



A Comparison of Mothers Upbringing Methods Based on Adolescents Intelligence Groups (High-Intelligence, Low-Intelligence and Normal)

Fakhr Alsadat Barati¹, Masume Kalantari², Mohammad Tahan³

¹MD of psychology and education of children with special need.

²Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

³Islamic Azad University, Birjand, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 23.01.2018

Received in revised form

26.03.2018

Accepted 21.04.2018

Available online

01.05.2018

ABSTRACT

This research has been designed to compare mothers upbringing methods based on adolescents intelligence groups; high-intelligence, low-intelligence and normal. To this purpose, 194 individuals were chosen from among male and female students of ages 14 and 15 from the city of Ghaenat from southern Khorasan province within the educational year of 2015, by the simple-random method in high-intelligence schools, by the census method in low-intelligence schools and by the multi-stage cluster sampling method in normal schools. The tools employed include the Bamrind questionnaire on upbringing methods. Pierson's codependence coefficient and multi-variant variance analysis have been used for data analysis. Results indicated that the difference is significant between intelligence groups regarding tyrannical and logical potency and no significant difference in upbringing methods based on freedom. There is positive and significant difference between mothers of children belonging to high and low-intelligence groups regarding authoritarian and logical potency, and mothers of children belonging to the normal and low-intelligence groups. There's no significant difference between other intelligence groups and upbringing methods.

© 2018 IJPES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

upbringing methods, intelligence groups including high-intelligence, low-intelligence, normal, adolescents.

1. Introduction

The family is one of the most important factors of personality formation and the basis of personal development and the basic fundament for man's personality (Navabinejad, 1997). Prior to pubescence, parents often feel as to be able to understand their child. However by the child entering into puberty they revert to the past, become traditionally-minded and expect children to exhibit habits which were commonplace at that time. Parental control on children may diminish upon pubescence, even below to that of friends. Adolescents possess different personality traits therefore parents must avoid employing a unique method to deal with different personalities. Parental methods may have a determining role in children's personality change. The pubescence is not only a difficult time for adolescents, but also parents experience mental pressure, agitation, stress and other alterations in these times. Upon puberty lots of changes come to pass not only upon children themselves, but also upon their parents such as life style, ways of dealing with the child and ... (Funtnl, 2008). Puberty is a transitory stage in one's life characterized by alterations in physical, mental, social and emotional growth and development. The most important thing parents have to remember is that they're no longer dealing with a child, but with a pubescent person. A great number of methods which are usable in dealing with children will become problematic if employed in dealing with adolescents. Parents must understand that the time of

¹ Corresponding author's address: Young Researchers and Elite Club, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Birjand, Iran.

e-mail: t.mohammad2@gmail.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17220/ijpes.2018.02.006>

pubescence is a transitory passage therefore they must change their methods of dealing with children to that of dealing with adolescents (Funtnl ,2008).

Child-parent relationship is a complicated network formed through bilateral actions and reactions and affects children through upbringing methods. Upbringing in fact is not a simple job, it requires a great deal of endeavor, time, patience and temperance of the upbringing method (Shariatmadar ,2010). Parents employ different upbringing styles in dealing with their children; that is semi-sustainable patterns and parental methods for the communication of family members with each other, which provide the basis for bilateral influences (Sadr Alsadat & colleagues, 2006). The meaning of upbringing methods is the methods or styles which parents employ for the upbringing of their children and indicates the outlook they have towards their children. Upbringing methods also include criteria and rules they impose upon their children (Nikuyi & Talebi, 2010).

Baumrind in his studies points out three characteristics which identify the effective method of upbringing from ineffective ones which include: 1. acceptance and close relations, 2. Controlling and 3. Granting of independence.

Through the interaction of these three factors, emerge three methods of upbringing: authoritative, authoritarian and permissive (Diaz, 2005).The authoritarian method is characterized by rigidity and inflexibility. Authoritarian parents demand total and absolute obedience. Authoritative parents emphasize children's autonomy within the scope of family rules, they know what their children do, where they go and with whom they mix. They nevertheless try to have convincing reasons. Permissive parents don't follow a certain rule in their upbringing and exercise no control on children's behaviors. They give their children total freedom to make their decisions so children act in complete freedom and without consultation with parents (Asadi & colleagues, 2007).

Intelligence may have an important role in reaching adult life. Mothers are the first among family members who maintain a direct relation with the child, not only during the fetal stage, but in rest of the life (Ahmadvand , 2004). No doubt that for many parents having and nurturing a child is potentially an enjoyable experience but they usually aren't aware of how to deal with their children in their adolescence and which upbringing method to follow. Especially for those parents who's children are different from the majority such as the high-intelligence and the mentally retarded, since any kind of extremism by parents may have undesirable consequences for the child, and may result in children's incomplete development and behavioral issues, employing a right and correct method of upbringing has a unifying role in helping adolescents to cope with these stages. Due to the importance of upbringing methods some researches have been done in this regard, some of which are pointed out here: Farzi-Golfarani and colleagues 2015 indicated in a research that there are differences between mothers with children suffering from depression, stress and mental/actual obsession, and mothers with normal children, in employing decisive reassuring and authoritarian upbringing methods. Hoseinian and Poorshahriari 2014 found in a research that there's no significant difference in upbringing methods of mothers of students suffering from auditory disorders and mothers with normal children. Most mothers in both groups employ the authoritative upbringing method. In a research (Nabavi Moghaddam, 2010) compares parental upbringing methods of parents with stuttering children and those with normal children. His results indicated that there is no significant difference between upbringing methods employed by parents with stuttering children and those with of normal children. To put it in a nutshell, this research has been designed with the purpose of comparing upbringing methods of mothers with high-intelligence, low-intelligence and normal children. This research assists parents to have a correct relationship with their children and employing appropriate upbringing methods during adolescence. In no other stage of life one needs parental support as in adolescence, and this important issue will only be realized by employing appropriate upbringing methods. In that regard, answering the following hypothesis was in consideration: there are differences between upbringing methods of mothers with high-intelligence, low-intelligence and normal adolescents.

2. Method

This research is fundamental regarding the purpose, and non-experimental (codependence and causal-comparative) regarding the method of collecting data.

2.1. Population and sampling method

Population of this research is comprised of all male and female 14-15-year-old students of high-intelligence, special education and governmental schools of the cit of Ghaenat of southern Khorasan province, within the educational year of 2015. In high-intelligence schools (n=40) 20 female students were chosen from among 32, and 20 male students from among 20 by the simple random method, in special education schools (n=34) 16 female students from among 70 and 18 male students from among 85 by the census method, and in governmental schools (n=120) 55 female students were chosen from among 499 and 65 male students from among 655 were chosen as the population by the multi-stage cluster.

2.2. Data collection tools

The Baumrind upbringing methods questionnaire (1991): which includes 30 bullets, subjects mothers indicate their opinion by a 5-degree measurement of completely opposed, opposed, no opinion, agreed, and completely agreed from 0-4. 10 relate to the permissive factor (28-24-21-19-17-14-13-10-6-1) 10 relate to the authoritarianism factor (29-26-25-18-16-12-9-7-3-2) and 10 relate to logical potency (30-27-23-22-20-15-11-8-5-4). By adding up the grades of questions relating to each factor of permissiveness, authoritarianism and logical potency, three independent grades are achieved for each test subject (Baumrind, 2011). In this research for the purposes of analyzing the propriety of the questionnaire of upbringing methods, the codependence of each question to the total grades of the same micro-measure is calculated. Results indicated the codependence coefficient to be significant for all questions accept for question no. 21.

Table 1. Sustainability of upbringing methods questionnaire of Baumrind Cronebach’s Alpha coefficient

Researcher	Reliability		
	Grantin of freedom	Authoritarianism	logical potency
Buri (1999)	0/81	0/86	0/78
Esfandiari (1996)	0/69	0/77	0/73
Current Study	0/67	0/81	0/85

3. Results

In this section, differences between methods of upbringing including granting of freedom, authoritarianism and logical potency are analyzed in three groups of high-intelligence, low-intelligence and normal.

Table 2. Average and deviation of mothers upbringing methods separated by intelligence groups

Variant	High-Intelligence	Low-Intelligence	Normal
Logical potency	\bar{X} =2/93 S=0/1 N=40	\bar{X} =2/53 S=0/16 N=34	\bar{X} =2/90 S=0/05 N=120
Granting of freedom	\bar{X} =1/85 S=0/09 N=40	\bar{X} =1/61 S=0/101 N=34	\bar{X} =1/60 S=0/05 N=120
Authoritarianism	\bar{X} =1/76 S=0/09 N=40	\bar{X} =2/20 S=0/16 N=34	\bar{X} =1/97 S=0/06 N=120

In the above table, the average and deviation of upbringing methods have been presented separated by intelligence groups. Results indicate that the average of logical potency and freedom methods is higher in the high-intelligence group compared to other intelligence-based groups. The average of the authoritarian method is higher within the low-intelligence group compared to other intelligence-based groups. For the comparison of upbringing methods within the three groups of high and low intelligence and normal, the multi-variant

variance analysis has been employed. In this analysis, intelligence-based groups are the independent variant and upbringing methods comprise the dependent variant.

Table 3. Multi-variant test results of comparison between intelligence groups in upbringing methods (MANOVA)

Variant	Value	Ratio F	D.F.H ⁴	D.F.W ²	Level Significance	Partial Eta Squared ²	Ability
Pillais Trace	0/091	3/006	6	380	0/007	0/045	0/906
Wilks Lambda	0/911	3/015	6	378	0/007	0/046	0/907
Hotellings Trace	0/096	3/023	6	376	0/007	0/046	0/908
Roys Largest Root	0/077	4/878	3	190	0/003	0/072	0/904

²Partial Eta Squared, ³Degree of freedom wrong, ⁴Degree of freedom hypothetical.

Results of the above table indicate that differences between intelligence groups have a significant correlation to upbringing methods. A more detailed analysis of intelligence groups effects on upbringing methods may be found in the following table.

Table 4. Inter-group test results analysis comparison of intelligence groups in upbringing methods

Reason Of Change	Variant	Total Square Roots	Extent Of Freedom	Square Roots Average	Ratio F	Significance Level	Partial Eta Squared	Ability
Among intelligence groups	Granting of freedom	4/375	2	2/188	2/215	0/112	0/023	0/448
	authoritarianism	6/992	2	3/496	3/950	0/029	0/036	0/660
	logical potency	8/318	2	4/159	4/301	0/015	0/043	0/744
Error	Granting of freedom	188/625	191	0/988				
	authoritarianism	186/008	191	0/974				
	logical potency	184/682	191	0/967				
Total	granting of freedom	193/000	193					
	authoritarianism	193/000	193					
	logical potency	193/000	193					

Results of the above table indicate that according to Ben Fozooni revision (0/017) that difference among intelligence groups regarding authoritarian and logical potency methods are significant, same results however indicate that between the same groups there's no significant difference regarding the permissive method. The test has a higher ability for identifying the logical potency method in comparison to other methods in intelligence groups, so the significant difference is higher in this group than other methods. According to the atai separate square - 3.2% of changes in the freedom method, 6.3% in the authoritarian and 3.4% of changes in the logical potency method are a result of differences among intelligence groups and other changes are due to other factors. Differences in mothers upbringing methods among different intelligence groups are shown in the following table.

Table 5. Multiple comparison test results HSD regarding upbringing methods according to intelligence groups

Upbringing Methods	The First Level Of Intelligence	The Second Level Of Intelligence	Difference Average	Standard Error Average
Ganting of freedom	high-intelligence	low-intelligence	0/364	0/231
	high-intelligence	normal	0/372	0/181
	Normal	low-intelligence	-0/008	0/193
Authoritarianism	high-intelligence	low-intelligence	*0/616	0/230
	high-intelligence	normal	-/280	0/180
	Normal	low-intelligence	-0/336	0/191
Logical potency	high-intelligence	low-intelligence	*0/550	0/229
	high-intelligence	normal	0/007	0/179
	normal	low-intelligence	*0/542	0/191

Results drawn from the above table according to the Tuki test show a positive and significant difference between mothers of high-intelligence and low-intelligence groups regarding the authoritarian method. There's also a positive significant difference between mothers of normal and low-intelligence groups, and high-intelligence and low-intelligence regarding the logical potency method. This difference is greater between the high and low-intelligence groups. There is no significant difference between other intelligence groups relating to upbringing methods.

4. Discussion and conclusion

Results of this research indicated that: the difference among intelligence groups regarding authoritarian and logical potency methods is significant ($p < 0/017$), But no significant difference regarding the permissive method. There is a positive and significant difference between mothers of high and low-intelligence groups regarding the authoritarian method. Between mothers of normal and low-intelligence, and high and low-intelligence groups a positive and significant difference is observed regarding the logical potency method, which is higher between the two groups of high and low-intelligence. There is no significant difference between other intelligence-groups and upbringing methods.

Findings of Farzi Golfarani & colleagues, 2015, Hoseinian & Pourshahriari, 2014 & Nabavi Moghaddam, 2010 are in accordance. Overall the findings of this research lead to: there's no significant difference between mothers of high and low-intelligence and normal groups regarding the permissive method, but between mothers of high and low-intelligence groups a positive and significant difference is observed regarding the authoritarian method, and between mothers of normal and low-intelligence, and high and low intelligence groups there is a positive and significant difference.

Studies show that the role of family and household is highly important for the child, especially during the primary years of his/her life. Children who've been able to actualize their talents have had parents who've encouraged, guided, approved of and appreciated their children (Ahmadvand, 2013). Thus, parents employ different upbringing methods for their children according to the intelligence level.

References

- Ahmadvand, M. (2013). *Psychology of children with special needs*, Tehran: Payame Noor publications.
- Ahmadvand, M. (2014). *Mental health*, Tehran: Payame Noor publications.
- Asadi, S. M., Zokayi, N. (2007). the relation between socio-cultural background and parental upbringing method, children's educational success and learning methods, *Quarterly Of Psychiatric And Clinical Psychology And Mental Health*, 1, 21.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95. doi:10.1177/0272431691111004
- Buri, J.R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 110-119. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5701_13
- Diaz, Y. (2005). Association between parenting and child behavior problems among latinomothers and children, Unpublished master thesis, University of Mariland.
- Esfandiari, Gh. (1996). Study of parenting practices of mothers of children with behavioral disorders and normal children's mothers and the effect of mothers' education on behavioral disorders in children. Master's Thesis, Tehran Psychiatric Institute.
- Farzi Golfarani, M., Mohammad, E., Elaheh, R., Moghaddam., Fatemeh, Asgari Moghaddam, Hajar. (2015). Upbringing methods comparison of mothers with children suffering from depression, stress and obsessive compulsive disorders, with mothers of normal children, *Journal Of Children With Special Needs Studies*, 3(4), 245-264.

- Funtnl, D. (2008), the keys to dealing with adolescents, translated by Hajizadeh mas'ood and Gheytsi Akram. Tehran: Saberi publications.
- Hoseinian, S., Pourshahriari, S. (2014). The relation between mothers upbringing methods regarding the self-esteem of normal female students and those suffering from auditory impairment, *Journal of Studies on Children With Special Needs*, 7, 367-384.
- Nabavi Moghaddam, M. (2010). A comparison between upbringing methods of parents with normal and stuttering children, Masters thesis, Islamic Azad University Birjand.
- Navabinejad, S. (1997). Three chapters in guiding and upbringing of children, Tehran: Oliya Va Morabian (parents and teachers) publications.
- Nikuyi, M., Talebi, A. (2010). Parents and upbringing methods, retrievable from: <http://www.javanemrooz.com>
- Sadr-Alsadat, Sayed Jalal., Shams, Esfandabad, Hasan., Emamipour, Soozan. (2006). A comparison of upbringing methods and familial functionality in families with incompetent care takers having normal and behavioral disorders, *Journal Of University Shahrkord Of Medical Sciences*, 2, 43-48.
- Shariatmadar, A. (2010) 2.Partial Eta Squared, upbringing methods, *School Counselor Quarterly*, 2, 44.