

Relationship of Parental Rearing Styles with Learning and Students' Thinking Styles

Abbas Habibzadeh, Bahareh Shirvani, Fatemeh Sadat Razeghi

Abstract

The purpose of this study is exploring the parenting styles relationship with learning and student thinking styles among students. For this purpose, correlation methodology was used. 350 students were selected for sampling by random sampling method. They were asked to fill questionnaires of 1- parental rearing styles methods 2-Sternberg thinking style scale and 3-Grasha-Riechmann styles scale. After filling questionnaires and analysis, findings showed that there is significant relationship between parental rearing styles (authoritarian and democratic styles) and learning styles but there isn't any significant relationship between permissive parenting style and learning styles. In addition, results showed that there is significant relationship between parental rearing styles (authoritarian and democratic styles) with thinking styles but there isn't significant relationship between permissive parental rearing styles and thinking styles. In addition, multi-variable regression model was used to predict thinking and learning styles. Results showed that parenting styles can predict thinking and learning styles.

Key words: style, parenting, thinking, learning

© 2015 BBT Pub. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Family is considered as the smallest unit of society and the main and principle element. Home environment is the first and the most important factor effective on growth of people characteristics. Child inherits some features from his parents but parents' role is not limited just to heritage aspects. Parent ideals and dreams, level of their satisfaction from marital relationships and selected parenting styles all can have significant role on shaping child behavior and his mental health. (Rezaeiyan, 2004). Studying parents and children relationship is one of important sectors of psychology. The relationships between children with other family members can be known as a system or part of it which are in interactions. Child is not influenced just by his parents' behavior or characteristics but can be influenced by combination of various factors. (Esfandiyari, 1995). Baumrind (1971) performed a lot of exploration in which some patterns of parents' behavioral methods were determined. 4 aspects of parents' behavior with child were evaluated including control, expectation level for wise behavior, clearance of parents' relationship with child, and parents' protection. Finally, parents' interactions was classified in 3 groups. Authoritative parents who are mentioned by verbal relationship encourage, designating part of self-authorization with certain boundaries for child performance and behavior. Authoritarian parents know unconditional obey of their child as an advantage and use violence and physical punishment to control their child. Permissive parents don't determine any limitation and framework for their children and release their parental responsibilities. Researches in this field show that each method has its certain effects and consequences. Their (1995) showed in his research that fathers' parental rearing style is effective on children anxiety. Chenari (1995) showed that there is positive relationship between self-concept of children and behavioral attitude of parents. In addition, in foreign researches, Weylung et al. (2004) indicated that parental rearing styles directly influence on their children characteristics features so that on illnesses and their life quality. Studies related to psychological, social, and physiologic aspects of training process lead to thinking styles field. In this regard, people have constant and different methods for decoding, storing and processing information which are principally independent of intelligence (Atkinson, 1988). It seems that socializing process and environment have great role in evolution of thinking styles. From the first, child interact with existed objects and people in environment and moves toward a certain styles. (Fallahat, 2004). The expression of "style" refers to habit or dominant pattern on a person to do tasks. (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1995). After entering expression "style" in psychology and education, some structures such as learning styles, stylistics, and training styles have been used extensively. Studies about learning styles made a connection between cognition studies (conceptions, memory, and thinking processes) and characteristics. (Marton, 1988). Style conception has been expanded later in behavioral filed in 2 aspects. A group of researchers explored cognitive and learning styles in schools in order to find effects of students' personal differences on their performances and another group made a framework to study learning styles and taught based on empirical observations. (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1995). One of relatively new definition about learning style is not limited to cognition aspect at all, it is definition of Grash Riechmann (1966) offered for learning. They consider learning style as social interaction and define various roles that students undertake in interaction with classmates, teachers, and their courses contents. Along with this definition, Riding & Cheema (1991) believe that learning styles have vast range and include cognition and other styles. The suggested model by Grasha Riechmann is made by students' responses to class activities. According to their ideas, learning styles can be identified as social and emotional aspects such as attitude toward learning, teachers, or classmates. In this definition for learning styles, communicative and interactive aspects of class has been emphasized. In their initial model for class interaction, 3 two-pole aspects were proposed:

- 1- Avoidant-participative
- 2- Competitive-collaborative
- 3- Dependent-independent

But they revised their model and stated that in each aspect, people are placed in unipolar continuum not in opposite poles. Stenberg named people different styles in information processing as thinking styles (Stenberg, 1994). According to his idea, thinking style is prioritized method of thinking and it is not an ability, but it is how a person uses his abilities. (Seyf, 2011). Proposed styles by Stenberg has shaped basis for mental self-regulation theory. Different classification for learning styles show that these styles are formed based on characteristics and cognitive features and any other infrastructural factor hasn't been referred yet explicitly as former of learning styles. (Shams Esfandabad, 139); although, some researchers stated if student has any impulsion for several years presence in class, they can react impulsively. (Kagan, 1996). As it was mentioned, in most cases, learning style variables include characteristics variable and approaches. Heinström (2000) believed that learning policies can be influenced by people characteristics features. Hawk (1993) also stated that for better perception of personal differences in educational progress and using learning policies, students should be explored as more principal features such as communicative characteristic styles and thinking styles. Takafumi & Kazuhisa & Norio (2005) found that thinking styles have significant relationship with problem solving process as participation. Thinking styles are related to communicative styles or extroversion amount. (Hing & Chaun, 2004). Studies in Iran show that learning styles is related to thinking styles. (Shokr et al., 2006; Khosravi, 2004; Yamini et al., 2008) studies to explore effective factors on learning preferred methods are a few. Moreover, none of studies of learning style was Grasha Riechmann styles. Here we want to explore how threefold proposed thinking style by Zhang & Stenberg (2005) influence on learning style. Explored learning styles in this research are suggested ones by Grasha and Riechmann. In spite of importance of this psychological field, a few studies are performed and there is no determining pattern in this field. The present study is generally trying to answer to this question how parental rearing styles are related to students' learning and thinking styles.

Research Hypotheses

First Hypothesis: there is relationship between parental rearing styles and learning styles.

Second Hypothesis: there is relationship between parental rearing styles and thinking styles.

Third Hypothesis: parental rearing role in prediction of students' thinking and learning styles.

Methodology

The method in this research is correlative. Correlative method includes all researches which try to discover or determine relationships between various variables using correlation coefficient. Correlative method has 2 main purposes: 1-discovering the correlation among variables. 2- Predicting a variable by one or several variables. In other words, the purpose of correlative research perceives variables and complicated patterns by studying correlation among patterns and variables presumed to have relationships with each other. This method is useful when purpose is discovering relationship among variables with no previous researches on them (Delavar, 2006). In present research, 350 people were selected by random sampling method among students.

Research Tool

A) Parental Rearing Styles Questionnaire (Baumrind): the initial form of this questionnaire has 30 items that was designed and made by Diana Baumrind. This questionnaire was translated by Hosseinpour (2002). This questionnaire measures parental rearing styles in 3 factors (permissive, authoritarian and democratic styles). In front of each 5 columns (fully agreed, agreed to some extent, disagreed to some extent, disagree, and fully disagreed) are scaled from 0 to 40 that individual score is obtained by summing related question score to each method and dividing it on number of questions. Reliability and validity of this questionnaire is confirmed. Buray (1991, quoted by Bagherpour, 2005) used differential method to explore reliability and validity of this questionnaire and observed that authoritarian style has negative relationship with permissive ($r=0.38$) and authoritative (democratic) style ($r=0.48$). permissive style doesn't have significant relationship with democratic method ($r=0.7$) (Mehrafuz, 1999). Buray (1991) used re-test to calculate reliability and obtained the following results. 81% for permissive style, 86% for authoritarian style and 0.78 for democratic style. (Mehrafuz, 1999)

B) Sternberg & Wagner 65-question Score (1992)

this scope includes 13 thinking styles that are separable by empirical findings in 3 thinking styles. (Sternberg & Wagner, 2005). First style is regulative, judgmental, hierarchical, general, and liberal thought styles (totally 25 items). The second style include executive, partial, kingdom, and conservative styles with 20 items. The last style include illegalization, lower democratization, internal, and external styles including 25 items. Items of this inventory are scaled on five-point Likret spectrum. In foreign research, internal reliability of each factor's questions has been reported (Zhang, 2009; Zhang and Stenberg, 2005). Farzad et al (2007) reported in relationship with internal similarity of mentioned inventory 0.7 for the first style, 0.63 for the second style, and 0.71 for the third style.

C) Grasha Riechmann Learning Styles Scope

This scope has 60 items that participators answer to questions from "fully agreed" to "fully disagreed" in five-point Likret spectrum. Since no witness seen in Iran based on this scope, explorative functional analysis has been used to confirm validity of its structures by Warimax rotation and main elements method. Some items were deleted for low functional load. Obtained results show confirmation of the mentioned structure in Iranian society. Baykul (2010) in a study of Grisha Reichmann validity reported styles internal similarity from 0.40 to 0.78. in this study, internal similarity based on Alpha Cronbah coefficient were obtained in independent styles 0.64, dependent style

0.65, preventive style 0.71, participative style 0.70, competitive style 0.74, and collaborative style 0.6. These results show high validity of this tool.

Findings

Table 1: frequency distribution and frequency percentage for selected sample gender

Gender	Frequency	Frequency percentage
Boy	153	43.71
Girl	197	56.29
total	350	100.00

The mentioned information showed that 43.71% are boy students and 56.29% are girl student.

Hypothesis 1: there is relationship between parental rearing styles and learning styles.

Table 2: relationship between parental rearing styles and learning styles

Parental rearing styles	Learning styles	Significance level
Permissive style	0.18	0.07
Authoritarian style	0.26	0.04
Democratic style	0.35	0.01

The above table shows there is significant relationship between parental rearing styles (authoritarian, democratic, permissive) and learning styles. So that, the relationship between authoritarian style with learning style is 0.26 that is in 0.04 significance level. In addition, the relationship between democratic style with learning style is 0.35 that is in 0.01significance level. Results show that there is no significant relationship between permissive style with learning style.

Hypothesis 2: there is relationship between parental rearing styles and thinking styles.

Table 3: relationship between parental rearing styles and thinking styles

Parental rearing styles	Thinking styles	Significance level
Permissive style	0.13	0.08
Authoritarian style	0.21	0.04
Democratic style	0.29	0.001

The above table shows there is significant relationship between parental rearing styles (authoritarian, democratic, permissive) and thinking styles. So that, the relationship between authoritarian style with learning style is 0.21 that is in 0.04 significance level. In addition, the relationship between democratic style with learning style is 0.29 that is in 0.001significance level. Results show that there is no significant relationship between permissive style with learning style.

Hypothesis 3: Parental rearing styles role in prediction students' thinking styles

Table 4: relationship between permissive style with learning style

Model	Total squares	Freedom degree	Average squares	F relation	Significance
Regression	842.4	3	280.80	7.37	0.001
Error	13254.02	348	38.09		
Total	14096.42	351			

To explore whether parental rearing styles can predict thinking styles, multiple regression coefficient was used. Results of table show that parental rearing can predict thinking styles. In addition, result show ($F_{3,348}=5.96$, $P < 0.01$) that parental rearing styles can predict thinking styles.

Table 5: standardized and unstandardized correlation coefficients of parental rearing styles to predict thinking styles

Variable	Unstandardized coefficients		Standard coefficients	T	Significance
	B	Standard error	Beta		
Constant number	29.96	2.52		11.82	0.0001
Permissive style	0.07	0.07	0.01	0.35	0.68
Authoritarian style	0.18	0.06	0.10	1.98	0.04
Democratic style	0.21	0.06	0.30	2.88	0.02

The standardized regression coefficient show that there is positive and significant relationship between parental rearing styles and thinking styles so that authoritarian style with β coefficient=0.1 ($t=1.96$, $p=0.04$), democratic style with β coefficient=0.3 ($t=2.88$, $p=0.2$) significantly can predict thinking styles. In addition, permissive parental rearing can't predict thinking style ($t=0.35$, $p=0.68$)

Hypothesis 4: what are parental rearing styles roles in prediction of students' learning styles?

Table 6: results related to multiple regression analysis that predict learning styles based on parenting styles

Model	Total squares	Freedom degree	Average squares	F relation	Significance
Regression	752.52	3	250.84	6.96	0.001
Error	12542.65	348	36.04		
Total	13295.17	351			

To explore whether parental rearing styles can predict learning styles, multiple regression coefficient was used. Results of table show that parental rearing can predict learning styles. In addition, result show ($F_{3,348}=6.96$, $P < 0.01$) that parental rearing styles can predict thinking styles.

Table 7: standardized and unstandardized correlation coefficients of parental rearing styles to predict learning styles

Variable	Unstandardized coefficients		Standard coefficients	T	Significance
	B	Standard error	Beta		
Constant number	22.33	2.52		11.82	0.001
Permissive style	0.08	0.06	0.01	0.32	0.08
Authoritarian style	0.23	0.09	0.15	2.03	0.03
Democratic style	0.28	0.07	0.32	2.87	0.02

The standardized regression coefficient show that there is positive and significant relationship between parental rearing styles and learning styles so that authoritarian style with β coefficient=0.15 ($t=1.96$, $p=0.04$), democratic style with β coefficient=0.3 ($t=2.88$, $p=0.2$) significantly can predict learning styles. In addition, permissive parental rearing can't predict learning style ($t=0.32$, $p=0.08$).

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study is exploring the relationship between parental rearing relationship with learning and thinking styles. For this purpose, correlative method has been used. 350 students were selected for random sampling and they were asked to fill questionnaire. Results showed that there is significant relationship between parental rearing style (authoritarian, democratic, and permissive style) and learning style but there isn't significant relationship between permissive style and learning style. Moreover, results show that there is significant relationship between parental rearing style (authoritarian, democratic, and permissive style) and thinking style but there isn't significant relationship between permissive style and learning style. Result also show that parental rearing styles can predict thinking and learning styles.

References

1. Delavar, Ali (2006). Theoretical and practical basis in human and social science. Tehran: Roshd
2. Stenberg, Robert. J (1997). Thinking styles translated by Ali Akbar Khosravi, Alaoddin Etemad Ahari (2002), Tehran: Dadar express
3. Khosravi, Ali Akbar (2004), the relationship between thinking styles and conceptual styles, conceptual style and learning styles, psychological researches, spring, no. 2
4. Farzad, Valioallah et al., (2007) exploring confirmative functional analysis and internal similarity of thinking style questionnaire among students, psychological chapter, Ferdowsi University, second year, no. 6
5. Yamini, Mohammad et al., the relationship between learning environment, social structuralism, thinking styles with deep approach to learning and returns on learning consequences. Psychology chapter, Tabriz University, no. 3
6. Seyf, Ali Akbar (2001) research psychology, learning and training psychology, 5th edition, Tehran: Agah express
7. Farrokhi, Nur Ali, (2004) common effect of learning policies and thinking styles on second grade of high school students' conception of Tehran. Ph.D. thesis, unpublished. Psychological and educational science faculty, Allameh Tabatabaei University
8. Comp bell, S.B. & Douglas, V.I. (1972) Cognitive styles and responses to the threat of frustration, Canadian journal of behavioral science, 4, pp, 30 - 42.
9. Jonanson, D.H & Grabowski, B.L. (1993). Hand book of individual differences, learning instruction. Mahwah Eylbaum.
10. Myers, I.B, MCCaulley, (1988). MBTT manual, A guide to the development and use of the myers - Briggs type indicator third education, palo alto, consulting psychologist press, Inc.
11. Riding, R. & Cheema, I (1991) cognitive styles - an over view and integration, educational psychology, 11, pp, 193 - 215
12. Zang L.F, and Sternberg R. J, (2005). A three Fold model of intellectual styles, Educational psychology. 17(1), 1 - 53 .
13. Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. Journal of Personality Assessment, 57 (1), 110- 119.
14. Atkinson, s. (1998). "Cognitive styles in the context of design and technology project work", educational psychology: international journal of experimental educational psychology,

15. 18(2), 183-194.
16. Baykul, Y. et al (2010). "A Validity and Reliability Study of Grasha-Riechmann Student Learning Style Scale", *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences*, *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences* 5, 3, 177-184.
17. Ching, Y. S., Chaun, L. W. (2004). "The relationship among creative, critical thinking and thinking styles in Taiwan high school students", *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, Vol.31, 33-45.
18. Grasha, A. F. (1996). "Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning style", Pittsburgh: Alliance publishers.
19. Hawk, S. (1993). "The effects of user involvement: some personality determinants", *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 38, 839-855.
20. Heinström, J. (2000). "The impact of personality and approaches to learning on information behavior", *Information Research*, Vol. 5 No. 3, 78-89.
21. Kagan, j. (1996). "Modifiability of an impulsive tempo", *Journal of educational psychology*, 57, 357-365.
22. Sternberg, R. J. & Grigorenko, E. L. (1997). "Are cognitive styles still in style?", *American psychologist*, 52, (7), pp 700-712.
23. Sternberg, R. J. & Wangner, R. K. (1992). *Thinking styles inventory*, Unpublished test, Yale university.
24. Sternberg, R. J. (2000). *Wisdom as a form of giftedness*, *Gifted child quarterly*, 44 (4), 252-259.
25. Sternberg, R. J. (1997a). *Thinking styles*, New York: Cambridge university press.
26. Zhang, L. F & Sternberg, R. J. (2005). "A threefold model of intellectual styles", *Educational psychological psychology review*, 17(1), 1-53.
27. Zhang, L. F., (2009). "Anxiety and thinking styles", *Personality and Individual Differences* 47, 347-351.
28. Zhang, L. F. (2000). "University students learning approaches in three cultures: an investigation of biggs's 3p model", *The journal of personality*, 134(1), 37-55.
29. Zhang, L. f & Sternberg, r. j(2005)." A threefold model of intellectual styles" *Educational psychological psychology review*, 17(1), 1-53.
30. Zhang, L. F. & Sternberg, r. j. (1998). "thinking styles, abilities, and academic achievement among Hong Kong university student", *Hong Kong educational research association*. 13,pp 41-62.
31. Zhang, L. F. (2002). "Thinking styles: Their relationships with modes of thinking and academic performance", *Educational Psychology*, 22, 331-348.

Abbas Habibzadeh, Ph.D. Educational psychology, faculty member and Assistant Professor in Qom Islamic Azad University

Bahareh Shirvani, Fatemeh Sadat Razeghi, Ph.D. student of Educational Psychology in Qom Islamic Azad University