

Research Article

Correlation Between Parenting Styles, Resilience, and Socioeconomic Status on Emotional Intelligence of College Students

Chun-Hsien Kuo^{1,3,5}, Tzu-Hsuan Lin¹, Yi-Chao Chen^{*2}, Mein-Woei Suen^{1,3,4,6,7}, Ni'matuzahroh⁸

¹Department of Psychology, Asia University, Taiwan

²Department of Social Work, Asia University, Taiwan

³Taiwan Applied Psychology Association, Taiwan

⁴Gender Equality Education and Research Center, Asia University, Taiwan

⁵Center for Prevention and Treatment of Internet Addiction, China Asia Associated University, Taiwan

⁶Department of Medical Research, Asia University Hospital, Asia University, Taiwan

⁷Department of Medical Research, China Medical University Hospital, China Medical University, Taiwan

⁸Department of Psychology, University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia

Abstract.

Corresponding Author: Yi-Chao Chen; email: chenyj@asia.edu.tw

Published 7 February 2024

Publishing services provided by Knowledge E

© authors et al. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the ICAP-H Conference Committee.

The family is the first and most important place for human interaction. Parents are the most important interaction objects. Numerous studies have pointed out that parenting styles can have a large and long-term impact on children. Several studies have linked parenting styles to emotional intelligence and resilience in children and adolescents. However, fewer studies have explored whether parenting styles are associated with college students' emotional intelligence and resilience. In addition, few studies have explored whether socioeconomic status is related to emotional intelligence and/or resilience. Therefore, this study takes 210 college students aged 18–23 years as research participants to explore the relationship between these variables. The instruments are Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI), Two-factor Index of Social Position, Inventory of Adolescent Resilience (IAR), and Emotion Management Questionnaire. Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation analysis. The findings suggest that parenting styles are associated with emotional intelligence. However, resilience is related to the caring dimension of parenting styles, but not the control dimension. Similar result was also found in socioeconomic status. The developmental changes of these variables and their mechanisms still need further research to explore.

Keywords: emotional intelligence, parenting styles, resilience, socioeconomic status

OPEN ACCESS

1. BACKGROUND

The family is the first environment everyone meets, and it also has a major impact on a person's future development. Among them, parents are usually the most important role. In addition to parents being role models for their children, parent-child interaction also affects the development of children's personality, behavior, emotion and cognition [1]. A related study in Taiwan also found that if parents adopt a caring and supportive parenting attitude, it will have a positive impact on their children's emotional intelligence, whereas strict parenting or laissez-faire discipline will bring negative emotions to their children [2]. In addition to parenting style, socioeconomic status can also affect a child's development in various ways. Parents with high socioeconomic status can also provide their children with a more supportive and stimulating environment, which will lead to more exploratory motivations for their children and better development in the future [3]. A study in Taiwan found that families with low socioeconomic status often used neglectful parenting methods in the process of parenting their children because their parents were busy with work [4]. In the face of these negative family background factors, it is easy to cause children to lack a sense of security, which indeed has a considerable impact on children's psychological feelings and emotional intelligence [5].

Human perception of stress comes from the interpretation of external stimuli and is also influenced by past experiences. In the process of repeated exposure to stress, humans also learn how to face and deal with stress. Humans also undergo a process of recovery after being stressed. This process of recovery can be called resilience. Werner [6] argues that there are three main factors that constitute resilience: risk factors, protection factors, and vulnerability factors. Risk factors and vulnerability factors make individuals more vulnerable to psychological and cognitive harm, hindering their normal development; protective factors can reduce the individual's ability to avoid being affected by the individual in an unfavorable environment, so social support and the family system are important factors in the development of resilience. In addition, these three factors interact with each other. It will make the individual have the buffering effect to the negative impact of adversity. What is more important is to allow individuals to maintain good development and quickly return to their original state even if they are facing adversity [7]. Children's character, emotional, behavioral and cognitive development is largely dependent on education, especially family education. The success of family education depends on the upbringing of parents.

Baumrind [8,9] collected the ways of parenting children by interviewing parents and children, and divided the parenting styles into three types: Democratic authoritative

(high caring and high control, also called authoritative) refers to parents who will set appropriate restrictions, but children can give opinions according to their own needs, and the communication between parents and children is open; Arbitrary dictatorial type (low caring and high control, also called authoritarian) is the general traditional type of parents (in Asia countries), who are more authoritarian and want their children to obey their own ideas, while ignoring their children's needs and putting their opinions on their children; Permissive (high caring and low control) refers to Parents do not formulate appropriate rules and norms for their children, and they spoil their children too much but neglect discipline, which leads to the phenomenon that children have a higher status than their parents.

Maccoby [10] extended Baumrind's parenting style dimension and advocated that the way parents raise their children can be divided into two axes, namely: (1) responsive, which means providing warmth and attachment emotionally, unconditionally (2) Control, which means discipline requirements, mandatory or firm guidance, expands the above three types of parenting by four types, adding (low caring and low control) neglect and Neglecting means that parents devote less attention to their children, do little to discipline their children, and do not take the initiative to care for their children, resulting in weak emotional communication and poor parent-child attachment. According to Maccoby's classification, this study divides parenting styles into four types: democratic authoritative, authoritarian, tolerant and doting, neglecting, and rejecting.

The link between parenting style and emotional intelligence can be observed early in development. Argyriou [11] for example, pointed out that there is a positive correlation between the democratic authoritative type and emotional intelligence; there is a negative correlation between the tolerant and doting type, the autocratic type and emotional intelligence, but there is no evidence that there is a relationship between the neglect and rejection type of parenting and emotional intelligence. Direct effects, but it is known that neglect, rejection-type parenting styles have an impact on individuals with emotional distress, low self-esteem, poor academic performance, or deviant behavior [12]. In addition, Farrell [13] found that the emotional IQ of preschool children is related to parenting style. However, few studies have explored whether the effect of parenting style can be related to the emotional intelligence of college students.

In another way, Benard [14] believes that resilience is a trait that describes an individual, which promotes successful adaptation, and can be transformed into strength from adversity or crisis. Resilience is generally broadly defined as an individual's overcoming of adversity and is used to describe an individual's ability to protect himself from danger or the negative effects of a dilemma, despite exposure to hazards or an environment in

which the individual experiences discomfort. There is good adaptation and development [15]. Research indicates that resilience can promote emotional intelligence [16].

Therefore, it is important to know the Correlation Between Parenting Styles, Resilience, and Socioeconomic Status on Emotional Intelligence of College Students. The purpose of this study was to understand the correlation between different parenting styles, socioeconomic status, and individual resilience on emotional intelligence.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

2.1. Research Subjects

This study recruited 210 college students aged 18-23 as participants. Among them, 91 males and 119 females. The number of participants at age 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 were 22, 19, 36, 65, 28, and 31, respectively.

2.2. Research Instruments

This study used the following inventories as research tools.

(1) Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI)

The Chinese version of the PBI is translated from the scale developed by Parker, Tupling and Brown [17]. PBI is used to measure the parenting styles of different parents. This scale includes two aspects of "caring" and "controlling". The scale has a total of 25 items, including 12 items of caring and 13 items of protection. According to the scores of the two subscales, the Judgment criteria, the scoring method of this study is based on the four-point Likert score, and the higher the score, the higher the degree of parental family attitude in the care and control. The test-retest reliability of this scale is 0.66-0.88, and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.65-0.73 is within the acceptable range.

(2) Two-factor Index of Social Position

This study divides occupation and education into five levels each based on the two-factor socioeconomic status index of Hollingshead and Redlich [18]. The socioeconomic status is divided into a total score weighted (occupation level multiplied by 7, educational level multiplied by 4): 1st level 52-55 points, 2nd level 41-51, 3rd level 30-40, 4th level: 19-29, fifth grade: 11-18.

(3) Inventory of Adolescent Resilience (IAR)

This study will use the adolescent resilience scale developed by Chan, et al. [19], which is based on Arkoff's adaptation theory. Resilience is divided into four levels,

including problem-solving ability, hope and optimism, empathy and interpersonal interaction, and emotional regulation. This study uses the total score of 28 items on the four subscales as the judgment of resilience. The scoring method of this study is based on four Likert points, and the higher the score, the higher the resilience of the individual. The Cronbach’s coefficient of this scale is .936, which shows that the IAR has good internal consistency.

(4) Emotion Management Questionnaire

This research adopts the emotion management questionnaire compiled by Kong, et al. [20], the items are divided into four subscales, namely: self-emotional assessment and expression ability, ability to recognize and evaluate other people’s emotions, self-emotional management ability, and emotional use. The scoring method in this study is based on a five-point Likert score, with higher scores indicating higher emotional intelligence. Internal consistency reliability for these four factors ranged from 0.83 to 0.90.

2.3. Data Analysis Technique

Pearson correlation analysis was used to understand whether there was a correlation between parenting style, resilience, socioeconomic status, and emotional intelligence. One-way ANOVA for independent sample was used to analyze whether emotional intelligence differs in socioeconomic status and the two-way ANOVA for independent sample was used to analyze whether emotional intelligence would be different in two groups.

3. RESULT

The results of analysis are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1: Correlations between parenting styles, resilience, S.E.S. and emotional intelligence.

	1	2	3	4	5
1.E.Q.	-	.760**	.320**	-.101	.134
2.Resilience	.760**	-	.454**	-.263**	.094
3.Caring	.320**	.454**	-	-.433**	.183**
4.Control	-.101	-.263**	-.433**	-	.073
5.S.E.S.	.134	.094	.183**	.073	-

E.Q.=Emotional Intelligence, Caring=Caring dimension of Parenting Styles, Control=Control dimension of Parenting Styles, S.E.S=Socioeconomic Status. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

One-way ANOVA for independent sample was used to analyze whether emotional intelligence differs in socioeconomic status. The results showed that emotional intelligence did not differ significantly in different socioeconomic status of the parents ($F_{(4,205)} = 1.721, p > .1$), nor did it differ in the levels of resilience ($F_{(4,205)} = 1.621, p > .1$).

According to the scores of the parenting style's caring and control dimensions, participants were divided into two groups (high score and low score). The two-way ANOVA for independent sample was used to analyze whether emotional intelligence would be different in two groups. In caring dimensions of parenting style, emotional intelligence was significantly different between the two groups ($F_{(1,206)} = 7.096, p < .01$). In Control dimension of parenting style, emotional intelligence was not significant different between two groups. The

Descriptive statistics of emotional intelligence scores of two groups in two dimensions (caring and control) of parenting style was shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2: Descriptive statistics of emotional intelligence scores of two groups in two dimensions (caring and control) of parenting style.

	N	Caring	N	Control
		M(SD)		M(SD)
High Score	111 99	65.42(9.91)	36 174	60.64(11.65)
Low Score		58.56(10.08)		62.51(10.31)

The two-way ANOVA for independent sample was used to analyze whether resilience scores would be different in two groups. Similar results were found in this analysis. In caring dimension of parenting style, resilience scores were significantly different between the two groups ($F_{(1,206)} = 10.321, p < .01$). In Control dimension of parenting style, resilience scores were not significant different between two groups. The Descriptive statistics of emotional intelligence scores of two groups in two dimensions (caring and control) of parenting style was shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3: Descriptive statistics of resilience scores of two groups in two dimensions (caring and control) of parenting style.

	N	Caring	N	Control
		M(SD)		M(SD)
High Score	111 99	93.88(12.334)	36 174	82.36(15.516)
Low Score		83.31(12.806)		90.25(12.805)

4. DISCUSSION

This research aims to determine the relationship between parenting style, socio-economic status, and resilience on students' emotional intelligence. Parenting style is the attitudes and values adopted by parents in raising their children, including aspects of children's cognition, emotions, and behavior, and shows how parents treat children [21]. Parenting styles are divided into several types, including democratic authoritative (high concern and high control, also called authoritative), arbitrary dictatorial type (low concern and high control, also called authoritarian) and permissive (high concern and low control) [8,22].

This parenting style was then expanded with two styles, namely [1] responsive, meaning providing emotional warmth and attachment, without conditions and [2] Control, namely a parenting style that provides emotional warmth and attachment, without conditions. discipline requirements, mandatory or strict guidance, expanding the three types of parenting above into four types, adding (low parenting and low control) neglect and Neglect means parents pay less attention to children, do less in disciplining children, and do not take the initiative to caring for their children, resulting in weak emotional communication and poor parent-child attachment [10].

The research results show that both dimensions of parenting are related to emotional intelligence. This is in line with research which proves that there is a positive correlation between the democratic authoritative type and emotional intelligence; There is a negative correlation between the tolerant and loving type, the autocratic type and emotional intelligence [11]. Meanwhile, neglect and rejection type parenting styles impact individuals with emotional distress, low self-esteem, poor academic performance, or deviant behavior [12]. This finding is also in line with research which proves that children's emotional intelligence is related to their parents' parenting style [13].

Parenting style refers to the attitudes and values held by parents in raising children's cognition, emotions and behavior, and shows how they treat children [21]. The findings of this research are also in line with research by Asghari & Besharat [23] with research subjects aged 18-20 years and found that all dimensions of perceived parenting style were positively related to emotional intelligence. Our research also found that in college students, emotional intelligence was associated with both dimensions of parenting style, which is consistent with Asghari and Besharat's [23] research. Although the two studies recruited participants from different age ranges and used different tools. However, the two studies still provided similar results. The findings of this research show that children's character, emotional, behavioral and cognitive development is very dependent on

education, especially family education. The success of family education depends on the parenting style of parents.

The results of this study also show that parents' socio-economic status does not have a significant relationship with emotional intelligence. Socioeconomic status is only related to the caring dimension in parenting patterns as in Teachman's research [3]; Wei & Ying [24] show that parents with high socioeconomic status are proven to be able to provide their children with a more supportive and stimulating environment, which will result in more exploratory motivation for their children and better development in the future. front [3,24]. A study in Taiwan found that families with low socioeconomic status often used neglectful parenting methods in the process of raising their children because parents were busy with work [4]. Facing these negative family background factors can easily cause children to lack a sense of security, which of course has a big impact on children's psychological feelings and emotional intelligence [5].

Resilience is a recovery process after experiencing stress. In this research, resilience is not influenced by parents' socio-economic status. This means that a student's ability to survive is not influenced by the socio-economic conditions of their parents but is more influenced by how a person perceives and interprets stress that comes from external stimuli and is also influenced by past experiences. Another factor that influences a person's resilience is repeated stressful events which make a person learn how to deal with stress. The process of recovering from the stress experienced is called resilience. Werner [6] argues that there are three main factors that shape resilience: risk factors, protective factors, and vulnerability factors. Risk factors and vulnerability factors make individuals more vulnerable to psychological and cognitive harm, thereby hindering their normal development; Protective factors can reduce an individual's ability to avoid individual influences in an unfavorable environment, so social support and family systems are important factors in developing resilience. In addition, these three factors interact with each other. This will give individuals a buffering effect against the negative impact of difficulties. What is more important is that it allows individuals to maintain good development and quickly return to their original state even when they encounter difficulties [7].

A limitation of this study is that the resilience scale was not adjusted to the age of the participants. Because at the time this research was conducted, a suitable resilience scale for college students was not yet available in Taiwan.

5. CONCLUSION

Although this study found a correlation between parenting style and emotional intelligence in college students. And the emotional intelligence and resilience of college students will vary depending on the caring dimension of parenting styles. However, there is still no clear explanation for the developmental changes and the mechanisms involved. Therefore, further research is needed to clarify the relationship between these characteristics.

References

- [1] Pinguart M. Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with externalizing problems of children and adolescents: An updated meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*. 2017;53(5):873.
- [2] Chen W, Hsu C. Warm support vs. iron discipline? The relation between parenting and adolescent mental health. *Bulletin of Education and Research*. 2011;57(2):121–154.
- [3] Teachman JD. Family background, educational resources, and educational attainment. *American Sociological Review*. 1987;52(4):548–557.
- [4] Liu H. The relationship among parental nurturing style, attachment individuation and ego-identity of adolescents in junior high school [Internet]. National Kaohsiung Normal University; 1997. Available from: <https://hdl.handle.net/11296/k4766g>
- [5] Wang C. The development of children's emotional intelligence [Internet]. National Cheng-Chi University; 1999. Available from: <https://hdl.handle.net/11296/tfjkkc>
- [6] Werner EE. Resilience in development. In: *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 1995. 81–85 p.
- [7] Bolton KW, Hall JC, Blundo R, Lehmann P. The role of resilience and resilience theory in solution-focused practice. *J Syst Ther*. 2017;36(3):1–15.
- [8] Baumrind D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Vol. 75, *Genetic Psychology Monographs*. US: Heldref Publications; 1967. 43–88 p.
- [9] Baumrind D. Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*. 1971;4(1 PART 2):1–103.
- [10] Maccoby EE. Socialization and developmental change. *Child Development*. 1984;55(2):317–328. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1129945>
- [11] Argyriou E, Bakoyannis G, Tantaros S. Parenting styles and trait emotional intelligence in adolescence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*. 2016;57(1):42–49.

- [12] Avenevoli S, Sessa FM, Steinberg L. Family structure, parenting practices, and adolescent adjustment: An ecological examination. In: *Coping with divorce, single parenting, and remarriage: A risk and resiliency perspective*. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; 1999. 65–90 p.
- [13] Farrell G. The Relationship between parenting style and the level of emotional intelligence in preschool-aged children English. *PCOM Psychology Dissertations*. 2015;1–82.
- [14] Benard B. Fostering resiliency in kids: Protective factors in the family, school, and community. *Sch Community*. 1991;(August):1–27.
- [15] Everall RD, Jessica Altrows K, Paulson BL. Creating a future: A study of resilience in suicidal female adolescents. *Journal of Counseling & Development*. 2006;84(4):461–470.
- [16] Schneider TR, Lyons JB, Khazon S. Emotional intelligence and resilience. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2013;55(8):909–914. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.07.460>
- [17] Parker G, Hilary T, Brown LB. *Instrument parental bonding*. Black Dog Institute. 1979;1–4.
- [18] Hollingshead A de B. *Two factor index of social position*. TA -TT. New Haven SE - 11 leaves; 28 cm: Hollingshead New Haven; 1957.
- [19] Chan YU, Yeh YC, Peng YY, Yeh BL. The development of the inventory of adolescent resilience. *Psychological Tests*. 2009;56(4):491–518.
- [20] Kong F, Zhao J, You X. Emotional intelligence and life satisfaction in Chinese university students: The mediating role of self-esteem and social support. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2012;53(8):1039–1043.
- [21] Pettit GS, Bates JE, Dodge KA. Supportive parenting, ecological context, and children's adjustment: A seven-year longitudinal study. *Soc Res Child Dev*. 1997;68(5):908–923.
- [22] Baumrind D. Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*. 1971;4(1):1–103. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372>
- [23] Asghari MS, Besharat MA. The relation of perceived parenting with emotional intelligence. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Science*. 2011;30:231–235.
- [24] Wei X, Ying L. The participation in shadow education of adolescents: School peer group and ascribed difference—A multilevel analysis based on CEPS data. *Journal of East China Normal University(Natural Science)*. 2020;38(11):56–68.