THE IMPORTANCE OF PARENTAL STYLES AND DISCIPLINARY STRATEGIES IN CHILD'S REARING

Ibrahim J. TEMBA•

Abstract

The society has to remember that children are gift from God, as matter of fact the richest of all blessings. So, the attempt to mold them in the image of others rather than individual and be permitted to be as such, for decades have been less-fruitful contrary to what has been expected. This review has largely expended the issue of parental styles and disciplinary strategies in the childhood development. Collection of various publications from relevant parenting topics has greatly achieved the effectiveness of this review. The shortage of children's perspective on parenting issues as well as disciplinary strategies is an apparent argument in this review. It is the author's expectation that this issue is provided with accurate attention of researchers from the relevant field in a near future.

Keywords: Parenting Styles, Parental Control, Parental Responsiveness, Disciplinary Strategies.

1. Introduction

Over the past decades in the parenting literatures, peers and other non-familial influences (such as neighbourhood community or culture) become more and more important in early and middle childhood and adolescence. However, it is generally believed and accepted that the family is a highly effective environment for child development (Parker and Buriel, 1998: 463-552).

This is due to the fact that parents provide a very important environment for children's development, the impact of parenting processes and the quality of parent-child relationships have been the main focus of family research. In addition, the changes in the demography of the family in many societies (Turkish society is no exception in this context, because they have witnessed significant social and economic changes in recent years (Norris and Inglehart, 2009)) coupled with the heightening of childhood problems has dramatically continue to increase, together with an active increasing interest in the matter of effective and responsible parenting (Ramey, 2002, 47-71).

Early research on parenting effects emphasised on the role of parents as models for their children to copy, as disciplinarians and teachers in the development of their children. Researchers have made significant attempts to understand parenting behaviours and their links to various aspects of child development. Although there is no one definitive and comprehensive theory about parenting, and how it shape children's development yet, strong relationships have been identified, especially between specific parenting strategies and styles, and their effects on the child (O'Connor, 2002: 555-72). Two aspects of parenting from research have emerged as being particularly significant. These aspects are defined in two different ways as 'parental responsiveness' and 'parental control' (Symonds, 1939; Baldwin, 1955; Sears et al, 1957; Schaefer, 1959: 226; Baumrind, 1978: 239-67; Maccoby and Martin, 1983, 1-101).

2. Parental Responsiveness

According to Baumrind, Parental Responsiveness, as cited in Grolnick (2003) refers "the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation and self-assertion by

_____

• Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Hizmet ABD, Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, tembaibrahimjr@gmail.com

being attuned, supportive and acquiescent to children's special needs and demands" (Baumrind, 1996, 410, cited in Gurland and Grolnick, 2003: 1212-24).

According to the findings, Parental responsiveness in Turkey indicates that, Turkish mothers showed a high level of warmth and this does not differ significantly with the SES. However, other aspects of positive parenting such as maternal sensitivity, reasoning, giving explanations to the child and cognitive stimulation increase with education (Prime Ministry Family Research Institution, 1995).

Warm and responsive parenting has consistently been associated with positive developmental outcomes such as secure emotional ties, good peer relations, high self-esteem and a strong sense of morality (Hastings, et al., 2000, 531-46; Wolff and Ijzendoorn, 1997, 571-91; Janssens and Gerris, 1992, 57-75; Loeb, and et al., 1980, 205-17; Ladd and Pettit, 2002, 269-309).

Parental Control

Parental Control referred to as "the claims parents make on children to become fully involved into the family whole by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys" (Baumrind, 1996, p. 410, cited in Gurland and Grolnick, 2003, 1212-24).

According to the research findings in the context of parental control shows that, while controlling and demanding parents set limits on the freedom of their children and monitor their behaviour, less controlling parents are less restrictive and give children significant freedom and autonomy. In the traditional Turkish family, parents often use punishment-based control as the most common control method and rarely use verbal reasoning. In this case, parents are authoritarian (Taylor and Oskay, 1995, 8-22) and interfere in the choice of the child's profession and friends (Kongar, 1976, 205-18). These parenting behaviours promote dependency and do not promote autonomous decision-making (Kağitcibaşi and Berry, 1989, 493-531).

In addition, some findings from other studies suggest that, low levels of parental monitoring and high levels of permissiveness are highly associated with problem behaviours (Kerr and Stattin, 2003, 121-51). And other studies show that high levels of parental control are not consistently associated with positive developmental outcomes. For example, harsh and inconsistent behavioural control is often associated with anti-social behaviour (Patterson, et al., 1989). However, these findings suggest that parental control is important, but the way it is administered can affect its effectiveness.

Parenting Styles

Parenting Styles is the combination of Parental control with parental responsiveness (Maccoby and Martin, 1983, 1-101). Research on parenting styles represents the main approach to the study of parent effects on children's development. This typological approach examined the intersection of warmth / acceptance and control dimensions of parenting behaviour, leading to four specific parenting styles or clusters of child-rearing practices.

- **Authoritative parenting style**, it is characterised by high warmth / high control and encourages independence to the children and also puts appropriate limits on their behaviour. Open parent-child communication is encouraged and warmth and support are continuously reflected toward the children (Spera, 2005, 125-46).

- **Authoritarian parenting style**, it is characterised by low warmth / high control, it also becomes limiting by introducing restrictions on child behaviour. Such a parenting style requires unquestioned obedience and is intolerant of inappropriate behaviour. Strict, punitive measures are often used to ensure compliance with rules and standards (Bush and Peterson, 2013, 275-302.).

Parents who applied this kind of parenting style have high expectations and high maturity demands for their children, which they communicate through rules and orders. Little verbal communication is allowed and affinity indicators are kept to a minimum (Spera, 2005, 125-46).

- **Permissive – Indulgent Parenting Style** It is generally characterised by high warmth / low control. This kind of parenting style can be defined as the accepting, affectionate

parenting style. Parents who use this type have demonstrates warmth and emotional involvement with their children but make very few demands and have very few, if any, restrictions on their behaviour (Santrock, 2005).

- **Permissive-neglectful parenting style** Characterised by low warmth / low control; it is the opposite of the authoritative parenting style, low responsiveness and demandingness in both dimensions. Like those in the indulgent category, permissive-neglectful parents place very little restraint on their children and observe little of their children's activities. However, they show little warmth or affection, and often do not get involved in the lives of their children (Maccoby and Martin, 1983, 1-101; Teti and Candelaria, 2002, 149-180).

However, it is increasingly recognised that the most appropriate developmental targets definitions for parents can vary depending on the particular culture and context in which parents raise their children (Arendell, 1997). Indeed, for couple of years now, researches has questioned the applicability of these parenting styles in different contexts and takes into account the diversity of ecological niches in which parents and families are intertwined (McGroder, 2000, 752-71; GarciaColl, et al., 1995, 189-209).

To date, only a limited number of researches have investigated parenting styles in the Turkish context. Researchers reveal the values of warmth, affection and honesty among Turkish parents and high levels of authoritarian parenting. (Yağmurlu and Sanson, 2009, 361-80; Nacak et al., 2011, 85-104; Kağitcibaşi, 2007).

Parental discipline

Through disciplinary practices, parents are trying to ensure that children act according to parental standards of appropriate behaviour (Baumrind & Thompson, 2002, 3-34). Its usage as a label of punishment has begun to exceed its moderate origins. The root of the word is disciple, which denotes one who learns or apprentices himself for the purpose of learning (Pruett, 2010).

Thus, the discipline is defined as "the process of teaching children about appropriate/acceptable behaviours and societal norms and values." It is emphasise on the ability of the child to internalise the message which forms the basis of the discipline of the parent. Internalization is defined as 'the socially acceptable behaviour by taking into account the values and attitudes of the society as it is motivated, not by predicting external consequences but intrinsic or internal factors' (Grusec and Goodnow, 1994, 4).

In addition, three types of disciplinary techniques, as well as their relation to internalization and the development of children have been examined (Hoffman, 1970, 261-359):

o **Induction**, it has been characterise by the use of logic and explanation to explain the nature of misconduct and how it affects the rights and feelings of others. They vary in complex form; the early inductions are likely to be much simpler (for example, "if you push him, he will fall and cry"), however, with older children, parents can resort to more subtle psychological effects or processes (for example, "Don't yell at him. He was just trying to help" or "He feels bad because he was proud of his tower and you knocked it down") (Hoffman, 1983, 236-74).

o **Power Assertion**, It involves the use of threat or the use of actual force, physical punishment or withdrawal of privileges. The coherence and use of the power assertion is related to the moral orientation of children based on the fear of external perception and punishment (Hoffman 1970b, 1983, 236-74).

o **Love withdrawal**, involves withholding attention, affection or approval, or expressing disappointment or disapproval after a child misbehaves (for example, ignores the child, turns his or her back on the child, refuses to speak or listen to the child, explicitly states a dislike for the child, isolates or threatens to leave the child)(Hoffman, 1983, 236-74).

Hoffman (1970, 261-359) concluded that neither Love withdrawal nor Power assertion were particularly effective in promoting internalization. On the other hand, the induction encouraged moral maturity. According to Hoffman (2001), inductions induce an optimal level of arousal suitable for learning, in which case the child is more likely to read and process the information contained in the inductive statement of the parent (Hoffman, 1970, 261-359, 2001).

Inductions direct children's attention to the consequences of their behaviour towards others and benefit from children's capacity to feel empathy for others' negative emotion. In contrast, the use of power-assertive and love withdrawal techniques can over-stimulate the child because of the punishment fear or anxiety about the loss of the parent's love; in both cases, the attention of the child is directed not to other people but to the consequences of the deviant act for the self. As a result, these techniques contribute to the child's view that the relevant moral standard is external rather than internal to the self (Hoffman, 1970, 261-359, 1983, 236-74).

The results of the laboratory observations, according to the project done by Aksan et al., on the Mother-child interactions, parenting behaviour and socio-emotional outcomes of the child, using the structures that reveal some parenting practices have shown that the children are ignored rather than praised after compliance, and after noncompliance, have been more frequently criticized than ignored (Aksan et al. 2008 and Kürüm, 2011; cited in Sen, et al., 2014, 175-92).

It can be said that this model, in which the Turkish mothers' attitude ignores compliance and criticizes noncompliance, states that compliance is seen as the expected response in Turkish culture and therefore it does not need to be rewarded. However, noncompliance is not an acceptable stance and leads to a negative reaction from parents (Sen et al., 2014, 175-92).

Physical Punishment

One aspect of power assertion that is especially noteworthy in the literature is the use of physical punishment. The punishment includes the presentation of a negative stimulus after certain behaviour to reduce the likelihood of that behaviour being repeated in the future. Physical punishment includes a series of behaviours that involve the use of physical force by parents directed to the child.

For that being highlighted, physical or corporal punishment may vary from malicious acts (such as beatings) to humiliating violence or, more commonly, to spanking and slapping (Holden, 2002, 590-95). The majority of the research focused on the latter, which is less severe form of physical punishment (slapping), and also referred to as 'customary physical punishment' (Larzelere, 2000, 199-221).

Turkey like many other countries in the world has ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Unicef, 1989). It comprises 54 articles which derive from three main themes: the 'best interest of the child, evolving capacity of the child, and respect for the human dignity of the child', and children's rights in the convention may be grouped into four categories: 'rights to survival, protection, development and participation' (Limber and Flekkoy, 1995, 1-16).

Further, Article 37 of the convention states that 'States Parties shall ensure that no child shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment'. Limited physical punishment, some argue, is not an infringement of children's human rights. But in recently, the second cycle review (Universal Periodic Review of Turkey's human rights record) took place in 2015 (session 21).

During the review, notably two recommendations ("Consider the adoption of the specific legislation prohibiting all forms of corporal punishment of children (Poland); "Prohibit all forms of violence against children, including corporal punishment (Slovenia)") were made and were accepted by the Government, which stated that it considered them already implemented or in the process of implementation (Children GITEACPO, 2016, 46).

Research on parenting and discipline in Turkey has indicated that the practice of physical punishment, such as spanking or smacking, remains deeply embedded in Turkish parenting culture (Keyes et al., 2015).

3. Conclusion

Throughout the literature reviewed above it is evident that, in the past decades much research on the life of children tends to rely on the perspectives of adults. In one way or another, this tendency limiting the crucial contribution that children themselves can make to further an understanding of what affecting their lives and needs.

However, it is the responsibility of the academic community to facilitate this inequality on the parenting literature to get to an end. Thus the gap between the children's and adult's perspective on parenting literature no longer be the topic of discussion.

For that being said, consulting directly with children themselves and invite them to reflect on and express their views about parenting styles and other affairs affecting their life directly or indirectly will cut the long lived myth that adults are the epitome of perfection.

REFERENCES

Arendell, T. E. (1997). *Contemporary parenting: Challenges and issues*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Baldwin, A. L. (1955). *Behavior and Development in Children*. Dryden Press.

Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. *Youth & Society*, Volume 9,Issue 3, 239-67.

Baumrind, D., Thompson, R. A. (2002). The ethics of parenting. *Handbook of parenting*, Volume 5, pp. 3-34.

Bush, K. R. and Peterson, G. W. (2013). Parent–child relationships in diverse contexts. In: *Handbook of marriage and the family*, Eds: Springer, pp. 275-302.

Children GITEACPO, (2016). Universal Periodic Review. *Compilation of Recommendations on Corporal Punishment*, Volume 46.

De Wolff, M. S. and Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1997). Sensitivity and attachment: A meta-analysis on parental antecedents of infant attachment. *Child development*, Volume 68, Issue 4, pp. 571-91.

Garcia Coll, C. T., Meyer, E. C. and Brillon, L. (1995). Ethnic and minority parenting. In: Bornstein, M. H. (ed.), *Handbook of Parenting*,Volume 2: Biology and Ecology of Parenting (2nd edition). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 189-209.

Grusec, J. E. and Goodnow, J. J. (1994). Impact of parental discipline methods on the child's internalization of values: A reconceptualization of current points of view. *Developmental psychology*, Value 30, Issue 1, pp. 4.

Gurland, S. T. and Grolnick, W. S. (2003). Children's expectancies and perceptions of adults: Effects on rapport. *Child Development*, Volume 74,Issue 4, pp. 1212-24.

Hastings, P. D., Zahn-Waxler, C., Robinson, J., Usher, B. and Bridges, D. (2000). The development of concern for others in children with behavior problems. *Developmental Psychology*, Volume 36, Issue 5, pp. 531-46.

Hoffman, M. L. (1970). Moral development. *Carmichael's manual of child psychology*, Volume 2, pp. 261-359.

Hoffman, M. L. (1983). Affective and cognitive processes in moral internalization. *Social cognition and social development: A sociocultural perspective*, pp. 236-74.

Hoffman, M. L. (2001). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge University Press.

Holden, G. W. (2002). Perspectives on the effects of corporal punishment: Comment on Gershoff (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, Volume 128, Issue 4, pp. 590-95.

Janssens, J. and Gerris, J. (1992). Child rearing, empathy and prosocial development. *Child rearing: Influence on prosocial and moral development*, pp. 57-75.

Kagitcibasi, C. and Berry, J. W. (1989). Cross-cultural psychology: Current research and trends. *Annual review of psychology*, Volume 40, Issue 1, pp. 493-531.

Kağitcibaşi, C. (2007). Family, self, and human development across countries. *Theory and applications*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kerr, M. and Stattin, H. (2003). Parenting of adolescents: Action or reaction. *Children's influence on family dynamics: The neglected side of family relationships*, pp. 121-51.

Keyes, K., Leray, E., Pez, O., Bitfoi, A., Koç, C., Goelitz, D., Kuijpers, R., Lesinskiene, S., Mihova, Z. and Otten, R. (2015). Parental use of corporal punishment in Europe: intersection between public health and policy. *PloS one*, Volume 10, Issue 2, e0118059.

Kongar, E. (1976). A survey of familial change in two Turkish gecekondu areas. *Mediterranean family structures*, pp. 205-18.

Ladd, G. W. and Pettit, G. S. (2002). *Parenting and the development of children's peer relationships*. Erlbaum Mahwah, N. J.**:** pp. 269-309.

Larzelere, R. E. (2000). Child outcomes of nonabusive and customary physical punishment by parents: An updated literature review. *Clinical child and family psychology review*, Volume 3, Issue 4, pp. 199-221.

Limber, S. P. and Flekkoy, M. G. (1995). The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child: Its relevance for social scientists. *Social Policy Report*, Volume 9, Issue 2, pp. 1-16.

Loeb, R. C., Horst, L. and Horton, P. J. (1980). Family interaction patterns associated with self-esteem in preadolescent girls and boys. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development*, Volume 26, Issue 3, pp. 205-17.

Maccoby, E., Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the contex of the family: Parent-child interaction. Handbook of Child Psychology 4th Edition. *Socialization, personality, and social development*,Volume 4, 1-101.

McGroder, S. M. (2000). Parenting among low-income, African American single mothers with preschool-age children: Patterns, predictors, and developmental correlates. *Child development*, Volume 71, Issue 3, pp. 752-71.

Nacak, M., Yagmurlu, B., Durgel, E. and Van de Vijver, F. (2011). Parenting in metropole and Anatolia samples: The role of residence and education in beliefs and behaviors. *Turk Psikoloji Dergisi*, Volume 26, Issue 67, pp. 85-104.

Norris P., Inglehart R. (2009). *Cosmopolitan communications: Cultural diversity in a globalized world*. Cambridge University Press.

O'connor, T. G. (2002). Annotation: The effects' of parenting reconsidered: findings, challenges, and applications. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, Volume 43,Issue 5, pp. 555-72.

Parker, R., Buriel, R. (1998). Socialization in the family: Ethnic and Ecological Perspective. *Handbook of child psychology*, Volume 3, pp. 463-552.

Patterson, G. R., DeBaryshe, B. D. and Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. *US: American Psychological Association*, Volume 2.

Pruett, K. (2010). *Partnership parenting: How men and women parent differently-Why it helps your kids and can strengthen your marriage.* ReadHowYouWant.com.

Ramey, S. L. (2002). The science and art of parenting. In: Borkowski, J. G., Ramey, S. L. and Bristol-Power, M. (eds.), *Parenting and the child's world: Influences on academic, intellectual and social-emotional development.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 47-71.

Santrock, J. W. (2005). *Adolescence.* 10th Edition, New York: University of Texas, McGraw Hill.

Schaefer, E. S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behavior. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* Volume 59, Issue 2, pp. 226.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., Levin, H. (1957). Patterns of child rearing.

Sen, H., Yavuz-Muren, H. M. and Yagmurlu, B. (2014). Parenting: The Turkish context. In: *Parenting across cultures,* Eds: Springer, pp. 175-92.

Spera, C. (2005). A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educational psychology review*, Volume 17, Issue 2, pp. 125-46.

Symonds, P. M. (1939). *The psychology of parent-child relationships*. D. Appleton Century Company, Incorporated.

Taylor, R. D., Oskay, G. (1995). Identity formation in Turkish and American late adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Volume 26, Issue 1, pp. 8-22.

Teti, D. and Candelaria, M. (2002). Parenting Competence in MH Bornstein (Ed.), Handbook of parenting, *Social conditions and applied parenting*, Volume 4, pp. 149-180.

Turkish Republic Prime Ministry Family Research Institution, (2012). The situation of women in Turkey. Ankara. In: Selin H, (Ed) *Parenting across cultures: Childrearing, motherhood and fatherhood in Non-Western Cultures,* Springer, Volume 7.

Unicef (1989). *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC)*. Retrieved from www2. ohchr. org/english/law/crc. htm.

Yagmurlu, B. and Sanson, A. (2009). Acculturation and parenting among Turkish mothers in Australia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* Volume 40, Issue 3, pp. 361-80.