

WCPCG-2010

Study of the effect of family patterns Style on shyness in Iranian Students

Maryam Zarnaghash^{a,*}, Siamak Samani^b

^a*M.A in Educational Psychology, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran*

^b*PHD in Educational Psychology, Islamic Azad University Branch of Marvdasht, Marvdasht, Iran*

Received date here; revised date here; accepted date here

Abstract

The Goal of present study was examining the effect of family Parents Style on shyness. The sample group included 85 girls and 115 boys. Revised version of cheek Shyness Questionnaire and Schaefer Family Patterns Style Questionnaire were used. Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated in order to determine of reliability of the measures. The results showed acceptable reliability of the instrument. **By using two way ANOVA the effect of patterns Style on shyness, was verified.** Results showed the Authoritarian Parenting of family, is the powerful determinant factor of shyness.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Keywords: Shyness, family patterns style, authoritarian parenting, authoritative parenting, permissive parenting, neglectful parenting

1. Introduction

Family is the most important unit of society which has the most effect on children's personality shaping. Children at the time of birth do not have any full understanding of themselves but little by little they develop a kind of primitive knowledge about themselves by shaping cognitive structural interaction with environment. Parents behaviours and reactions cause children idea shaping about themselves as far as these ideas and valuing of themselves are necessary for parents information about children basic needs (Goldberg, 2001). Each family has specific method for children individual and social education. These methods named parenting styles are influenced by differed factors such as cultural, social, economical and political factors.

Today researcher consider about parenting style and their effects on children personality. They show different patterns about parenting style. One of them is schaefer pattern. This model has two dimensions of parenting: **acceptance/responsiveness and demandingness/control.**

Parental acceptance/responsiveness refers to the extent to which parents are supportive, sensitive to their children needs and willing to provide affection and praise when their children meet their expectations. Accepting, responsive parents are affectionate and often smile at praise and encourage their children, though they are also quite critical when a child misbehaves. Less accepting and responsive parents are often quick to criticize, belittle, punish or ignore their children and rarely communicate to children that they are loved and valued (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

* Maryam Zarnaghash. Tel.: +987116476804; fax: +987112231206.

E-mail address: mzarnaghash@yahoo.com.

Demandingness/control refers to how much control over decision lies with the parent as opposed to the child. Controlling/demanding parents set rules expect their children to follow them and monitor their children closely to ensure that the rules are followed. Less controlling and demanding parents make fewer demands and allow their children a great deal of autonomy in exploring the environment, expressing their opinions, emotions and making decision about their own activities (Sigelman, 1999).

By crossing these two dimensions, we have four basic patterns of child rearing to consider, as: **1- Authoritarian parenting.** This is a restrictive parenting style combining high demandingness/control and low acceptance/responsiveness. Parents impose many rules, expect strict obedience, rarely explain why the child should comply with rules and often rely on power tactics such as physical punishment to gain compliance. **2- Authoritative parenting.** Authoritative parents are more flexible. They are demanding and exert control, but they are also accepting and responsive. They set clear rules and consistently enforce them but they also explain the rationales for their rules and restrictions, are responsive to their children needs and points of view and involve their children in family decision making. They are reasonable and democratic in their approach. Although it is clear that they are in charge, they communicate respect for their children. **3- Permissive parenting.** This style is high in acceptance/responsiveness but low in demandingness/control. Permissive parents are indulgent they make relatively few demands on children to behave maturely, encourage children to express their feeling and impulses and rarely exert control over their behaviour. **4- Neglectful parenting.** Finally, parents who combine low demandingness/control and low acceptance/responsiveness are relatively uninvolved in their children upbringing. They seem not to care about their children and may even reject them or else they are so overwhelmed by their own problems that they cannot devote sufficient energy to setting and enforcing rules (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Shyness

Shyness is described as a kind of worry and restraint in others attendance (Garcia, 1991). Therefore those people are shy in a view of excitement feel bashfulness and shyness in social situations and are worried about others reflection to their behaviours and they show restrained behaviour (Henderson, 2002). On the other hand the shy are isolated in social situations and they have problems in eye contact with others (Buss, 1986 & Henderson, 2002). Shyness has three indexes:

- 1- Cognitive (excessive awareness, intentional evaluation from social situation)
- 2- Emotion (mind anxiety and body reflection)
- 3- Behavioural (restrained behaviour and taciturnity)

Every indexes can make or increase other indexes and also can create a circle of anxiety (Alm, & Lindberg, 1999).

2. Method

Statistical population includes Iranian youth high schools. Sampling was includes 115 boys and 82 girls in Shiraz high school. Selected samples were used based on random cluster sampling style. Therefore between Shiraz high schools a high school for girls and a high school for boys were selected among all high schools randomly and one section from each level was selected randomly. For example if there were four section of level, one of them was chosen. If any students had any questions they could get complete explanation about questions. For gathering data in this research parenting style scale and shyness scale are used.

Parenting style scale includes two dimension, control dimension and acceptance dimension. This scale was designed by Schaefer (1965). Validity and reliability in parenting style scale were acceptable. Corenbakh alfa in this research is 0.78. For shyness scores, a shyness scale (Cheek, 1983) is used. This scale includes 20 Item which were made by Cheek and Buss. Validity and reliability obtained by cheek was acceptable and corenbakh alfa in this research is 0.83.

The aim of the present research is the studying effects of parenting style on shyness in teenagers in Shiraz high school. This research is based on analysis of variance and t- test for independent groups. Parenting style in this research is as independent variable and shyness is as a dependent variable.

At first to determine the kind of parenting style dimension, control dimension and acceptance dimension were calculated. Samples whose parenting style score in both of dimensions were higher than mean their parents

were known as authoritative parents. Those students whose scores in the control dimension were higher than mean and in the acceptance dimension were lower than mean their parents were known authoritarian. Students who have higher scores than mean in the acceptance dimension and lower scores than mean in the control dimension their parents were known permissive. Those whose scores in the both of dimension were lower than mean, their parents were known as neglectful

3. Finding

The first research question is there a significant relationship between parenting style and shyness? There is significant difference in level of 0.0001.

Table1-Result of analysis of variants

Variants	Mean of square	Sum of square	DF	F	P<
Parenting style	1011.850	3035.54	3	7.20	0.0001
Gender	0.154	0.154	1	0.001	0.97
Parenting style/Gender	217.930	653.789	3	1.55	1.20
Error	140.520	26558.19	189		
Total	197	6.398	197		

We use
Schaefer test

among four style of parenting based on shyness score. Which is elaborated as follows discovered: 1- Authoritative parenting style cause strength of self stem. It could be said that those children with mentioned the characteristic such as self stem, developed identify, self attitude discovered, have more psychological adoption, social efficiency and they have motivation to be advanced. In this study the least of shyness score belongs to authoritative style and children have developed with this method show a low level of shyness. Children shyness scores grown with this method have significant difference with children educated with authoritarian method are significant in level of 0.05. 2- Permissive parenting style includes high level of kindness and acceptance and low level of control and supervision. Although such these children get their emotional needs the other aspects of their personalities are not grown positively. Since permissive parents greatly support their children, Self stem is increased in this children. The difference between permissive parenting and authoritarian parenting group is about 0.0001 significant and with neglected group is about 0.03 significant. 3- parents who have authoritarian parenting style on one side known themselves the source of support for their children and they expect their children in all of their work refer to them. Their children are dependent mentally and spiritually and they don't have any senses of independent. On other side because the family has low acceptance and kindness their children don't have self stem and sense of ability about themselves. Therefore such these children don't see their abilities in their social relationships. Since the level of kindness and acceptance is low in such these families, so the positive characteristic of these children aren't praised by their parents. Moreover, their self stem never is grown and these children don't believe their abilities and talents and have no hope to their parent of support.

Table2-Result of parenting style dimension based on shyness score

Independent variabl	Independent variabl	Mean	Error	P<
Authoritative	Neglectful	-2.89	2.45	0.7
	Permissive	4.38	2.39	0.34
	Authoritarian	-6.63	2.40	0.05
Permissive	Authoritarian	-11.08	2.34	0.0001
	Authoritative	-4.38	2.39	0.34
	Neglectful	-7.106	2.38	0.03
Authoritarian	Neglectful	3.74	2.40	0.49
	Permissive	11.01	2.34	0.0001
	Authoritative	6.63	2.40	0.05
Neglectful	Permissive	7.27	2.38	0.03
	Authoritarian	-3.74	2.40	0.74
	Authoritative	2.89	2.45	0.44

The second research question, is there a significant difference between control and kindness to girls and boys? With a view of table3 we understand parents have a high level of control on their boys in a level of 0.01 significant and high level of acceptance on their girls in a level of 0.005 significant. Since girls have significant difference from boys in a view of Romans and affection, they received high level of kindness from their parent affection than boys. There are no significant difference between shyness on girls and shyness on boys.

Table3- Comparison of control dimension and acceptance dimension between male and female

Dimension		N	Mean	SD	DF	T	P<
Control	Male	115	123.31	13.08	195	2.60	0.01
	Female	82	117.80	16.52			
Acceptance	Male	115	131.35	22.50	195	-2.83	0.005
	Female	82	140.35	21.13			

4. Result and Discussion

Based on researches Spere (2005), Marten (2002), Miller (1993), children who are developed with neglect parenting show high level of shyness than children are developed with authoritative parenting. Many research such as Pulkkinen (1982), show children are received kindness and control show more self stem and more positive social relation. Research by Belsky (1995), Sigelman(1999) show authoritarian parenting have positive relation with shyness on teenagers.

At final we can say authoritarian and neglectful parenting comparison authoritative and permissive parenting have higher score in shyness scale and the authoritarian parenting have higher scores in shyness scale and the authoritarian parenting of family is the powerful determinant factor of shyness.

References

- Alm, C., & Lindberg, E. (1999). *Attributions of shyness – resembling behaviors by shy and non – individuals*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 575-585.
- Belsky, J; Crnic, K; & wood worth's (1995). Personality and parenting: Exploring the mediating role of transient mood and daily hassles. *Journal of personality*, 63, 905-929.
- Buss, A. H. (1986). A theory of shyness. In woH. Joes. J. M. cheek, & S. R. Briggs (Eds) , shyuess: *Perspectives on re search and treatment* (pp. 39-46). New York: Plenumpress.
- Cheek, J. M. (1983). *The revised cheek and Buss shyness scale*. Unpublished, wellesley college, wellesley MA.
- Garcia, S., Stinson, L., Ickes, W., Bissonnette, V., & Briggs, S. R. (1991). Shyness and physical attractiveness in mixes –sex dyads. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 35-49.
- Goldberg, N. A., & Schmidt, L., A. (2001). *Shyness, sociability, and social dysfunction in schizophrenia*. *Schizophrenia Research*, 48(2-3), 343-349.
- Henderson, D. L. & Trapnell, P. D. (2002). *Typological measures of shyness*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 79-93.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). *Socialization in the Context of the family: Parent – child in traction*. Np. H. Mussen (Ed), Hand book of child psychology (vol4,pp. 1-10). NewYork: Wiley.
- Miller, R. S. (1995). On the nature of embarrassability, Shyness, Social evaluation and social skill. *Journal of personality*, 63, 315-339.
- Pulkkinen, L. (1982). Self – Control and Continaity from childhood to late adolescence. Inp. B. Baltes & o. G. Brim (Eds). *Life – spam development and behavior* (Vol , 4, pp. 63-105). Orlando, Fl: Academic press.
- Schaefer, E. S.(1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory . *Child Development*, 36, 413-424.
- Sigelman, Carol (1999) *Life – span Human development* 22-thorell, Lisa (2005). Attachment & Human Development, Jun 2005 vol. 7 Issue 2, p 187-204, 18p.
- Spere, K. A., Schmidt, L. A., Todd, C. R., & Fox, N. A. (2005). Is a lack of cerebral hemisphere dominance a risk factor for social “conflictedness”? *Mixed- handedness in shyness and sociability*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(2), 271-281.