness ( $r = -0.22$ ,  $p < 0.01$  and  $r = -0.27$ ,  $p < 0.01$  respectively). Permissive parenting style did not have a statistically significant correlation with hardiness. While authoritative parenting style also had the predictive ability of hardiness by 10%.

**Conclusion:** In military students, authoritative parenting style had moderate positive correlation with hardiness and had the predictive ability of 10% for hardiness. The authoritative parenting style had positive affected on their hardiness.

**Keywords:** Parenting styles, Hardiness, Military

**J Med Assoc Thai 2018; 101 (Suppl. 1): S19-S23**

**Full text. e-Journal:** <http://www.jmatonline.com>

Parenting styles affect development of an individual's personality and could be classified into 4 categories: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful. Each parenting style has its own dimension of control and response to children's individual needs as followed: authoritative parenting has certain control and responsive to children's emotional needs; authoritarian parenting has the control dimension but lacks the emotional responsiveness; permissive parenting lacks the ability to control but are very responsive to their children's needs; lastly, neglectful parenting neither has control or responsiveness to the children's needs<sup>(1-3)</sup>. National studies found that

authoritative parenting style coincided with ability to adapt to new environments, appropriate social behaviors, self-control, emotional intelligence and academic achievement<sup>(4-7)</sup>. Furthermore, there were studies that associated relationships between parenting styles and mental health problems such as depressive symptoms and substance use disorder<sup>(8,9)</sup>. Studies from other countries found the parenting styles was an important variable in predicting the sense of self-esteem, creativity, and hardiness<sup>(10-12)</sup>.

Hardiness is a quality of resilience that helped in the face of adversity in life. The aspect of hardiness consisted of firstly, commitment; it referred to a belief that one has the ability to make a decision and follow through; secondly, control, which indicated a belief of autonomy in regulation and management of various problems; thirdly, challenge, which referred to life as continuously changing, and the perception that changes are positive and opportunities for new learning

### Correspondence to:

Wannasewok K, Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, 2 Wanglang Road, Bangkoknoi, Bangkok 10700, Thailand.  
Phone: +66-2-4194293-8, Fax: +66-2-4194298  
E-mail: [kamonnet.wan@mahidol.ac.th](mailto:kamonnet.wan@mahidol.ac.th)

**How to cite this article:** Hosiri T, Wannasewok K, Chaiarn P, Phattharayuttawat S, Manussirivithaya V, Ngamthipwattana T. Parenting styles and hardiness of students in a Thai military academy. J Med Assoc Thai 2018;101;Suppl. 1: S19-S23.

experiences<sup>(13)</sup>. Studies revealed that hardiness has a positive relationship with academic success and prevention against stress related to the military training<sup>(14,15)</sup>. The authors' aim to investigate possible correlation between to parenting styles and hardiness in Thai military students to understand the influences of parenting style to hardiness.

## Objective

To study the correlation between parenting styles and hardiness of students in a Thai military academy, and the predictive ability of parenting styles in individual's hardiness.

## Materials and Methods

### Subjects

The target populations were all of the first to fifth year cadets in a Thai military academy, with the total of 356 students. The data were collected in the school year of 2016. All participants were volunteers and the ill students were excluded.

### Procedure and measurement

The participants were asked to respond to the questionnaires as followed:

1) Parenting style rating scale<sup>(5)</sup> developed by Puntip Sirivunnabood et al<sup>(18)</sup> and modified by Weeranuch Wongkongdej. The questionnaire consisted of 67 items, have corrected item-total correlation of 0.17 to 0.64, and have Cronbach's alpha coefficient of each parenting style between 0.76 to 0.92. The interpretation of the scores were calculated by using Z score for each of the style. The results were separated into authoritative style, authoritarian style, permissive style, neglectful style.

2) Dispositional resilience scale [DRS-15] Thai version<sup>(17)</sup> translated from Paul T. Bartone's questionnaire<sup>(16)</sup> by Piyamaporn Singkhum. The questionnaire consisted of 15 items and have Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.82. The results were interpreted as the high hardiness (higher than mean scores) and the low hardiness (lower than mean score).

### Analysis

The data were analyzed using the SPSS software version 20.0 (IBM Corp., Amonk, NY, USA). The prevalence of parenting style and hardiness were presented by using descriptive statistic. The analysis of the variables used One-way ANOVA and Post-hoc by the Least significant difference [LSD] method. The analysis of the correlation between the variables used

Pearson's correlation coefficient and measure the predictive ability by using stepwise multiple regression analysis.

### Ethical consideration

The present study is approved by Siriraj Institutional Review Board [SIRB], Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University; Si. 094/2016.

## Results

The 349 participants in the present study were all male between the age of 19 to 25 years old. The participants consisted of 72 first year students (22.57%), 80 second year students (25.08%), 61 third year student (19.12%), 41 fourth year students (12.85%), and 65 fifth year students (20.38%) respectively. In regard to parenting style, 313 responses were completed and were able to categorized into one of the four parenting styles in total of 143 respondents (45.69%). First, 100 respondents (31.95%) had received authoritative parenting style, 22 respondents (7.03%) had received permissive parenting style, 11 respondents (3.52%) had received neglectful parenting styles, 10 respondents (3.19%) had received authoritarian parenting style, and 170 responses (54.31%) were unable to classified into any of the parenting styles. The parenting styles' scores were illustrated in Table 1.

In regard to hardiness, the authors received 309 completed responses with mean score of 27.67. One hundred and sixty nine participants (54.69%) were in high hardiness group, and 140 participants (45.31%) were in the low hardiness group. The mean score of high and low hardiness group were  $31.41 \pm 3.53$  and  $23.16 \pm 3.34$ , respectively. The hardiness score were divided into 3 components as illustrated in Table 2.

The comparison of the means in hardiness score in each of the parenting style found that authoritative parenting style has the mean of  $29.59 \pm 5.65$ , permissive parenting style has the mean of  $27.86 \pm 5.51$ , neglectful parenting style has the mean of  $25.64 \pm 4.37$ ,

**Table 1.** Parenting style score (n = 142)

Variables	Full score	Mean	SD
Authoritative	85	65.57	7.66
Permissive	80	42.94	9.10
Authoritarian	85	36.38	11.97
Neglectful	85	36.23	11.77

SD = standard deviation

and authoritarian parenting style has the mean of  $25.30 \pm 3.77$ , respectively. The students who received authoritative parenting style would have different hardiness scores than those who received neglectful and authoritarian parenting style at statistical significance of  $p < 0.05$  (Table 3).

The correlation between parenting styles and hardiness found that authoritative parenting style had a moderate positive correlation with hardiness ( $r = 0.32$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Meanwhile, authoritarian and neglectful parenting style had low negative correlation with hardiness ( $r = -0.22$ ,  $p < 0.01$  and  $r = -0.27$ ,  $p < 0.01$  respectively).

Permissive parenting style did not have a statistically significant correlation with hardiness. When analyzed each of the parenting style by the components of hardiness, it was found that in authoritative parenting style, there was a statistically significant positive correlation with commitment and control ( $r = 0.42$ ,  $p < 0.01$  and  $r = 0.26$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , respectively). Authoritarian and neglectful parenting style had statistically negative correlation with commitment and control ( $r = -0.31$ ,  $p < 0.01$  and  $r = -0.37$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , respectively). Permissive parenting style had a negative correlation with commitment ( $r = -0.19$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) but there was no correlation with the control. All four parenting styles did not have statistically significant correlation with the challenge component (Table 4).

In relation to prediction of hardiness, authoritative parenting style was able to predict about 10% ( $R^2 = 0.10$ ) at significant level of 0.001 (Table 5).

## Discussion

The present study had the mean of total

**Table 2.** Hardiness score (n = 309)

Variables	Full score	Mean	SD
Hardiness	45	27.67	5.36
Commitment	15	10.26	2.30
Control	15	10.23	2.33
Challenge	15	7.18	2.58

**Table 3.** Compare the average of hardiness score in 4 parenting styles and Post hoc test value (n = 142)

Parenting style	X $\pm$ SD	F-test	p-value	Post-hoc
1) Authoritative (n = 99)	29.59 $\pm$ 5.65	3.51	0.01*	1 to 2, 1 to 4
2) Authoritarian (n = 10)	25.30 $\pm$ 3.77			
3) Permissive (n = 22)	27.86 $\pm$ 5.51			
4) Neglectful (n = 11)	25.64 $\pm$ 4.37			

\* The p-value  $< 0.05$

**Table 4.** Correlation between parenting styles and hardiness (n = 303)

	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive	Neglectful
Hardiness	0.32**	-0.22**	-0.08	-0.27**
Commitment	0.42**	-0.31**	-0.19**	-0.37**
Control	0.26**	-0.14**	-0.04	-0.19**
Challenge	0.05	-0.05	0.04	-0.06

\*\* The p-value  $< 0.01$  (two-tailed)

**Table 5.** Analysis of the parenting styles describing the hardiness by stepwise multiple regression analysis (n = 142)

	b	SE <sub>b</sub>	$\beta$	t	p-value
Constant	10.58	4.61	-	2.29	0.02
Authoritative parenting style	0.26	0.06	0.31	3.94	0.00
SE <sub>est</sub> = $\pm 5.316$					
R = 0.31, R <sup>2</sup> = 0.10, F = 15.57, p-value $< 0.001$					

hardiness score at 27.67. Within the components of hardiness which are commitment, control, and challenges the average scores were 10.26, 10.23 and 7.18, respectively. Similar, the results were found in Piyamaporn Singkhum's study on navy students in 2009; the average score of hardiness was 26.54, and the average of each component of hardiness were 9.17, 9.76 and 7.60, respectively<sup>(17)</sup>. The challenge component scored the lowest in both study could be explained by the strict routine assigned to the military students which was rigid and predictable. However, the control component was in high range which inferred that despite under rigid routines, the students still feel they were able to use their capabilities to handle daily situations.

The most common type of parenting style was authoritative parenting style at 31.95%. This result coincided with other study regarding parenting styles in Thailand that found that the most common parenting style was authoritative parenting style. Weeranuch Wongkongdej conducted a study in grade 8 and 11 students in Bangkok area, in total of 739 participants. She found that 47.9% were raised by authoritative parenting style<sup>(5)</sup>. In addition, Panthip Sirivunnabood et al studied the relationship between Thai people's behaviors and social processes in 1,316 students and found that authoritative parenting style were the highest at 49.3%<sup>(18)</sup>.

The study population differed in parenting style and hardiness on statistical significant level of 0.005. According to Cohen's determining the strength of the relationship (1988), authoritative parenting style had moderate positive correlation with hardiness ( $r = 0.32, p < 0.01$ ). Authoritarian parenting style and neglectful parenting style had a low negative correlation with hardiness ( $r = -0.22, p < 0.01$  and  $-0.27, p < 0.01$ ). Authoritative parenting style had a predictive ability of hardiness by 10% ( $R^2 = 0.10$ ). When compared to Mirzaei and Kadivarzare study<sup>(12)</sup>, there were significant relationship between parenting styles and hardiness in high school students. Specifically, authoritarian parenting style had the predictive ability of hardiness by 29%. When calculated authoritarian parenting style and authoritative parenting style together the predictive ability went up to 33%. In both studies, there were similarities in the aspect of statistical significant for authoritarian and authoritative parenting style. Both styles had a dimension of control, one of the components of hardiness. However, the results differed in the predictive ability of hardiness, as this current study only found a predictive ability for authoritative

parenting style for prediction of hardiness by 10%. The differences between the studies may be explained by the variation in the studied; the current study only had students who received authoritarian parenting style by 3.19%. According to Barton, hardiness could be altered by the environment such as past experiences, or resilience interventions internally and externally<sup>(19)</sup>. Hence, in the current study, the military students received additional training in academics and life experiences which differed than in other education systems. This differential system could be significant factors that affected hardiness other than parenting style.

The limitations of the study were as followed: first, the questionnaires were self-reported and thus there may be biases in the responses. Secondly, the interpretation of the DRS-15 (Thai version) was from the first version to be translated into Thai language so the hardiness' score did not have the cutoff point which differed in the later versions. Lastly, the respondents in the present study were only a sample of military students from one military school which was not the representative of the entire military students' population due to differences between each type of army. Therefore, further studies should be conducted in such a way that is more of a representative of the general military students' population. The research may be designed to be appropriate for the general population and choose a different instrument which would allowed more thorough details interpretations.

## Conclusion

Military students who received authoritative, authoritarian, and neglectful parenting style had the statistical correlation with hardiness. Permissive parenting style and hardiness correlation was not found on a statistical level. The authoritative parenting style had the predictive ability of 10% for hardiness. Thus the authoritative parenting style had positive influence on hardiness in military students.

## What is already known on this topic?

The parenting styles have a role in hardiness development.

## What this study adds?

The present study found that the differences in parenting style and hardiness scores on a statistical significance level. Authoritative parenting style had a moderate positive correlation with hardiness, authoritarian and neglectful parenting style had

negative correlations with hardiness at a minimal level. Lastly, permissive parenting style did not have the statistical significance correlation with hardiness. Authoritative parenting style had 10% predictive ability of hardiness. The authoritative parenting style had positive affected on hardiness in military students.

### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the commandant of military academy for their consent for the data collection process. The accomplishment of the present study was facilitated by Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University to support the scholarship of Siriraj Graduate Student Scholarship which allowed the present study to be a success.

### Potential conflicts of interest

None.

### Reference

1. Baumrind D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genet Psychol Monogr* 1967; 75: 43-88.
2. Baumrind D. Current patterns of parental authority. Virginia: American Psychological Association; 1971.
3. Maccoby EE, Martin JA. Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In: Mussen PH, Hetherington EM, editors. *Handbook of child psychology. Vol.4. Socialization, personality, and social development*. 4<sup>th</sup>ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1983: 1-101.
4. Chittayasothorn D. Diana Baumrind's parenting styles. *University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce Journal Humanities and Social Sciences* 2009; 29: 173-87.
5. Wongkongdej W. Attitudes toward help-seeking and self-regulated learning of secondary school students with different parenting styles [thesis]. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University; 2004.
6. Meesomsarn K. A comparison of emotional intelligence of pubescent children with different parenting styles as perceived by themselves [thesis]. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University; 2001.
7. Buranasin T. Parenting Styles Affecting to Academic Achievement in Primary School in Bangkok [thesis]. Bangkok: Mahidol university; 2012.
8. Kititussaranee S, Sontirat S, Surinya T. The relationship between parenting styles and depression of the fourth level student. *Rama Nurs J* 2009; 15: 36-47.
9. Pongthanawisuth S, Sangkool J, Jatchavala C. Parental parenting styles in patients with substance use disorders: A study in Songkhla, Thailand. *Songkla Med J* 2016; 34: 259-6.
10. Zakeri H, Karimpour M. Parenting styles and self-esteem. *Procedia- social and behavioral sciences*. In: Bekirogullari Z, editor. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Education and Educational Psychology*; October 19-22, 2011; Istanbul, Turkey; 2011: 758-61.
11. Fan J, Zhang L. The role of perceived parenting styles in thinking styles. *Learn Individ Differ* 2014; 32: 204-11.
12. Mirzaei F, Kadivarzare H. Relationship between parenting styles and hardiness in high school students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2014; 116: 3793-97.
13. Kobasa SC. Stress life events, personality, and health: an inquiry into hardiness. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1979; 37: 1-11.
14. Sheard M, Golby J. Hardiness and undergraduate academic study: the moderating role of commitment. *Pers Individ Dif* 2007; 43: 579-88.
15. Eid J, Johnsen B, Bartone PT, Nissestad OA. Growing transformational leader: exploring the role of personality hardiness. *Leader Organ Dev J* 2008; 29: 4-23.
16. Bartone PT. Hardiness protects against war-related stress in Army Reserve Forces. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 1999; 51: 72-82.
17. Singkhum P. Hardiness and naval professional training performance in Royal Thai Naval academy students [thesis]. Bangkok: Mahidol University; 2001.
18. Sirivunnabood P, Uwanno T, Rithakananone P, Kotrajaras S, Maneesri K, Suttiwan P. The study of pattern of relationships between contemporary behavior of Thai people and socialization process of Thai families in relation to the development of the country. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University; 2002.
19. Barton PT, Roland RR, Picano JJ, William TJ. Psychological hardiness predicts success in US Army Special Forces candidates. *Int J Sel Assess* 2008; 16: 78-81.