

The Analysis of Relationship Between Parenting Pattern, Demographic Variables, Adversity Intelligence and Emotional Intelligence

Prasetio Rumondor¹, Syatria Adymas Pranajaya², Sudadi³, Sumarni Rumfot⁴, Agus Rofi'i⁵

¹Institut Agama Islam (IAI) Muhammadiyah Kotamobagu, Jl. Piere Tendean Gang Bohusami, Kotamobagu, Sulawesi Utara

²UIN Sultan Aji Muhammad Idris (UINSI) Samarinda, Jl. H. A. M. Rifaddin, Kota Samarinda, Kalimantan Timur

³UIN Sultan Aji Muhammad Idris Samarinda, Jl. H. A. M. Rifaddin, Loa Janan Ilir, Kota Samarinda, Kalimantan Timur

⁴Universitas Pattimura, Jalan Ir M Putuhena, Kampus Poka, Ambon Rumah Tiga, Kec. Teluk Ambon, Kota Ambon, Maluku

⁵Universitas Majalengka, Jl. Raya K H Abdul Halim No.103, Kec. Majalengka, Kabupaten Majalengka, Jawa Barat

prasetiorumondor@iaimkotamobagu.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to determine the effect of emotional intelligence and parenting style on adversity intelligence. The population in this study were teenagers who attended junior and senior high schools in Jakarta. Testing the validity of the construct and statistical analysis of Structural Equating Modeling (SEM) obtained a fit model of the influence of emotional intelligence, parenting, and demographic variables on the role-influence of adversity-fit intelligence with empirical data. The results of the study show that the emotional intelligence variable evaluates other people's emotions; parenting style is not involved; and the demographic variables of gender and education level have a significant effect on adversity intelligence. Evaluation of other people's emotions has a negative direction towards adversity intelligence. That is, a high evaluation of other people's emotions has an impact on a low adversity quotient. As with uninvolved parenting, gender and education level have a positive relationship.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Parenting, Adversity Intelligence

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pengaruh kecerdasan emosional dan pola asuh terhadap kecerdasan adversitas. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah remaja yang bersekolah di SMP dan SMA di Jakarta. Pengujian validitas konstruk dan analisis statistik Structural Equating Modeling (SEM) diperoleh model fit pengaruh variabel kecerdasan emosional, pola asuh, dan demografi terhadap peran-pengaruh kecerdasan adversity-fit intelligence dengan data empiris. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa variabel kecerdasan emosional mengevaluasi emosi orang lain; pola pengasuhan tidak terlibat; dan variabel demografi jenis kelamin dan tingkat pendidikan berpengaruh signifikan terhadap kecerdasan adversitas. Evaluasi terhadap emosi orang lain memiliki arah negatif terhadap kecerdasan adversitas. Artinya, evaluasi yang tinggi terhadap emosi orang lain berdampak pada rendahnya adversity quotient. Seperti halnya pola asuh yang tidak terlibat, jenis kelamin dan tingkat pendidikan memiliki arah hubungan yang positif.

Kata Kunci: Kecerdasan Emosional, Pola Asuh, Kecerdasan Adversitas.

Copyright (c) 2023 Prasetio Rumondor, Syatria Adymas Pranajaya, Sudadi, Sumarni Rumfot, Agus Rofi'i

Corresponding author: Prasetio Rumondor

Email Address: email.koresponden@gmail.com (Jl. Piere Tendean Gang Bohusami, Kotamobagu, Sulut)

Received 11 April 2023, Accepted 17 April 2023, Published 17 April 2023

INTRODUCTION

There have been lots of systemic changes both in the government and in the economic sector, education, and others. In the world of education itself, it is only limited to distance learning (PJJ), and the scope is only limited to family and closest relatives (Latifa & Islami, 2020). For adolescents who are currently in the phase of searching for identity, it is a turmoil that is quite burdensome (Luturmas, 2022). Because the scope for teenagers is limited given the safety rules of the family and parents, looking at the various problems that these teenagers are currently facing, the author wants to see how they can overcome and survive the pressures that exist in their current environment (Alimashariyanto

et al., 2022). Due to limitations in the scope of learning and the scope of association, or the lack of interaction with peers, today's teenagers feel bored (Hema & Gupta, 2015). As quoted from the previous research, the inability to deal with various kinds of difficulties will affect the lives and future development of students and determine whether they can become qualified selves (Luturmas et al., 2022). Endurance in facing the challenges currently faced by adolescents in the realm of learning psychology is called adversity intelligence (Alhamuddin & Zebua, 2021). According to earlier study, adversity intelligence is used to assess how people react to adversity as well as their capacity to face and overcome adversity and to forecast who will be able to do so and who won't (Pranajaya et al., 2020). According to previous research, adversity intelligence is an inner ability that allows people to turn their bad situations into life-changing advantages (Rofi'i & Nurhidayat, 2020). There are several factors that influence individual adversity intelligence (Afandi & Pranajaya, 2022).

There are two kinds of factors that influence adversity intelligence, namely, internal and external factors (Zebua & Sunarti, 2020). As Stoltz explained in his book, success is like a tree. Internal factors include genetics, beliefs, talent, desire or will, character, performance, intelligence, and health. While external factors include education and the environment (Dini, 2022). Looking at these two internal and external factors, the authors will treat emotional intelligence and parenting as independent variables in this study (Zebua & Suhardini, 2021). Emotional intelligence contributes 80 percent to one's life success (Salehan et al., 2022). The ability to handle and perform well under pressure in difficult circumstances depends greatly on one's adversity intelligence (Sharma & Singh, 2016). As for recognizing emotions and successfully understanding them, emotional intelligence is crucial (Shen, 2014). While making decisions, it's crucial to consider both factors (Zebua, 2021). Emotional intelligence has a significant influence on adversity intelligence, especially on the dimension of managing one's own emotions (Stoltz, 2000). Emotional intelligence scale correlated positively and significantly with adversity intelligence (Susiloningsih et al., 2023). Positive results between emotional intelligence and AQ, which can improve student performance (Zebua, 2020; Wahab et al., 2023).

METHOD

The population in this study were men and women who were in the teenage stage and attended junior high and high school levels in the Jakarta area. Also, this study's sampling was purposeful and conducted using a non-probability sampling technique. The Likert scale model was the scale employed in this investigation. The levels of each instrument's responses in this study range from the highest (very positive) to the lowest (very negative). Model statements consist of positive statements (favorable) and negative statements (unfavorable). Furthermore, the highest statement for the unfavorable statement is given to the strongly disagree answer, and the lowest score is given to the strongly agree option. Both favorable and unfavorable items are used to construct these scores; the scoring for favorable things is SS = 5, S = 4, N = 3, TS = 2, and STS = 1, and the scoring for

unfavorable items is vice versa. SEM was used as the statistical analysis method in this investigation (Structural Equation Model). Regression, path, and confirmatory factor analyses are some of the models under question.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

There were 254 research subjects, with the lowest score being on the parenting variable with a score of -6.53 and the highest being 55.56. While the highest score is in the parenting variable with a score of 86.15, the lowest score is 27.22. The adversity intelligence variable has a range of scores between 29.18 and 74.52. The lowest score for one of the emotional intelligence variable's dimensions, called appraisal of other emotions, is 17.93, and the highest is 68.42; similarly, the lowest score for emotional self-assessment is 12.72, and the highest is 66.31; the lowest score for emotional regulation is 12.72, and the highest is 65.42; the lowest score for social skills is 14.44, and the highest is 65.42; and the lowest score for emotion utilization is 1.84, and the highest is 68. Authoritarianism has the lowest score of 21.79 and the highest score of 72.90 on the parenting variable with dimensions, whereas permissiveness has the lowest score of 17.56 and the highest score of 69.05, and involvement has the lowest score of 21.84 and the highest score of 67.35. Significant individual differences can be measured by variables having a wide range of scores, and the distribution of scores on each variable can be used to explain individual differences in the population.

The R-squared approach of 0.235, or 23.5%. That is, the variation of adversity intelligence is influenced by emotional intelligence (evaluation of other people's emotions, self-assessment of emotions, emotional regulation, social skills, emotional utilization, and optimism), parenting style (authoritarian, democratic, permissive, and negligent), and demographic variables (gender and level of education) studied in this study among adolescents, the remaining 76.75 percent, however, are impacted by elements outside the scope of this research. The magnitude of the importance is 0.000. As a result, the study's null hypothesis according to which parenting style, demographic factors, and emotional intelligence have no substantial impact on adversity intelligence is rejected. That is, it is well acknowledged that factors related to emotional intelligence, parenting, and demographics have a substantial impact on adversity intelligence. The parenting variable, not getting engaged, the emotional intelligence variable, evaluating other people's feelings, and the demographic variables of gender and education level all had sig values below 0.05, making the four variables significant. While other variables have sig values > 0.05 , which means that the variable is not significant. This means explaining the minor hypotheses, namely H2, H11, H12, and H13, is accepted.

A regression coefficient of -0.201 is found for the emotional assessment variables of other people, with a 0.004 (sig < 0.05) level of significance. The results show a significant and favorable direction association between the emotional intelligence and adversity intelligence measures. That is, the higher the emotional assessment of other people, the higher the adversity intelligence. In the emotional self-assessment variable, it is 0.014 with a significance of 0.822 (sig > 0.05). The findings

demonstrate that self-emotional appraisal has no discernible influence on adversity intelligence. The emotion control variable had a regression coefficient of -0.067 and a significance level of 0.320 (sig > 0.05). The results show that the emotion control variables have no discernible effect on adversity intelligence. The social skills variable was investigated with a regression coefficient of 0.077 and a significance level of 0.288 (sig > 0.05). The findings indicate that the social skills variable has no discernible impact on adversity intelligence. The emotional utilization variable's regression coefficient is -0.136, with a significance level of 0.090 (sig > 0.05). The results show that adversity intelligence is not significantly impacted by the emotion usage variable. The optimism variable has a regression coefficient of -0.018 and a significance level of 0.787 (sig > 0.05). The results show that the optimistic variable has no obvious effect on adversity intelligence.

Democratic parenting is significant with a regression coefficient of -0.005 and a significance level of 0.948 (sig > 0.05). According to the findings, there is no discernible relationship between democratic parenting and adversity intelligence. With a significance threshold of 0.952 (sig < 0.05), a regression coefficient of 0.060 for the authoritarian parenting style is achieved. The results show that the parenting style variable, which is authoritarian, has no appreciable effect on adversity intelligence. With a significance level of 0.878 (sig < 0.05), a regression coefficient of -0.019 for the permissive parenting style is obtained. According to the results, the factor of permissive parenting has little to no effect on adversity intellect. The uninvolved parenting style was identified with a regression coefficient of 0.448 and a significance level of 0.001 (sig < 0.05). The findings indicate that the parenting style variable is not relevant and has a sizable favorable impact. In other words, adversity intelligence increases with non-involved parenting style whereas adversity intelligence decreases with non-involved parenting style.

Regression coefficient for the demographic variable gender is 0.118, and its significance level is 0.044 (sig < 0.05). The findings indicate that gender is a demographic variable with a considerable impact and a positive value. In other words, women have higher adversity intelligence than men do. A demographic variable called education level has a regression coefficient of 0.112 and a significance level of 0.037 (sig < 0.05). The findings demonstrate a substantial and favorable tendency for the demographic variable of education level. The ability to overcome adversity increases with education level. Taking into account other people's emotions increased adversity intelligence's variance by 1.6%. The contribution is significant with a sig F change of 0.047 (p < 0.05). Self-emotional assessment contributes 0.3% to the variance of adversity intelligence. The contribution is not significant with a sig F change of 0.404 (p > 0.05). Emotional regulation contributes 0.1% to the variance of adversity intelligence. The contribution is not significant with a sig F change of 0.593 (p > 0.05). Social skills contribute 2.8% to the variance of adversity intelligence. The contribution is significant with a sig F change of 0.008 (p < 0.05). The use of emotions contributes 0% to the variance of adversity intelligence. The contribution is not significant with a sig F change of 0.855 (p >

0.05). Optimism contributes 11.6% to the variance of adversity intelligence. With a sig F Change value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$), the contribution is substantial.

The variance in adversity IQ was 0.1% lower due to the democratic parenting component. It is not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) that the sig F change for this contribution was 0.682. The variance in adversity IQ is 0.4%, while the authoritarian parenting variable is 0.4%. Due to the non-statistically significant sig F change of 0.280 ($p > 0.05$), this contribution was not made. The variance in adversity IQ was 0.4% lower when permissive parenting was taken into account. Due to the non-statistically significant sig F change of 0.280 ($p > 0.05$), this contribution was not made. 4.1% of the variance in adversity intelligence was explained by the variable of uninvolved parenting. The contribution has a statistical significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). The variance in adversity intelligence was explained by the gender variable to the extent of 5.1%. With sig F = 0.051 ($p > 0.05$), this contribution was not statistically significant. The education level variable contributed 1.4% to the adversity intelligence variance. The contribution is statistically significant with sig F change of 0.031 ($p < 0.05$).

CONCLUSION

In this study, significant results were obtained on the parenting variable not involved in adversity intelligence. The parenting style that was not considered contributed 4.1% of the variance, the demographic variable of gender contributed 5.1%, and the educational level contributed 1.4%. In the dimension of evaluating other people's emotions, the emotional intelligence variable explained 1.6% of the variance. Education level made up 1.4% of the variance, while gender made up 5.1% of the demographic factor. Given this, it is reasonable to conclude that the gender variable significantly affects the adversity quotient. In this study, the emotional intelligence variable's relationship to the judgment of others' emotions has a negative direction, which means that the higher the measure, the lower the adversity intelligence. Appraisal of other emotions is defined as the ability to understand the emotions of the people around one.

REFERENCES

- Alimashariyanto, M., Sarib, S., & Mokodenseho, S. (2022). The role of parents in parenting from islamic law perspectives: Study of muslim families in Ambang II Village. *At-Turas: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, 9(1), 38-59.
- Alhamuddin, A., & Zebua, R. S. Y. (2021). Perceptions of Indonesian Students on the Role of teachers in Offline and Online Learning During the Covid-19 Pandemic Period. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*, 7(4), 834-844.
- Afandi, N. K., & Pranajaya, S. A. (2022). Grateful personality development of junior high school students in east kalimantan. *Southeast Asian Journal of Islamic Education*, 4(2), 235-248.

- Hema, G. & Gupta, S. M. (2015). Adversity Quotient for Prospective Higher Education. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2, 2349-3429.
- Idris, M., & Mokodenseho, S. (2021). Model pendidikan islam progresif. *J-PAI: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 7(2), 72-86.
- Latifa, R. & Islami, L. A. (2020). The Adversity Quotient of Pesantren Students: The Effects of Academic Stress, Emotional Intelligence, Academics Self- Concept and Social Supports. *Jurnal Psikologi Islami*, (2), 153-163.
- Luturmas, Y., Diana, E., Abdusshomad, A., & Wiranata, R. R. S. (2022). Implementasi Struktur Kurikulum Berdasarkan Kemendikbudristek No 371/M/2021 Dan Pp No 57 Tahun 2021 Pada Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (Rpp) Tahun Ajaran 2022/2023 Di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *Jurnal Multidisipliner BHARASA*, 1(2), 71-81.
- Luturmas, Y. (2022). Religion, Customs, and Village Government in Collaborating the Pillars of Rural Development. *Daengku: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Innovation*, 2(4), 440-447.
- Luturmas, Y., Wirjawan, T. W., & Arta, D. N. C. (2022). Pengaruh Kompetensi Dan Reward Terhadap Employee Engagement Melalui Perceived Organizational Di Raffana Kids Store. *Jurnal Administrasi dan Manajemen*, 12(4), 368-374.
- Pranajaya, S. A., Firdaus, A., & Nurdin, N. (2020). Eksistensial humanistik dalam perspektif bimbingan konseling islam. *Al-Ittizaan: Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling Islam*, 3(1), 27-41.
- Rofi'i, A., & Nurhidayat, E. (2020). The impact of english EFL technology powerpoint in learning speaking for english pre-service teacher. *Journal of Physics Conference Series*, 1477.
- Rofi'i, A., ., E., & Rafli, Z. (2019). Narrative Writing in Novel Towards EFL Learning. *KnE Social Sciences*, 3(15), 139–152.
- Salehan, S., Rao, D. G., Soepriyadi, I., Nuryana, A., & Luturmas, Y. (2022). Analysis of the Influence Organizational Control System and Trust on Employee Performance. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 5(3).
- Sharma, T. & Singh, S. (2016). Effect of Emotional Intelligence on Adversity Quotient of Indian Managers. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Applied Science and Technology*.
- Shen, Y. C. (2014). A Study Investigating the Influence of Demographic Variables on Adversity Quotient. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 10(1).
- Stoltz, P. G. (2000). *Adversity quotient at work: Make everyday challenge the key to your success-putting principles of AQ into action*. N.Y: HarperCollins Publishing, Inc. e-book.
- Susiloningsih, E., Hendrajaya, H., Luturmas, Y., Akbar, M., & Suroso, A. (2023). The Analysis Effect of Organizational Communication and Self Development Program on Teacher Performance. *Journal on Education*, 5(4), 14181-14186.

- Zebua, R. S. Y. (2020). The Strategy to Build Educative Interaction in Islamic Education on Online Learning Setting. *Mudarrisa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan Islam*, 12(2), 185-202.
- Wahab, A., Sari, A. R., Zuana, M. M. M., Luturmas, Y., & Kuncoro, B. (2022). Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter Melalui Literasi Digital Sebagai Strategi Dalam Menuju Pembelajaran Imersif Era 4.0. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling (JPDK)*, 4(5), 4644-4653.
- Zebua, R. S. Y., & Sunarti, S. (2020). The Strategy Of Islamic Character Education With Role Model And Habituation Method On Online Learning. *Ta'dib: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 9(2), 45-58.
- Dini, J. P. A. U. (2022). Strategi pendidikan karakter anak usia dini menggunakan perangkat kepribadian genetik STIFIn. *Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 6(3), 1859-1872.
- Zebua, R. S. Y., ST, M. P., & Suhardini, A. D. (2021). *Model pembelajaran pendidikan karakter: panduan operasional untuk pembelajaran online dan dilengkapi contoh implementasi pada mapel PAI & BP*. Nas Media Pustaka.
- Zebua, R. S. Y. (2021, August). The Implementation of Character Building to Improve Resident Participation in Waste Management. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 810, No. 1, p. 012025). IOP Publishing.