

b144 240 6X

U.F.S. BIBLIOTEK

RDIE EKSEMPLAAR MAG ONDER  
EN OMSTANDIGHEDE UIT DIE  
BIBLIOTEK VERWYDER WORD NIE

University Free State



34300001324643

Universiteit Vrystaat

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED  
PARENTING STYLES AND RESILIENCE DURING  
ADOLESCENCE**

**NATASHA KRITZAS**  
**[B.Soc.Sc., B.A. Hons (Psychology)]**

*Dissertation (in article format) submitted in accordance with the partial  
requirements for the degree*

**M.Soc.Sc. (Counselling Psychology)**

**in the**

**DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY,**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

**at the**

**UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE**

**NOVEMBER 2002**

**SUPERVISOR: DR A.A. GROBLER**

Universiteit van die  
Oranje-Vrystaat  
BLOEMFONTEIN  
29 AUG 2003  
UOVS SASOL BIBLIOTEEK

## CONTENT

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>COPING AND SENSE OF COHERENCE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PARENTING</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>METHOD</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Measuring Instruments</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Sampling</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Research Question</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>STATISTICAL PROCEDURES</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>REFERENCE LIST</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>AFRIKAANS ABSTRACT</b>	<b>31</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*“Interdependence is a higher value than independence”*

(Covey, pp.9, 1992)

For the development and production of this thesis I feel a deep sense of gratitude

- to my wonderful parents, Jannie and Evie Kritzas. Thank you for your constant demonstration of unconditional love, support and interest. I am very grateful and I love you both very much.
- to my sisters, Rhea, Christine and Thalia. Thank you for your encouragement, assistance and most importantly the laughter.
- to my mentor and supervisor, Dr. Grobler. Your professional approach and accountability is unforgettable. Thank you for all that you have taught me, I will carry it with me forever.
- to Dr. Esterhuyse. Thank you for assisting in getting the statistics done.
- to the headmasters, teachers and learners from the relevant schools. Thank you for your time, effort and dedication.

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between perceived parenting styles and resilience in adolescence. The respondents were a sample of 360 English speaking, multi-cultural subjects, with a mean age of 17,6 years. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to investigate these results. The criterion variables included sense of coherence (measured by Antonovsky's Orientation to Life Questionnaire) and problem-focused, emotion-focused and dysfunctional coping strategies (operationalised by means of the COPE scale). The predictor variables included six scales, namely mother's permissiveness, father's permissiveness, mother's authoritarianism, father's authoritarianism, mother's authoritative parenting and father's authoritative parenting (measured by means of the Parental Authority Questionnaire). Authoritative parenting provided the most significant contribution to the explanation of the variance in resilience for both culture groups and both sexes.

**Keywords:** Parenting styles, Resilience, Coping, Sense of coherence, Gender, Culture, Adolescence.

## INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is recognised as a particularly stressful period of development, and in today's society this age group encounters many stressors. Although most research on stress and coping has focused on adults, recent attention to adolescents suggests that there are developmental changes in coping at this age and that particular coping strategies vary with gender and the type of stressors adolescents' experience. According to Wolchik and Sandler (1997), these stressors may have their origins in both intra- and interpsychic spheres of the adolescent's functioning and may be of a personal, family, physical, social, or environmental nature. Adolescents respond to these stressors in different ways and a distinction may be made between the ways in which they choose to cope with them. Some adolescents choose to cope and achieve despite the context of their environment, while others do not cope and tend to fall into delinquent behaviour, academic problems, substance abuse, depression and even suicide.

According to the literature (Strümpfer, 2001), the difference between coping and non-coping behaviour can be explained with reference to the concept of resilience. Strümpfer defines resilience as a pattern of psychological activity that consists of a motive to be strong in the face of inordinate demands; the goal directed behaviour of coping and rebounding, and of accompanying emotions and cognitions. Resilience is also defined as accomplishing positive developmental outcomes in the face of adversity. Accordingly resilience is the process of, capacity for, or outcome of, successful adaptation despite challenging or threatening circumstances (Sandler, Wolchik, Mackinnon, Ayers & Roosa, 1997).

Resilience is influenced by internal as well as external life factors and experiences. Much progress has been made in identifying coping resources. This includes the characteristics of the child, relationships with the primary caretakers and support from the extra-familial community resources. Sandler, Wolchik, MacKinnon, Ayers, and Roosa (1997), as well as Roosa, Wolchik and Sandler (1997) state that positive parenting behaviour may therefore be considered as one of these external forces and it has been shown to correlate positively with children's mental health. These positive parenting qualities can, however, be reduced by exposure to high levels of stress, and the diminished quality of parenting can in turn increase the child's likelihood of developing mental health problems.

## COPING AND SENSE OF COHERENCE

There is consistent evidence that suggests that dimensions of active coping (including problem-solving and positive cognitions about a stressful situation) are related to lower mental health and substance use problems. On the other hand the use of avoidance coping strategies are related to higher emotional, behavioural and substance use problems in adolescents (Herman-Stahl & Peterson, 1999; Sander, Wolchik, MacKinnon, Ayers & Roosa 1997). Other researchers (Brodzinsky et al., 1992; Causey & Dubow, 1992; Wills, 1985) have reported that problem-focused coping is significantly related to several positive developmental outcomes, namely self-efficacy, self-esteem, and perceived competence in multiple domains. A study investigating coping and adjustment in childhood and adolescence (Fields & Prinz, 1997), found that adolescents prefer approach strategies to avoidance strategies when addressing stressful interpersonal events. Similarly De Anda et al. (2000) state that adolescents in their sample (ranging between 15- to 18- year old high school learners from various cultural backgrounds, namely, Latino, African American and Caucasian American) chose to make use of coping strategies that were adaptive rather than maladaptive. Unlike younger children who had a strong preference for problem-focused strategies, adolescents made use of a more emotion-focused strategy, with the emphasis on active-cognitive coping. As far as academic stressors among American adolescents aged 13 to 18 were concerned, a greater use of problem-focused strategies was reported. Older adolescents were also found to use more coping strategies than younger adolescents (Williams & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 1999). The reason for this may be that older adolescents are more likely to try alternative strategies in their repertoire of coping skills when the initial coping strategy is not effective (Fields & Prinz, 1997; Williams & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 1999).

In an attempt to explain how people stay healthy despite high stress loads, Antonovsky (1987) introduced his core construct of the *sense of coherence*. According to this author it is a dispositional orientation that is presumed to engender, sustain and enhance health, as well as strength, at other endpoints. He describes it as a coping resource that is presumed to mitigate life stress by affecting the overall quality of one's cognitive and emotional appraisal of the stimuli that impact on one. When an individual's sense of coherence is strong, stimuli from the environment are perceived, (a) as comprehensible: making cognitive sense; (b) as being manageable: under the control of both the individual and legitimate others (e.g. spouse, friends, professionals, formal authorities, political leaders



or religious figures) and (c) as being meaningful: motivationally relevant, in the form of welcome challenges that are worth engaging in and investigating oneself in (Antonovsky).

Many studies have been conducted in an effort to determine both gender and cultural differences with reference to coping. Gonzales and Lauren (1997) state that ethnic minority children are disproportionately exposed to stressful life conditions such as family poverty, diminished community resources, and racial discrimination. This group has therefore been assumed to have an increased risk of developing mental health problems. Their research findings suggest that African American youths in high-risk, urban environments, particularly males, have a greater risk of acquiring behavioural difficulties. A review of Hispanic youths by the same authors suggested that Mexican Americans might be at greater risk for depression when compared to African Americans, non-Hispanic Caucasians and other groups of Hispanics. Asian/Pacific Island adolescents (living in America) were also investigated. It appears that they experience fewer mental health problems relative to the general population. The findings indicate that American Indian/Alaska Native adolescents experience more mental health problems than younger Indian/Native children do and, possibly, more than non-Indian adolescents.

D'Zurilla, Maydeu-Olivares and Kant (1998) found that men have a more positive orientation towards problems and coping whereas women have a more negative approach. De Anda et al. (2000) conducted a study in order to determine the most frequently encountered stressors as well as coping strategies in a group of adolescents. A number of gender and ethnic differences were evident in the findings. The results suggested that both genders reported a low frequency of substance abuse; however the rate for males was significantly higher (Carver, Scheier & Weintraub, 1989; De Anda et al., 2000). Certain coping strategies were viewed as more appropriate by females (e.g., affective release) than by males as well as more appropriate by one ethnic group, but not by another. Statistically significant differences among the three ethnic groups (Caucasian, Latino and African Americans) were demonstrated in regard to distraction, affective release, and help seeking. Caucasian respondents indicated the most frequent use and Latino students the least frequent use. Although the averages were low for all three groups, Latino students reported significantly higher rates of substance abuse, with African Americans reporting the lowest rates. Caucasian students reported experiencing stressors significantly more than did African American students. Vast differences were

found among three ethnic groups, with Caucasian respondents experiencing these stressors most often, followed by Latinos and African Americans. Caucasians were more likely to seek help and Latino students were the least likely to employ this strategy (De Anda et al.).

Studies have been conducted to determine factors that influence resilience within disadvantaged as well as minority groups. Smokowski, Reynolds, and Bezruczko (1999) conducted a study to determine resilience factors in disadvantaged African Americans. Their findings suggested that internal traits such as future optimism, future expectations, goals, perseverance, determination, and the ability to reflect on one's life to identify past experiences of overcoming threatening challenges, were significant internal ingredients in the resilience process. Stein and Nyamathi (1998) conducted a study to determine gender differences among impoverished minority females and males in associations among latent variables representing stress and coping (*inter alia*) strategies. These results indicated that impoverished women reported greater stress, depression and more avoidant coping strategies than did their male counterparts.

As is evident above, *gender* and *culture* appear to play a role in the development of resilience during adolescence. Subsequently, studies on the effect of *parenting* on resilience shall be discussed.

## PARENTING

Joseph (1994) states that parents contribute in a significant way to children's self-esteem and resilience. Diana Baumrind (1970) identified five different parental styles, namely, the authoritarian, the permissive, the democratic-authoritative, the traditional and the rejecting-neglectful. She also identified their effects on the development of what she refers to as a competent child. Three of these styles (authoritarian, permissive and democratic-authoritative) were used for the purpose of this study.

Baumrind describes authoritarian parents as strict and autocratic. In such homes punishment is severe and harsh and rules are established independent of any input from the child. The above-mentioned author describes the complete opposite of this style as the permissive style. Permissive parents impose no limits and there is no consistent set of rules for their children. Basically these parents expect that their children will raise themselves. Baumrind describes the democratic-authoritative type as a parent who demands respect from the child and establishes rules that are consistently enforced. This parent considers the child's wishes and opinions when appropriate, gives feedback to the child about his/her behaviour, corrects negative behaviour and reinforces positive behaviour.

According to research conducted by Baumrind (1983), there were more competent children from the democratic homes studied than from any other home. In the sample of children, 85% of those raised in democratic homes were judged competent and 15% were considered partially competent. Regarding the girls from authoritarian homes, none were judged to be incompetent, although more than half were evaluated as only partially competent. A quarter of the boys from these households were considered totally incompetent while half were evaluated as partially competent and only 18% were seen as fully competent. None of the girls from the permissive homes were fully competent, while 70% were judged as partially competent and the remaining 30% were evaluated as completely incompetent. Sixty percent of the boys from permissive homes were partially competent, 20% were fully competent, and the other 20% were considered to be totally incompetent. Other researchers (Austin, 1998; Coppersmith, 1967) state that the children of parents who made use of a democratic style had a higher self-esteem and that this style is generally superior to all others.

Several recent studies have indicated that there is a relationship between various forms of psychopathology during childhood and adolescence and the perceived parenting style (i.e., the child's perceptions of their parents' behaviour). In their study, Wolfradt, Hempel, and Miles (2002) made use of four parenting styles, i.e. authoritative (high demand and high responsiveness), authoritarian (high demand and low responsiveness), permissive (low demand and high responsiveness) and indifferent or neglectful (low demand and low responsiveness). This study confirmed previous investigations only in part as far as general psychological adjustment was concerned. As the authors had hypothesised, it was the group of adolescents that perceived their parents as authoritarian who had the highest anxiety scores. However, a better adjustment of the group that perceived an authoritative parental style among their parents could not be shown in the study. Adolescents who perceived their parents as authoritative only reflected more active coping whereas those who perceived their parents as permissive seemed to show a distinctively better psychological adjustment by scoring lowest on anxiety and showing high levels of active coping. Similarly, when Dusek and Danko (1994) conducted a study in a group of high school learners, they found that those with authoritarian parents reported less frequent use of active coping behaviour than did learners with highly permissive or authoritative parents. The results of the described studies showed that perceived authoritarian and controlling parenting styles are closely related to psychological disturbances in adolescence. Doll and Lyon (1998) seem to agree with the above-mentioned authors in their review of what has been learned to date about the developmental pathways of risk and resilience. They examine the potential for school-based prevention/intervention programmes to foster resilience and ameliorate risk. Their findings suggest that ineffective or uncaring parenting is a predictor of adult failure. They also found that children reared under conditions of physical and/or emotional abuse were more likely to experience psychopathology and other negative outcomes as adults.

Smokowski et al. (1999) agree that parenting has an influence on resilience by suggesting that ties within the family play an important role in fostering resilience. They found that resilient adolescents frequently reported being grateful for family members (especially mothers) who provided positive role modelling, consistent caring and motivational support. Beyond simply having a positive relationship, the most highly valued supportive contribution of interpersonal relationships was providing motivational and informational support. This is similar to the authoritative style described earlier as the parents in this

sample were often described as having understandable yet stringent limits. The authors state that parenting in dangerous economically disadvantaged environments varies from parenting under normal circumstances. Familial social support was highly valued by the adolescents. Positive as well as negative role modelling was available in the family environment. Resilient adolescents were able to learn and grow from both. Positive role modelling provided the adolescents with adaptive coping strategies and they learned risk-taking consequences from negative role modelling without experiencing it firsthand. Less resilient adolescents seemed to have a more negative familial role modelling, and did not learn from the negative risk-taking role modelling. The authors indicate that motivational and emotional support provided by a caring parent may raise the adolescent's self-esteem sufficiently for him to confidently seek other nurturing relationships outside of the home.

Sagy and Dotan (2001) conducted a study that examined the phenomenon of maltreated, eighth grade Israeli children using the salutogenic approach. In the past, research on maltreatment in the family focused on pathogenic questions and this study was therefore aimed at determining whether maltreating families could contribute to a child's perceived competence. The answers obtained in the study suggest that the sense of family coherence is significant in the ability of the maltreated child to cope with the negative situation. A family that is structurally stable, presents orderly and clear rules, has expectable goals, copes with problems in reliable ways (once again a description similar to that of the authoritative parenting style), but maltreats a child, may serve as a source of strength that enables the child to develop a perceived competence. Therefore, despite the fact that the family is dysfunctional concerning a specific aspect, it may function positively concerning other aspects.

Wagner, Cohen and Brook (1996) state that adolescents who reported warm parenting by both mother and father were less likely to suffer symptoms of depression in reaction to stressful events than were adolescents who reported harsher discipline by both parents. These results suggest that a positive relationship with parents provides a form of social support that enhances psychological resources (e.g., self-esteem) and therefore enables adolescents to cope effectively with stressful situations.

Although research investigating the relationship between parenting styles and the development of pathology or non-coping behaviours abounds, little is known about the relationship between parenting styles and the development of resilience or coping behaviour. The aim of this project was to investigate this relationship as a function of both gender and culture in a group of grade 12 learners within the South African context.

## METHOD

The aim of this study was to determine the empirical relationship between adolescents' levels of resilience and their perceived parenting styles. The possibility of cultural and gender differences were also investigated throughout. A non-experimental prospective design was used in which resilience was the criterion variable, and perceived parenting style the predictor variable (Huysamen, 1993). These variables require further exposition.

**Criterion variable** - In order to obtain an indication of the Grade 12 learners' levels of resilience, information regarding their sense of coherence and their coping strategies was gathered. In this regard, The Orientation to Life Questionnaire (OLQ) (Antonovsky, 1987) and the Cope-Scale (Carver, Scheier, Weintraub, 1989) were used.

**Predictor variable** - Adolescents were requested to supply information regarding their perceptions of their parents' (mothers' and fathers') rearing styles in terms of permissiveness, authoritarianism and authoritativeness. The Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991) was used to obtain information concerning these styles.

### Measuring Instruments

#### *Resilience*

#### *Orientation to Life Questionnaire (OLQ) (Antonovsky, 1987)*

Feldt and Rasku (1998) state that Antonovsky's theory has been widely adopted in health and well-being research, therefore the OLQ was used to obtain information regarding the adolescent's sense of coherence. It is a self-rapport questionnaire and consists of 29 items that determine the manner in which the individual experiences his/her world. The questions are answered on a seven point semantic differential scale with two opposing statements. Antonovsky (1987) indicated that the scale measures three components of coherence, namely, comprehensibility, manageability and meaningfulness. Of the 29 items, 11 measure comprehensibility, 10 measure manageability and 8 items measure meaningfulness. The score can range from 29-203, and the higher the score, the stronger the person's sense of coherence. Separate scores for each of the three components can be obtained, but Antonovsky emphasized that coherence is a single dimension construct and that the components cannot be distinguished from one another. Therefore the total scores were used for the purpose of this study. Antonovsky designed this questionnaire to be a culture free instrument. Frenz, Carey, and Jorgensen (1993) found a Cronbach coefficient alpha and a Pearson product-moment correlation of 0.93 and 0.92 respectively. This gives an indication of a high internal consistency and test-retest

reliability. Wissing, De Waal and De Beer (1992) reported a Cronbach coefficient alpha of 0.88 and 0.90 in two investigations with students and staff related to a South African University.

#### **The COPE-Scale (Carver, Scheier & Weintraub, 1989)**

This 53-item scale evaluates the various methods used to manage stressful situations. The scale is a self-reporting questionnaire and consists of 14 different subscales which each represent a specific dimension of coping. The 14 subscales can be divided into three groups, namely problem-focused strategies, emotion-focused strategies, and more dysfunctional strategies. The participant answers the questionnaire on a four point scale ranging from 1: Not at all; 2: Rarely; 3: Sometimes and 4: Often. The higher the score obtained on each subscale, the higher the tendency to make use of that specific coping strategy. A high total score gives an indication that the individual uses a large variety of coping strategies. Carver et al. (1989) reported a Cronbach coefficient alpha (for the internal consistency of the different subscales) of between 0.62 and 0.92. According to these authors the test-retest reliability is also satisfactory.

#### ***Parenting Styles***

##### **Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) (Buri, 1991)**

This is a 30-item instrument designed to measure parental authority, or disciplinary practices, from the child's point of view. The mother and father forms are identical except for appropriate references to gender. It measures Baumrind's (1970) permissive, authoritarian and authoritative parental authority prototypes. Of the 30 items, 10 measure each style. The individual is requested to circle the number on a 5-point scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree and 5=strongly agree) that best describes how that statement applies to him/her and his/her mother/father. There are six separate scores for each participant, namely, mother's permissiveness, mother's authoritarianism, mother's authoritativeness, father's permissiveness, father's authoritarianism and father's authoritativeness. Scores on each of these variables can range from 10-50; the higher the score the greater the use of that specific parenting style used by the parents (as perceived by the adolescent). Buri (1991) obtained the following Cronbach coefficient alpha values for the six scales: 0.75 for mother's permissiveness, 0.85 for mother's authoritarianism, 0.82 for mother's authoritativeness, 0.74 for father's permissiveness, 0.87 for father's authoritarianism, and 0.85 for father's authoritativeness.



Buri also reported the following test-retest reliabilities: 0.81 for mother's permissiveness, 0.86 for mother's authoritarianism, 0.78 for mother's authoritative, 0.77 for father's permissiveness, 0.85 for father's authoritarianism and 0.92 for father's authoritative. Both the test-retest reliability coefficients and the Cronbach alpha values are highly reliable, especially given the fact that there are only 10 items per scale.

### Sampling

The study was conducted on Grade 12 learners from racially integrated, English-medium, secondary schools in Bloemfontein (n = 360). The participants included representatives of both genders and of both white and black cultures. The composition of the sample with respect to gender and culture is reflected in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of participants according to gender and culture

<i>Biographical variable</i>	N	%
<b>Gender:</b>		
Female	215	59,7
Male	145	40,3
Sub-total	360	100,0
<b>Culture group:</b>		
White	174	48,5
Black	184	51,3
Coloured	1	0,2
Sub-total	359	100,0

One learner failed to indicate his/her culture group, thus explaining the difference between the two sub-total figures in Table 1. From Table 1 it is also clear that there were 70 more female participants than male participants. Only one learner from the coloured group completed the questionnaire and it was therefore decided to omit this learner, as the representation was too small. The average age of the grade 12 learners was 17,6 years with a standard deviation of 0,68 years. The youngest learners were 16 years old while the oldest learners (only 2) were 20 years old.

### Research Question

This study was conducted to determine whether perceived parenting styles (permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative) could be used to predict resilience in the adolescent. The moderating role of gender and culture in this relationship was investigated separately.

## STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

A hierarchical regression analysis was used to determine the degree to which the grade 12 learners' resilience (sense of coherence and coping strategies) could be explained by their perceived parenting styles. The procedure that was followed with regard to the hierarchical regression analysis was firstly to determine the total variance in the grade 12 learners' resilience that was explained by the predictor variables collectively (whole model). Thereafter in each instance one of the predictor variables was omitted to determine that specific variable's contribution to the explanation of the variance. The percentage variance that was explained by the specific variable, is indicated by  $R^2$  (squared multiple correlation coefficient). In order to determine whether a specific variable's contribution to the  $R^2$ -value was statistically significant, the hierarchical F-test was used. This test was calculated as follows (Van der Walt, 1980):

$$F = \frac{(R^2_{y.1\dots k1} - R^2_{y.1\dots k2}) / (k1 - k2)}{(1 - R^2_{y.1\dots k1}) / (N - k1 - 1)}$$

Where:

$R^2_{y.1\dots k1}$  = The squared multiple correlation coefficient for the greater number of independent variables.

$R^2_{y.1\dots k2}$  = The squared multiple correlation coefficient for the smaller number of independent variables.

$K_1$  = Greater number of independent variables

$K_2$  = Smaller number of independent variables

$N$  = Total number of cases

In addition to the hierarchical regression analysis, the inter-correlations between the predictors mutually, as well as those between predictors and criterion-variables, were calculated and briefly discussed. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) of both the predictor and criterion variables were also calculated.

### Effect Size

The practical significance of the results was considered by means of a calculated effect size. Steyn (1999) provides information regarding the method whereby the effect sizes can be calculated as well as guidelines for the interpretation of these effect sizes.

In a hierarchical regression analysis it is necessary to determine the effect size of the contribution that a specific predictor makes. The effect size supplied is an indication of the contribution to  $R^2$  in terms of the proportion of unexplained variance of the whole model. According to van der Westhuizen, Monteith, and Steyn (1989) the effect size of the individual contributions can be calculated in terms of  $f^2$ , specifically by means of the following formula:

$$f^2 = \frac{R^2 - R^2_1}{1 - R^2}$$

where:

$R^2$  = proportional variation explained by the whole model

$R^2_1$  = proportion variation explained by the smaller number of independent variables.

According to Cohen, the guideline values that can be used are the following:

$f^2 = 0,01$  : small effect

$f^2 = 0,15$  : medium effect

$f^2 = 0,35$  : large effect

These guideline values were used to determine the practical significance of the results that were obtained. The statistical analysis was done by means of the SAS computer programme (SAS Institute, 1985). The 1% level of significance was used in this study.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) of the criterion, as well as the predictor variables for the participants according to gender and culture group, are reflected in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

Table 2: Means and standard deviations for the two genders with respect to the criterion and predictor variables.

Variables	Female			Male		
	N	$\bar{x}$	s	N	$\bar{x}$	s
<b>Criteria variables:</b>						
Sense of coherence	207	125,42	19,69	133	127,88	16,21
Problem-focused	206	58,98	8,48	125	58,20	8,56
Emotion-focused	202	61,93	7,91	125	57,18	7,28
Dysfunctional	207	28,88	6,33	130	28,12	5,91
<b>Predictor variables:</b>						
Permissive (mother)	202	24,96	5,06	131	26,62	5,34
Permissive (father)	204	25,50	6,27	130	26,93	5,60
Authoritarian (mother)	208	30,95	6,49	134	31,41	6,11
Authoritarian (father)	206	31,73	8,47	139	33,21	6,80
Authoritative (mother)	208	37,24	6,63	136	35,74	6,20
Authoritative (father)	213	33,78	8,34	136	33,30	7,57

Table 3: Means and standard deviations for the culture groups with respect to the criterion and predictor variables.

Variable	Black			White		
	N	$\bar{x}$	s	N	$\bar{x}$	s
<b>Criteria variables:</b>						
Sense of coherence	175	124,14	18,46	165	128,77	18,14
Problem-focused	166	58,77	8,72	165	58,61	8,32
Emotion-focused	164	60,18	7,95	163	60,05	8,08
Dysfunctional	169	29,47	5,79	168	27,70	6,43
<b>Predictor variables:</b>						
Permissive (mother)	167	26,25	4,98	166	24,97	5,41
Permissive (father)	164	26,34	6,00	170	25,79	6,12
Authoritarian (mother)	174	31,38	5,90	168	30,87	6,78
Authoritarian (father)	174	32,72	7,83	171	31,92	7,90
Authoritative (mother)	174	36,07	6,13	170	37,23	6,82
Authoritative (father)	179	32,28	8,04	170	34,98	7,83

### Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Hierarchical regression analyses were executed for the two gender and two culture groups separately. Because there were four criterion variables, a hierarchical regression analysis was executed for each criterion variable.

## Gender

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to investigate the relationship amongst the predictor variables internally and between the predictor and criterion variables for the two genders. The results are indicated in Table 4.

Table 4: Inter-correlations for the two genders

Variables	Female					
	PM	PF	AM	AF	VM	VF
1 Sense of coherence	.14	.01	-.16	-.12	.27*	.28*
2 Problem-focused	.04	-.05	.05	.05	.19*	.09
3 Emotion-focused	.08	-.08	-.01	.12	.22*	.16
4 Dysfunctional strategies	.07	.21*	.17	.13	-.20*	-.24*
5 Permissive (mother) PM	-	.42*	-.21*	-.02	.16	.01
6 Permissive (father) PF		-	.03	-.33*	.01	.04
7 Authoritarian (mother) AM			-	.49*	-.35*	-.17
8 Authoritarian (father) AF				-	-.05	-.25*
9 Authoritative (mother) VM					-	.36*
10 Authoritative (father) VF						-
Variables	Male					
Variables	PM	PF	AM	AF	VM	VF
1 Sense of coherence	-.06	-.09	.05	-.07	.25*	.30*
2 Problem-focused	.01	-.04	.04	.02	.30*	.29*
3 Emotion-focused	.08	.05	.19	.09	.27*	.27*
4 Dysfunctional strategy	.26*	.14	-.01	.01	-.22*	-.11
5 Permissive (mother) PM	-	.48*	-.14	-.08	-.05	-.04
6 Permissive (father) PF		-	.20	-.12	-.12	.06
7 Authoritarian (mother) AM			-	.40*	-.11	.11
8 Authoritarian (father) AF				-	.01	-.30*
9 Authoritative (mother) VM					-	.41*
10 Authoritative (father) VF						-

Please note: Decimal fractions were omitted.

The correlation coefficients in Table 4 indicate the following for *females*:

A significant relationship (at the 1% level of significance) exists between all four the *resilience* variables (*sense of coherence*, *problem-focused*, *emotion-focused* and *dysfunctional coping strategies*) and a mother's *authoritative style*. The relationship between *dysfunctional coping strategies* and a mother's *authoritative style* is negative, while the relationship between the other three *resilience* variables and the mother's *authoritative style* is positive. This correlation indicates that the more the daughters perceived their mothers as *authoritative*, the higher their levels of *sense of coherence*, *problem-focused* and *emotion-focused coping strategies*. Moreover, the results indicated that there was a significant relationship (at the 1% level) between two of the *resilience* variables, namely, *sense of coherence* and *dysfunctional coping strategies* and the *authoritative style* in fathers (with their daughters). The relationship between *dysfunctional coping strategies* and the *authoritative style* of the father was negative, while the relationship between *sense of coherence* and the father's *authoritative style* was significantly positive.

The correlation coefficients in Table 4 indicate the following for *males*:

As was the case with the females, a statistically significant relationship (at the 1% level) was found to exist between all four the *resilience* variables (*sense of coherence, problem-focused, emotion-focused and dysfunctional coping strategies*) and the mother's *authoritative style*. The relationship between *dysfunctional coping strategies* and the *authoritative style* of the mother is negative, while the relationship between the other three *resilience* variables and an *authoritative style* by the mother is positive. This correlation indicates that the more the sons perceived their mothers as *authoritative*, the higher their levels of *sense of coherence, problem-focused* and *emotion-focused coping strategies* and the lower their levels of *dysfunctional coping strategies*. Moreover, the results in Table 4 indicate a positive relationship (at the 1% level) between the three resilience variables, namely, *sense of coherence, problem-focused* and *emotion-focused strategies* and the father's authoritative style (with their sons).

From Table 4 it is also evident that for both girls and boys, a positive correlation exists between the *perceived parenting styles* of both parents. In other words, if the mother is perceived as *permissive*, then the father is also perceived as *permissive*; if the mother is perceived as *authoritative*, then the father is also perceived as *authoritative*, and if the mother is perceived as *authoritarian*, then the father is also perceived as *authoritarian* – this is true for both girls and boys.

Furthermore, the degree to which perceived parenting styles could be used to explain the variance in grade 12 learners' resilience was investigated for boys and girls separately. By means of the hierarchical *F*-test the contribution of each specific variable to the  $R^2$ -value was investigated. The group sizes for the two genders differed and therefore different critical values exist. The critical *F*-values (at the 1% level of significance) were 6,78 and 6,90 for girls and boys respectively. The practical significance of the results was also investigated by means of the calculated effect sizes ( $f^2$ ).

*Resilience* was measured by (i) *sense of coherence* and (ii) *coping strategies (problem-focused, emotion-focused and dysfunctional coping strategies)*. Separate hierarchical regression analyses were executed for each of the criterion variables during the analysis.

**Results of two genders with respect to the criterion variables** - The results of the hierarchical regression analyses are indicated in Table 5 for the two genders in respect of the criterion variables.

Table 5: Contributions of the predictor variables to R<sup>2</sup> for the genders in respect of the criterion variables

Criterion variable - Sense of Coherence									
Variable in analysis	Female					Male			
	Variable omitted	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>
1. pm+pf+am+af+vm+vf	-	0,1439				0,1752			
2. pm+pf+am+af+vm	vf	0,1099	0,0340	6,80*	0,04	0,1542	0,0210	2,63	
3. pm+pf+am+af+vf	vm	0,1258	0,0181	3,62		0,1135	0,0617	7,71*	0,07
4. pm+pf+am+vm+vf	af	0,1423	0,0016	0,32		0,1529	0,0223	2,79	
5. pm+pf+af+vm+vf	am	0,1392	0,0047	0,94		0,1401	0,0351	4,39	
6. pm+am+af+vm+vf	pf	0,1302	0,0137	2,74		0,1505	0,0247	3,09	
7. pf+am+af+vm+vf	pm	0,1086	0,0353	7,06*	0,04	0,1646	0,0106	1,33	
Criterion variable - Problem-focused coping strategy									
Variable in analysis	Female					Male			
	Variable omitted	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>
1. pm+pf+am+af+vm+vf	-	0,0660				0,1324			
2. pm+pf+am+af+vm	vf	0,0643	0,0017	0,34		0,0986	0,0338	3,76	
3. pm+pf+am+af+vf	vm	0,0275	0,0385	7,70*	0,04	0,1045	0,0279	3,10	
4. pm+pf+am+vm+vf	af	0,0639	0,0021	0,42		0,1315	0,0009	0,10	
5. pm+pf+af+vm+vf	am	0,0542	0,0118	2,36		0,1248	0,0076	0,84	
6. pm+am+af+vm+vf	pf	0,0595	0,0065	1,30		0,1320	0,0004	0,04	
7. pf+am+af+vm+vf	pm	0,0635	0,0025	0,50		0,1229	0,0095	1,06	
Criterion variable - Emotion-focused coping strategy									
Variable in analysis	Female					Male			
	Variable omitted	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>
1. pm+pf+am+af+vm+vf	-	0,1027				0,1702			
2. pm+pf+am+af+vm	vf	0,0873	0,0154	3,08		0,1503	0,0199	2,49	
3. pm+pf+am+af+vf	vm	0,0779	0,0248	4,96		0,1241	0,0461	5,76	
4. pm+pf+am+vm+vf	af	0,0906	0,0121	2,42		0,1700	0,0002	0,03	
5. pm+pf+af+vm+vf	am	0,1007	0,0020	0,40		0,1394	0,0308	3,85	
6. pm+am+af+vm+vf	pf	0,1004	0,0023	0,46		0,1640	0,0062	0,78	
7. pf+am+af+vm+vf	pm	0,0920	0,0107	2,14		0,1637	0,0065	0,81	

Criterion variable – Dysfunctional coping strategies									
Variable in analysis	Female					Male			
	Variable omitted	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	p	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	p
1. pm+pf+am+af+vm+vf	-	0,1340				0,1555			
2. pm+pf+am+af+vm	vf	0,1131	0,0209	4,18		0,1542	0,0013	0,16	
3. pm+pf+am+af+vf	vm	0,1260	0,0080	1,60		0,1077	0,0478	5,98	
4. pm+pf+am+vm+vf	af	0,1147	0,0193	3,86		0,1521	0,0034	0,43	
5. pm+pf+af+vm+vf	am	0,1282	0,0058	1,16		0,1295	0,0260	3,25	
6. pm+am+af+vm+vf	pf	0,0834	0,0506	10,1*	0,06	0,1532	0,0023	0,29	
7. pf+am+af+vm+vf	pm	0,1307	0,0033	0,66		0,0690	0,0865	10,8*	0,10

Key: [pm=permissive mother; pf=permissive father; am=authoritarian mother; af=authoritarian father; vm=authoritative mother; vf=authoritative father]

p ≤ 0,01

Concerning the *females*:

The results indicate that the predictor variables collectively explained 14,39% ( $R^2 = 0,1439$ ) of the variance in *sense of coherence*; 6,60% ( $R^2 = 0,0660$ ) of the variance in *problem-focused coping strategy*; 10,27% ( $R^2 = 0,1027$ ) of the variance in *emotion-focused coping strategy*, and 13,4% ( $R^2 = 0,1340$ ) of the variance in *dysfunctional coping strategies*. The calculated  $R^2$ -values for *sense of coherence* [ $F = 4,624$ ;  $p = 0,0002$ ]; *emotion-focused coping strategy* [ $F = 3,091$ ;  $p = 0,0068$ ], and *dysfunctional coping strategy* [ $F = 4,357$ ;  $p = 0,0004$ ] are significant at the 1% level of significance. The calculated  $R^2$  for *problem-focused coping strategy* [ $F = 1,942$ ;  $p = 0,0769$ ] is not significant at the 1% level of significance.

When investigating the contributions of the individual predictors to  $R^2$ , it was evident that merely two, namely *authoritative father (vf)* and *permissive mother (pm)* independently provided a significant contribution (3,4% and 3,53% respectively), at the 1% level of significance, to the explanation of the variance in the *sense of coherence* of the grade 12 girls. *Authoritative mother (vm)* independently provided a significant contribution (3,85%), at the 1% level of significance, to the explanation of the variance in *problem-focused coping strategy*. None of the predictors independently provided a significant contribution (at the 1% level of significance) to the explanation of the variance in *emotion-focused coping strategy*. *Permissive father (pf)* independently provided a significant contribution (8,34%), at the 1% level of significance, to the explanation of the variance in *dysfunctional coping strategies*.



Regarding the *males*:

The results indicate that the predictor variables collectively explained 17,52% ( $R^2 = 0,1752$ ) of the variance in *sense of coherence*; 13,24% ( $R^2 = 0,1324$ ) of the variance in *problem-focused coping strategy*; 17,02% ( $R^2 = 0,1702$ ) of the variance in *emotion-focused coping strategy*, and 15,55% ( $R^2 = 0,1555$ ) of the variance in *dysfunctional coping strategies* in grade 12 boys. The calculated  $R^2$ -values for *sense of coherence* [ $F = 3,469$ ;  $p = 0,0038$ ] and for *emotion-focused coping strategy* [ $F = 3,180$ ;  $p = 0,0070$ ] are significant at the 1% level of significance. The calculated  $R^2$  for *problem-focused coping strategy* [ $F = 2,366$ ;  $p = 0,0359$ ] and for *dysfunctional coping strategies* [ $F = 2,915$ ;  $p = 0,0118$ ] are significant at the 5% level of significance.

When investigating the contributions of the individual predictors to  $R^2$ , it was evident that *authoritative mother (vm)* independently provided a significant contribution (6,17%), at the 1% level of significance, to the explanation of the variance in the *sense of coherence* of the grade 12 boys. None of the predictors provided a significant contribution (at the 1% level of significance) to the explanation of the variance in the *problem-focused coping strategy* and the *emotion-focused coping strategy*. Permissive mother (pm) provided a significant contribution (8,65%), at the 1% level of significance, to the explanation of the variance in the *dysfunctional coping strategies*.

According to the guideline values of the different effect sizes, the contributions of the predictor variables in *sense of coherence*, *problem-focused coping strategy* and *dysfunctional coping strategies* indicate a small to medium effect size.

### **Culture**

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to investigate the relationship amongst the predictor variables internally and between the predictor and criterion variables for the two cultures.

Table 6: Inter correlations for the two culture groups

Variables	Black					
	PM	PF	AM	AF	VM	VF
1 Sense of coherence	13	14	-14	-13	20	21*
2 Problem-focused	08	01	02	03	29*	19
3 Emotion-focused	08	10	03	-07	22*	25*
4 Dysfunctional strategies	13	16	13	07	-18	-13
5 Permissive (mother) PM	-	52*	03	-01	18	04
6 Permissive (father) PF		-	22*	-16	02	24*
7 Authoritarian (mother) AM			-	43*	-25*	01
8 Authoritarian (father) AF				-	03	-29*
9 Authoritative (mother) VM					-	28*
10 Authoritative (father) VF						-
Variables	White					
	PM	PF	AM	AF	VM	VF
1 Sense of coherence	07	-15	-03	-05	30*	34*
2 Problem-focused	-02	-10	06	04	18	14
3 Emotion-focused	01	-22*	08	20*	29*	15
4 Dysfunctional strategies	09	18	07	07	-20*	-21*
5 Permissive (mother) PM	-	39*	-34*	-05	-02	-03
6 Permissive (father) PF		-	-01	-34*	-09	-12
7 Authoritarian (mother) AM			-	49*	-27*	-13
8 Authoritarian (father) AF				-	-08	-24*
9 Authoritative (mother) VM					-	45*
10 Authoritative (father) VF						-

Please note: decimal fractions were omitted.

\*p<=0,01

The correlation coefficients in Table 6 indicate the following for *blacks*:

A significant relationship (at the 1% level of significance) exists between two of the four resilience variables (*problem-focused* and *emotion-focused*) and a mother's *authoritative style*. The relationship between these two resilience variables and an *authoritative style* is positive. This correlation indicates that the more *black* learners perceive their mother's as authoritative, the higher their levels of *problem-focused* and *emotion-focused coping strategies*. Moreover, it is evident that a positive relationship (at the 1% level of significance) exists between the resilience variables, namely *sense of coherence* and *emotion-focused coping strategy*, and the father's *authoritative style* in black learners.

The correlation coefficients in Table 6 indicate the following for *whites*:

A significant relationship (at the 1% level of significance) exists between three of the four resilience variables (*sense of coherence*, *emotion-focused* and *dysfunctional coping strategies*) and a mother's *authoritative style*. The relationship between *dysfunctional coping strategies* and a mother's *authoritative style* is negative, while the relationship between the other two resilience variables and the mother's *authoritative style* is positive. This correlation indicates that the more the whites perceive their mothers as *authoritative*, the higher their levels of *sense of coherence* and *emotion-focused coping strategies* and the lower their level of *dysfunctional*

*coping strategies*. Moreover, the results in Table 6 indicated a positive relationship (at the 1% level of significance) between two of the resilience variables, namely *sense of coherence* and *emotion-focused strategy*, and a father's *authoritative style* for white learners.

From Table 6 it is also evident that a positive correlation exists for both culture groups between the perceived parenting styles of both parents. In other words, if the mother is perceived as permissive, then the father is also perceived as permissive; if the mother is perceived as authoritarian then the father is also perceived as authoritarian, and if the mother is perceived as authoritative, then the father is also perceived as authoritative. Subsequently an investigation was conducted to determine the extent to which the perceived parenting styles could explain the variance in the resilience of grade 12 learners. This was done separately for the two culture groups (black and white).

**Results for the two cultures in respect of the criterion variables** - The results of the hierarchical regression analyses are indicated in Tables 7 for the two cultures in respect of the criterion variables.

Table 7. Contributions of the specific variables to R<sup>2</sup> for the culture groups regarding the criterion variables

Criterion variable - Sense of coherence									
Variable in analysis	Black					White			
	Variable omitted	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	p	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	p
1. pm+pf+am+af+vm+vf	-	0,0935				0,2121			
2. pm+pf+am+af+vm	vf	0,0821	0,0114	1,63		0,1716	0,0405	8,10*	0,05
3. pm+pf+am+af+vf	vm	0,0869	0,0066	0,94		0,1684	0,0437	8,74*	0,06
4. pm+pf+am+vm+vf	af	0,0900	0,0035	0,50		0,1921	0,0200	4,00	
5. pm+pf+af+vm+vf	am	0,0851	0,0084	1,20		0,1767	0,0354	7,08*	0,04
6. pm+am+af+vm+vf	pf	0,0844	0,0091	1,30		0,1767	0,0354	7,08*	0,04
7. pf+am+af+vm+vf	pm	0,0791	0,0144	2,06		0,1732	0,0389	7,78*	0,05
Criterion variable - Problem-focused coping strategy									
Variable in analysis	Black					White			
	Variable omitted	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	p	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	p
1. pm+pf+am+af+vm+vf	-	0,1029				0,0718			
2. pm+pf+am+af+vm	vf	0,0929	0,0100	1,43		0,0665	0,0053	0,88	
3. pm+pf+am+af+vf	vm	0,0533	0,0496	7,09*	0,06	0,0420	0,0298	4,97	
4. pm+pf+am+vm+vf	af	0,0984	0,0045	0,64		0,0705	0,0013	0,22	
5. pm+pf+af+vm+vf	am	0,0957	0,0072	1,03		0,0596	0,0122	2,03	
6. pm+am+af+vm+vf	pf	0,1022	0,0007	0,10		0,0676	0,0042	0,70	
7. pf+am+af+vm+vf	pm	0,1015	0,0014	0,20		0,0618	0,0100	1,67	

Criterion variable - Emotion-focused coping strategy									
Variable in analysis	Black					White			
	Variable omitted	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>
1. pm+pf+am+af+vm+vf	-	0,0703				0,1676			
2. pm+pf+am+af+vm	vf	0,0564	0,0139	1,99		0,1655	0,0021	0,35	
3. pm+pf+am+af+vf	vm	0,0481	0,0222	3,17		0,1001	0,0675	11,3*	0,08
4. pm+pf+am+vm+vf	af	0,0701	0,0002	0,03		0,1606	0,0070	1,17	
5. pm+pf+af+vm+vf	am	0,0646	0,0055	0,79		0,1603	0,0073	1,22	
6. pm+am+af+vm+vf	pf	0,0689	0,0012	0,17		0,1542	0,0134	2,23	
7. pf+am+af+vm+vf	pm	0,0701	0,0002	0,03		0,1610	0,0066	1,10	

  

Criterion variable - Dysfunctional coping strategy									
Variable in analysis	Blacks					White			
	Variable omitted	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	Contribution to R <sup>2</sup>	F	f <sup>2</sup>
1. pm+pf+am+af+vm+vf	-	0,1078				0,0995			
2. pm+pf+am+af+vm	vf	0,0921	0,0157	2,24		0,0898	0,0097	1,62	
3. pm+pf+am+af+vf	vm	0,0859	0,0219	3,13		0,0880	0,0115	1,92	
4. pm+pf+am+vm+vf	af	0,0996	0,0082	1,17		0,0854	0,0141	2,35	
5. pm+pf+af+vm+vf	am	0,0899	0,0179	2,56		0,0911	0,0084	1,40	
6. pm+am+af+vm+vf	pf	0,0901	0,0177	2,53		0,0690	0,0305	5,08	
7. pf+am+af+vm+vf	pm	0,0938	0,0140	2,00		0,0874	0,0121	2,02	

Key: [pm=permissive mother; pf=permissive father; am=authoritarian mother; af=authoritarian father; vm=authoritative mother; vf=authoritative father]

\*p ≤ 0,01

Concerning the *blacks*:

The results indicate that the predictor variables collectively explained 9,35% ( $R^2 = 0,0935$ ) of the variance in *sense of coherence*; 10,29% ( $R^2 = 0,1029$ ) of the variance in *problem-focused coping strategy*; 7,03% ( $R^2 = 0,0703$ ) of the variance in *emotion-focused coping strategy*, and 10,78% ( $R^2 = 0,1078$ ) of the variance in *dysfunctional coping strategies*. The calculated  $R^2$ -values for *sense of coherence* [ $F = 2,150$ ;  $p = 0,0523$ ] and *emotion-focused coping strategy* [ $F = 1,486$ ;  $p = 0,1887$ ] are not significant at the 1% level of significance. The calculated  $R^2$ -values for *problem-focused coping strategy* [ $F = 2,313$ ;  $p = 0,0377$ ] and for *dysfunctional coping strategies* [ $F = 2,498$ ;  $p = 0,0258$ ] are significant at the 5% level of significance.

When investigating the contributions of the individual predictors to  $R^2$ , it was evident that not one of them independently provided a significant contribution (at the 1% level of significance) to the explanation of the variance in the *sense of coherence*, the *emotion-focused coping strategy* and the *dysfunctional coping strategies* of the grade 12 black learners. *Authoritative*

*mother (vm)* independently provided a significant contribution (4,96%), at the 1% level of significance, to the explanation of the variance in *problem-focused coping strategy*.

Regarding the *whites*:

The results indicate that the predictor variables collectively explained 21,21% ( $R^2 = 0,2121$ ) of the variance in *sense of coherence*; 7,18% ( $R^2 = 0,0718$ ) of the variance in *problem-focused coping strategy*; 16,76% ( $R^2 = 0,1676$ ) of the variance in *emotion-focused coping strategy*, and 9,95% ( $R^2 = 0,0995$ ) of the variance in *dysfunctional coping strategies* in grade 12 white learners. The calculated  $R^2$ -values for *sense of coherence* [ $F = 6,192$ ;  $p = 0,0001$ ] and for *emotion-focused coping strategy* [ $F = 4,597$ ;  $p = 0,0003$ ] are significant at the 1% level of significance. The calculated  $R^2$ -value for *problem-focused coping strategy* [ $F = 1,768$ ;  $p = 0,1102$ ] is not significant at the 1% level of significance, while the calculated  $R^2$ -value for *dysfunctional coping strategies* [ $F = 2,557$ ;  $p = 0,0213$ ] is significant at the 5% level of significance.

When investigating the contributions of the individual predictors to  $R^2$ , it was evident that *authoritative father (vf)*, *authoritative mother (vm)*, *permissive father (pf)*, *permissive mother (pm)* and *authoritarian mother (am)* independently provided a significant contribution (8,10%, 8,74%, 3,54%, 3,89% and 3,54% respectively), at the 1% level of significance, to the explanation of the variance in the *sense of coherence* of the grade 12 white learners. None of the predictors provided a significant contribution (at the 1% level of significance) to the explanation of the variance in the *problem-focused coping strategy* and the *dysfunctional coping strategies*. *Authoritative mother (vm)* provided a significant contribution (6,75%), at the 1% level of significance, to the explanation of the variance in the *emotion-focused coping strategy*. According to the guideline values of the different effect sizes, it is evident that the contributions of the predictor variables in *sense of coherence* indicate a small to medium effect size.

From the results in Table 7 it appears that there is a higher relationship between perceived parenting styles and *sense of coherence* for the white learners than for the black learners. This would suggest that perceived parenting styles have a greater influence on *sense of coherence* for the white learners than for the black learners.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Larson (2000) indicates that a surprising number of American adolescents appear to be bored, unmotivated and unexcited about their lives, as could be demonstrated from the statistics on drug-use, teenage pregnancy, violence and delinquency. Much still has to be learned about fortigenic aspects of life's transitions (Arnett, 2000) and if South Africa wishes to prosper in terms of psychological health, the resilience of its people needs to be improved. This study focuses specifically on how parenting styles influence resilience in both male and female adolescent learners from both black and white culture groups.

This study confirmed the general findings (Baumrind, 1983; Sandler et al., 1997; Smokowski et al., 1999; Wagner et al., 1996) that positive parenting behaviour is considered as an external factor that has been shown to correlate positively with an adolescent's resilience. Dusek and Danko (1994) suggest that adolescents with *authoritarian* parents reported less frequent use of active coping strategies. Similarly, the present study indicated a significant negative correlation between a mother's and a father's *authoritative style* and *dysfunctional coping strategies* in female adolescents. A significant negative correlation exists between a father's *authoritative style* and *dysfunctional coping strategies* in males. As far as culture is concerned, this study indicated a significant positive correlation between mothers' and fathers' *authoritarian styles* and positive coping strategies in their adolescent children.

Surprisingly, the findings suggest that there is a positive relationship between fathers' *authoritarian styles* and *emotion-focused coping strategies* in white adolescent learners. In contrast, other researchers (Dusek & Danko, 1994; Wagner et al., 1996) found that authoritarian and harsh parental styles are closely related to psychological disturbance. Wolfradt et al. (2002) found that adolescents who perceived their parents as *permissive* seemed to manifest distinctively better psychological adjustment whereas this study found no significant correlation in this regard.

As far as gender is concerned, the findings in the present study suggest that an *authoritative* mother facilitates *sense of coherence* in males and *problem-focused coping strategies* in females, while an *authoritative* father facilitates *sense of coherence* in females. This supports Baumrind's (1983) findings that a *permissive* mother facilitates a *sense of coherence* in females (this is contradictory to Baumrind's findings, yet it supports Wolfradt et al.'s findings)

and *dysfunctional coping strategies* in males, while a *permissive father facilitates dysfunctional coping strategies* in females. Cultural differences were also evident in the study. The findings indicate that an *authoritative mother facilitates a sense of coherence and emotion-focused coping strategies* in white adolescents and *problem-focused coping strategies* in black adolescents. A *sense of coherence* is also facilitated by an *authoritative father*, and, surprisingly, by a *permissive mother, permissive father and authoritarian mother*. The latter findings were evident for white adolescents in the study, but not for black adolescents.

Several suggestions can be made for future studies. A replication of the study with different culture groups in other regions of South Africa could be conducted to determine the consistency across a variety of adolescent populations. A future study might also investigate the present study qualitatively. Further research will be necessary to enhance and develop appropriate parenting styles that facilitate resilience in adolescent children. Another limitation was the fact that only one measure of parenting styles was used in the present study. Making use of more sophisticated methodologies, paying greater attention to the interaction between internal and external circumstances and refining theories to make specific predictions about how input variables influence components, should be considered in future.

## REFERENCE LIST

- Antonovsky, A. (1987). *Unravelling the mystery of health. How people manage stress and stay well.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Arnett, J.J. (2000). Emerging childhood: a theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469-480.
- Austin, G. (1998). *Love and power, parent and child: how to raise competent, confident children.* Rolling Hill Estates, C.A: Robert Erlmann.
- Baumrind, D. (1970). Socialisation and instrumental competence in young children. *Young Children*, 26, 104-119.
- Baumrind, D. (1983). Rejoinder to Lewis' interpretation of parental firm control effects. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 101-104.
- Brodzinsky, D.M., Elias, M.J., Steiger, C., Simon, J., Gill, M., & Hitt, J.C. (1992). Coping scale for children and youth: scale development and validation. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 13, 195-214.
- Buri, J.R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 110-119.
- Carver, C.S., Scheier, M.F. & Weintraub, J.K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 267-283.
- Causey, D.L., & Dubow, E.F. (1992). Development of a self-report coping measure for elementary school children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 21, 47-59.
- Coppersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem.* San Francisco: Freeman.



De Anda, D., Baroni, S., Boskin, L., Buchwald, L., Morgan, J., Ow, J., Gold, J.S., & Weiss, R. (2000). Stress, stressors and coping among high school students. *Children and Youth Services Review, 22*, 441-463.

Doll, B. & Lyon, M.A. (1998). Risk and resilience: implications for the delivery of educational and mental health services in schools. *School Psychology Review, 27*, pp 348-363.

Dusek, J.B. & Danko, M. (1994). Adolescent coping styles and perceptions of parental child rearing. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 9*, 412-427.

D'Zurilla, T.J., Maydeu-Olivares, A., & Kant, G.L. (1998). Age and gender differences in social problem-solving ability. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 241-252.

Feldt, T. & Rasku, A. (1998). The structure of Antonovsky's orientation to life questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 505-516.

Fields, L. & Prinz, R. J. (1997). Coping and adjustment during childhood and adolescence. *Clinical Psychology Review, 17*, 937-976.

Frenz, A.W., Carey, M.P., & Jorgensen, R.S. (1993). Psychometric evaluation of Antonovsky's sense of coherence scale. *Psychological Assessment, 5*, 145-153.

Gonzales, N.A. & Lauren, S.K. (1997). Stress and coping in an ethnic minority context: children's cultural ecologies. In: Wolchik, S.A. and Sandler, I.N. Editors, 1997. *The handbook of children's coping*. Plenum, New York, 3-40.

Herman-Stahl, M. & Peterson, A.C. (1999). Depressive symptoms during adolescence: direct and stress-buffering effects of coping, control beliefs, and family relationships. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20*, 45-62.

Huysamen, G.K. (1993). *Methodology for the social and behavioural sciences*. Halfway House: Southern Africa.

Joseph, J.M. (1994). *The resilient child: preparing today's youth for tomorrow's world*. Plenum Press, New York, 95-134.

Larson, R.W. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist*, 55, 170-183

Roosa, M.W., Wolchik, S.A., & Sandler, I.N. (1997). Preventing the negative effects of common stressors: current status and future directions. In: Wolchik, S.A. & Sandler, I.N. Editors, 1997. *The handbook of children's coping*. Plenum, New York, 515-534.

Sagy, S. & Dotan, N. (2001). Coping resources of maltreated children in the family: a salutogenic approach. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 25, 1463-1480.

Sandler, I.N., Wolchik, S.A., MacKinnon, D., Ayers, T.S., & Roosa, M.W. (1997). Developing linkages between theory and intervention in Stress and coping processes. In: Wolchik, S.A. and Sandler, I.N. Editors, 1997. *The handbook of children's coping*. Plenum, New York, 3-40.

SAS Institute (1985). *SAS user's guide: Statistics version 5<sup>th</sup> edition*. Cary: Author.

Smokowski, P.R., Reynolds, A.J., & Bezruczko, N. (1999). Resilience and protective factors in adolescence. *Journal of School Psychology*, 37, 425-448.

Stein, J.A. & Nyamathi, A. (1998). Gender differences in relationships among stress, coping, and health risk behaviours in impoverished, minority populations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 141-157.

Steyn, H.S. (1999). *Praktiese beduidenheid: die gebruik van effektgrootes*. Potchefstroom: Publikasiebeheer Komitee, PU vir CHO.

Strümpfer, D.J.W. (2001). Psychofortology: Review of a new paradigm marching on. (*Submitted for publication*).

Van der Walt, H.S. (1980). Die wetenskaplike gebruik van inligting by voorligting en keuring vir vakleerlingopleiding. *Humanitas*, 6, 85-96.

Van der Westhuizen, G.J., Monteith, J.L. & Steyn, H.S. (1989). Relative contribution of different sets of variables to the prediction of the academic achievement of black students. *South African Journal of Education*, 9, 769-773.

Wagner, B.M., Cohen, P., & Brook, J.S. (1996). Parent/adolescent relationships. Moderators of the effect of stressful life events. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 11, 347-374.

Wills, T.A. (1985). Stress, coping and tobacco and alcohol use in early adolescence. In S. Shiffman & T.A. Wills (Editors). *Coping and substance use*. New York, Academic Press, 67-94.

Williams, K & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. (1999). Coping Strategies in Adolescents. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 20, 537-549.

Wissing, M.P., De Waal, M., & De Beer, I. (1992). *Sense of coherence and stress symptomatology*. Paper delivered at the 25<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Psychology, 19-24 July 1992, Brussels, Belgium.

Wolchik, S.A. & Sandler, I.N. (Eds) (1997). *Handbook of children's coping; linking theory and intervention*. New York: Plenum Press.

Wolfradt, U., Hempel, S. & Miles, J.N.V. (2002). Perceived parenting styles, depersonalisation, anxiety and coping behaviour in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, (Article in Press).

## OPSOMMING

Die doel van hierdie navorsing was om die verband tussen waargenome style van ouerskap en veerkragtigheid in adolessensie te ondersoek. Die respondente was 'n steekproef van 360 Engelssprekende persone uit verskillende kulture met 'n gemiddelde ouderdom van 17,6 jaar. Hierargiese regressie-ontleding is gebruik om die data te ontleed. Die kriteriumveranderlikes is koherensiesin (gemeet an Antonovsky se Orientation to Life Questionnaire) en strategieë vir probleemhantering (probleemgerig, emosiegerig en disfunksioneel) wat gemeet is met die COPE Skaal. Die voorspellingsveranderlikes het ses skale ingesluit, naamlik die vader en moeder se outoritêre, gesaghebbende en permissiewe ouerstyle. Outoritêre ouerskap het geblyk die grootste bydrae te lewer tot 'n verklaring vir die variansie in veerkragtigheid onder geslagte en kultuurgroepe.

**Sleutelterm:** Ouerskapstyle, Hanteringstrategie, Koherensiesin, Geslag, Kultuur, Adolessensie