

# The Effect of Perceived Parenting Styles on Self-Regulated Learning Strategies and Motivational Beliefs.

**Münire Erden**

Yıldız Technical University,  
İstanbul, Turkey

**Işıl Uredi**

Mersin University,  
Mersin, Turkey

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of perceived parenting styles on self-regulated learning strategies and motivational beliefs. The participants were 350 eighth grade students in a primary school. Perceived parenting styles were determined by utilizing the *Parenting Styles Scale* developed by Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch (1991). The students' self-regulated learning strategies and motivational beliefs were measured using the *Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire* developed by Pintrich and De Groot (1990). The results revealed that those dimensions of self-regulated learning related to the intrinsic value of study, self efficacy, cognitive and metacognitive self-regulated learning strategies were influenced by parenting styles. Students with authoritative parents were found to use more self-regulated learning strategies than those with authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful parents. However, the students with indulgent parents were found to use more cognitive and metacognitive strategies than those with authoritarian and neglectful parents. This study also indicated that the self-efficacy of students with authoritative parents is higher than that found among the students with indulgent, authoritarian and neglectful parents; and they experience less test anxiety than do the students with authoritarian parents.

*Keywords:* Parenting styles, self regulatory learning, self regulatory strategies, motivational beliefs

## Introduction

In the last two decades, researchers have become more interested in identifying the factors that foster the development of self-regulated learning. There are many factors which affect self-regulatory learning skills of students in school. There is evidence that general parenting styles and specific parenting practices shape childrens' competence, especially in the area of educational achievement (Glasgow, Dornbusch, Troyer, Steinberg & Ritter, 1997). The aim of this study is to investigate the effect of perceived parenting styles on self-regulated learning strategies and motivational beliefs.

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Münire Erden, e-mail: erden@yildiz.edu.tr.

## Parenting style

Parenting is a complex activity that includes many specific behaviors that work individually as well as together to influence child outcomes. Although specific parenting behaviors may influence child development, researchers generally attempt to describe comprehensive parenting typologies. The construct "parenting style" is used to capture normal variations in parents' attempts to control and socialize their children (Baumrind, 1991).

Parenting style encapsulates two important elements of parenting: "responsiveness" and "demandingness" (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Parental responsiveness which can also be referred to as parental warmth and supportiveness is defined by Baumrind (1991) as the "extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive and acquiescent to children's special needs and demands"(p.62).

Parental demandingness, meanwhile, refers to supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys as well as expectations and claims that force the children to become integrated into the family whole (Baumrind, 1991). Categorizing parents according to whether they are high or low on parental demandingness and responsiveness creates a typology of four parenting styles: indulgent, authoritarian, authoritative, and neglectful (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Each of these parenting styles reflects different, naturally occurring, patterns of parental values, practices and behaviors and a distinct balance of responsiveness and demandingness.

Indulgent parents (also referred to as "permissive" or "nondirective") are more responsive than they are demanding. They are untraditional and lenient, do not demand mature behavior, do allow considerable self-regulation and avoid confrontation. Authoritarian parents are highly demanding and directing, but not responsive. They expect their orders to be obeyed without explanation. These parents provide well-ordered and structured environments with clearly stated rules. Authoritative parents are both demanding and responsive. They have clear standards for their children's conduct. Their disciplinary methods are supportive (Baumrind, 1991).

Neglectful parents are low in both responsiveness and demandingness. In extreme cases, this parenting style might encompass both rejecting-neglecting and neglectful parents, although most parents of this type fall within the normal range. Research shows that parents who are responsive and intellectually stimulating, but maintain firm parental control and who place high maturity demands on their children, promote rather than undermine self-efficacy and intrinsically motivated engagement in difficult tasks (Baumrind, 1996).

### **Self-regulated learning and strategies**

Self-regulated learning involves the process by which learners personally activate cognitions, affects and behaviors that are systematically oriented towards learning goals (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2008). One of the most commonly used definitions of self-regulated learning propounded by social cognitive theorists identifies the self-regulated learner as one who is behaviorally, metacognitively and motivationally active in his or her own learning (Zimmerman,

1989). These learners are aware of the task demands and their ability to meet them. They have high efficacy for learning and attribute outcomes to factors under their control. They have a repertoire of effective learning and problem solving strategies and have the capacity to apply them appropriately (Perry, 1998). Pintrich (2000) defines self-regulated learning as "an active, constructive process whereby learners set goals for their learning and then attempt to monitor, regulate, and control their cognition, motivation, and behavior, guided and constrained by their goals and the contextual features in their environment"(p.453). Students who have self-regulation skills are characterized as having high levels of performance, high self-efficacy beliefs and as being reflective thinkers.

One of the basic components of self-regulated learning are self-regulated learning strategies. Self-regulated learning strategies include cognitive learning strategies and metacognitive/self-regulated learning strategies to control cognition (Pintrich, 1999). Cognitive strategies are used to refer to cognitive processes and behaviors that students use during actual learning experiences to complete an assignment or to accomplish a goal implied by the academic task (Boekaerts, 1996). Rehearsal, elaboration and organizational strategies have been identified as important cognitive strategies related to academic performance in the classroom (Pintrich, 1999; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). Metacognition refers to the awareness, knowledge and control of cognition. There are three general processes that make up metacognitive self-regulatory activities: planning, monitoring, and regulating (Pintrich, Smith, Garcia & McKeachie, 1991).

Another component of self-regulated learning are motivational beliefs. Knowledge of cognitive and metacognitive strategies alone is not usually enough to promote student achievement; the student also must be motivated to use these strategies (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). Pintrich (1999) has concentrated on four general types of motivational belief in his empirical work, namely self-efficacy beliefs, task value beliefs, goal orientation and test anxiety. Self-efficacy belief is defined as peoples' beliefs about their capabilities of producing designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives.

Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, behave and motivate themselves. (Bandura, 1994). Task value beliefs refer to beliefs about the importance of, the inherent

interest in, and the value of the task. Goal orientation refers to whether the focus is on mastery and learning of the task, or on grades or some other extrinsic reason for doing the task.

Test anxiety refers to worrying about tests and, therefore, cognitive interference (Pintrich, 1999; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). Although self-efficacy beliefs, task value beliefs and goal orientations generally have positive and linear relations with the self-regulated learning strategies, test anxiety generally has negative relations with self-regulated learning strategies (Ostovar & Khayyer, 2004; Wolters, Yu & Pintrich, 2002).

### **Parenting style and Self-regulated learning**

According to Martinez-Pons (1996) parental self-regulatory modeling, i.e. applying goal setting, motivation and strategy usage, is observed by elementary students who, in turn, reflect this in their own self-regulation. Purdie, Carrol and Roche (2004) explored the relationship between parenting behavior and adolescents' self-regulation processes. They found a notable correlation between self-regulation and parental efficacy which influences school related behavior.

In addition to the importance of parenting styles for self-regulated learning, research on parenting styles has also demonstrated the importance of parenting style to academic learning and achievement. This research has consistently shown that parenting style is directly related to students' achievement strategies (Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000), locus of control orientation and self concept (Mcclun & Merrel, 1998), learning and study strategies (Boveja, 1998), school achievement (Dornbusch et al. 1987; Lamborn et al., 1991; Steinberg, Elmen & Mounds, 1989), goal orientation (Gonzalez, Holbein & Quilter, 2002) and motivational orientations (Leung & Kwan, 1998). In these aforementioned pieces of research parenting style appears to be a key resource for childrens' self-regulation.

### **The current study**

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of perceived parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful, and indulgent) on self-regulated learning strategies (cognitive strategies and metacognitive self-regulated learning strategies) and motivational beliefs (self-efficacy, intrinsic value and test anxiety). The study was conducted on a group of

children who are at an early stage of puberty and whose perceptions related to their parents are emergent. At puberty students have a strong desire to become independent from their parents and divert their attention to their peers. Identifying how students at puberty perceive their parents, and the bearing of this on their self-regulated learning strategies and motivation are fundamentally important for parents. By doing so, this study aims to provide guidance for parents through assisting them in dealing with their childrens' behavior specific to the age of puberty.

## **Method**

### *Participants*

The participants in this study were three hundred and fifty 8<sup>th</sup> grade students from a state primary school in İstanbul. This school was selected randomly from a residential area of İstanbul where families of middle socio-economic status live. There were 166 girls (47.4%) and 184 boys (52.6 %). The mean age of the students was 15 years.

### *Instruments*

Parenting Style Scale (PSS): the perceived parenting styles of the subjects' parents were determined by utilizing the *Parenting Style Scale* developed by Lamborn et al. (1991) which is based on studies conducted by Maccoby and Martin (1983) and Steinberg et al. (1989).

Three factors emerged from the analysis: acceptance/involvement, strictness/supervision and psychological autonomy.

The acceptance/involvement factor measures the extent to which the adolescent perceives his or her parents as loving, responsive and involved. The strictness/supervision factor assesses parental monitoring and supervision of the adolescent. The psychological autonomy dimension includes the degree to which parents value and use techniques which encourage independent problem solving, choice and participation in decision making. For acceptance/involvement, scale items are on a four-point scale, and for the strictness/supervision scale the first two items are on a seven-point scale and the other items are in a three-point scale format.

The *Parenting Style Scale* was adapted into Turkish by Yilmaz (2000). This scale's Cronbach alfa coefficient for primary school students has been found to be .60 for the acceptance/involvement dimension (nine items);

.75 for strictness/supervision dimension (eight items); and .67 for psychological autonomy dimension (nine items). This scale's Cronbach alfa coefficient for secondary school students was found to be .70 for the acceptance/involvement dimension; .69 for the strictness/supervision dimension and .66 for the psychological autonomy dimension. In the instrument, four parental attitudes were differentiated from the intersection of acceptance/involvement and strictness/supervision.

For the acceptance/involvement and strictness/ supervision factors, the students' parents who were given a score above the median were labeled as "authoritative", whereas the students' parents with a score below the median were labeled as "neglectful". For the acceptance/involvement factor, the students' parents who scored below the median and the ones who scored above the median on the strictness/supervision factor were labeled as "authoritarian". For the acceptance/involvement factor, parents who had a score above the median and the ones scored below the median on strictness/supervision factor were labeled as "indulgent" (Yilmaz, 2000).

The Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ): the students' self-regulated learning strategies and motivational beliefs were measured using the MSLQ developed by Pintrich and De Groot (1990).

The scale is composed of 44 items with a Likert-type response scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true of me*) to 7 (*very true of me*). This scale covers two areas, namely self-regulated learning strategy and motivational beliefs. The self-regulated learning dimension includes cognitive strategy (thirteen items) and metacognitive self-regulation scale (nine items) while the motivational beliefs dimension includes self-efficacy (nine items), intrinsic value (nine items) and test anxiety scale (four items). The cognitive strategy scale consists of thirteen items pertaining to the use of rehearsal strategies and elaboration strategies such as summarizing and paraphrasing.

The metacognitive self-regulation scale is constructed from metacognitive and effort management items. These items include metacognitive strategies such as planning, skimming and comprehension monitoring and effort management strategies including students' persistence at difficult or boring tasks. The motivational beliefs dimension includes self-efficacy, intrinsic value and a test anxiety scale.

The task value components of motivational beliefs involve students' goals when carrying out tasks, and their beliefs about the importance and interest of the task (Pintrich and De Groot, 1990)

The scale was adapted into Turkish by Uredi (2005) with the aim of measuring self-regulated learning strategies and motivational beliefs related to academic performance in the classroom. After providing transliterational equivalence, validity and reliability studies of the adaptation process indicated that the Turkish form of the scale was found to be transliterally equal to the original form. Furthermore, it was found that all the items in the Turkish form of the scale were similar to those of the original form in terms of factorial structure and reliability (cognitive strategy use  $\alpha = .82$ , self-regulation  $\alpha = .84$ , self-efficacy  $\alpha = .92$ , intrinsic value  $\alpha = .88$ , test anxiety  $\alpha = .81$ ).

#### *Procedures*

Data collection took place in the course of the school year 2005/2006 in the selected school. The parenting style scale and motivated strategies for learning questionnaires were administered during lesson time in classroom settings. Students were instructed to respond to the MSLQ and PSS and were asked to consider their mathematics coursework when responding to the MSLQ items.

### **Results**

In this study, the dependent variable was found to be normally distributed within groups. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed in order to investigate the effect of the perceived parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful) on self-regulated learning strategies (cognitive strategies and metacognitive self-regulation strategies) and motivational beliefs (self-efficacy, intrinsic value and test anxiety). Means and standard deviations of dependant variables are displayed in Table 1.

The result of the MANOVA showed that the mean scores for students' self-regulated learning strategies and motivational beliefs are significantly different according to perceived parenting style of the students' parents [ $F = 0.544$ ;  $F(15,944) = 15.52$ ;  $p < .01$ ,  $\eta^2 = .184$ ]. This analysis also indicates that parenting styles explain 18% of the total variance in self-regulated learning strategies and motivational beliefs.

MANOVA also yielded a significant difference for cognitive strategy  $F(3,346) = 54.48$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $MSE = 106.04$ ; metacognitive self-

regulated learning strategy  $F(3,346)=52.06$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ,  $MSE= 60.23$ ; self-efficacy  $F(3,346)= 40.83$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ,  $MSE=81.19$ ; intrinsic value  $F(3,346)= 41.98$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ,  $MSE=49.04$  and test anxiety  $F(3,346)= 5.843$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ,  $MSE=36.66$ .

The results of Tukey HSD test indicated that (1) students who perceive their parents as authoritative obtained significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) higher scores on the cognitive strategy, metacognitive self-regulated learning strategy, self efficacy and intrinsic value dimensions of the test than did the students with authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful parents. (2) Students

who perceive their parents as indulgent obtained significantly higher scores in the cognitive strategy and metacognitive self-regulated learning strategy dimensions of the test than did the students with authoritarian and neglectful parents. (3) Students who perceive their parents as indulgent obtained significantly higher scores from the intrinsic value dimension of the test than the students with neglectful parents. (4) Students with authoritative parents experience significantly less test anxiety than do the students with authoritarian parents.

**Table 1.**

Descriptive Statistics of Tests According to Perceived Parenting Styles

		Parenting Style	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss
SELF-REGULATED LEARNING STRATEGIES	COGNITIVE STRATEGY	Authoritative	127	75.82	7.38
		Authoritarian	76	59.75	8.07
		Neglectful	79	60.38	11.95
		Indulgent	68	66.93	14.35
		Total	350	67.12	12.44
	SELF-REGULATION	Authoritative	127	48.63	7.44
		Authoritarian	76	36.55	5.88
		Neglectful	79	37.52	8.97
		Indulgent	68	42.07	8.63
		Total	350	42.23	9.31
MOTIVATIONAL BELIEFS	SELF-EFFICACY	Authoritative	127	49.93	7.85
		Authoritarian	76	39.45	9.66
		Neglectful	79	37.05	9.65
		Indulgent	68	42.63	10.70
		Total	350	43.33	10.64
	INTRINSIC VALUE	Authoritative	127	42.94	6.03
		Authoritarian	76	38.22	8.15
		Neglectful	79	37.49	6.39
		Indulgent	68	39.90	7.59
		Total	350	40.09	7.27
TEST ANXIETY	Authoritative	127	16.37	5.46	
	Authoritarian	76	17.91	5.17	
	Neglectful	79	17.63	5.20	
	Indulgent	68	17.71	4.84	
	Total	350	17.25	5.25	

Note: (Levene's  $f_1=14.45$ ,  $p < .05$ ; Levene's  $f_2=4.88$ ,  $p < .05$ ; Levene's  $f_3=3.23$ ,  $p < .05$ ; Levene's  $f_4=14.87$ ,  $p < .05$ ; Levene's  $f_5=2.46$ ,  $p < .05$ )

**Table 2.**

Results of the MANOVA. Note: [ $\lambda = .544$ ;  $F(15,944) = 15.523$ ;  $p < .01$ ]

Sources	Variables	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Square	F	p
Corrected Model	Cognitive	17329.87	3	5776.62	54.48	$p < .01$
	Self-regulation	9406.42	3	3135.47	52.06	$p < .01$
	Self-efficacy	9945.51	3	3315.17	40.83	$p < .01$
	Intrinsic value	6175.32	3	2058.44	41.98	$p < .01$
	Test anxiety	642.63	3	214.21	5.84	$p < .01$
Intercept	Cognitive	1427872.07	1	1427872.07	13465.97	$p < .01$
	Self-regulation	561013.55	1	561013.55	9313.00	$p < .01$
	Self-efficacy	600568.68	1	600568.68	7397.03	$p < .01$
	Intrinsic value	772347.01	1	772347.01	15750.07	$p < .01$
	Test anxiety	101718.55	1	101718.55	2774.56	$p < .01$
ABT	Cognitive	17329.87	3	5776.62	54.49	$p < .01$
	Self-regulation	9406.42	3	3135.47	52.06	$p < .01$
	Self-efficacy	9945.51	3	3315.17	40.83	$p < .01$
	Intrinsic value	6175.32	3	2058.44	41.98	$p < .01$
	Test anxiety	642.63	3	214.21	5.84	$p < .01$
Error	Cognitive	36688.33	346	106.04		
	Self-regulation	20840.75	346	60.23		
	Self-efficacy	28091.92	346	81.19		
	Intrinsic value	16967.04	346	49.04		
	Test anxiety	12684.75	346	36.66		
Total	Cognitive	1630667.00	350			
	Self-regulation	654301.00	350			
	Self-efficacy	705992.00	350			
	Intrinsic value	868891.00	350			
	Test anxiety	117457.00	350			
Corrected Total	Cognitive	54018.20	349			
	Self-regulation	30247.17	349			
	Self-efficacy	38037.43	349			
	Intrinsic value	23142.36	349			
	Test anxiety	13327.37	349			

**Table 3.**

Summary of Tukey HSD test results related to discrepancies in parenting styles towards self-regulated learning strategies and motivational beliefs

	Variables	Parenting Style (I)	Parenting Style (J)	(I-J)	SE	p
SELF-REGULATED LEARNING STR.	COGNITIVE STRATEGY	Authoritative	Authoritarian	16.07	1.49	$p < .01$
			Neglectful	15.44	1.48	$p < .01$
			Indulgent	8.89	1.55	$p < .01$
			Authoritarian	-7.18	1.72	$p < .01$
			Neglectful	-6.55	1.70	$p < .01$
	SELF-REGULATION	Authoritative	Authoritarian	12.08	1.13	$p < .01$
			Neglectful	11.11	1.11	$p < .01$
			Indulgent	6.56	1.17	$p < .01$
			Authoritarian	-5.52	1.30	$p < .01$
			Neglectful	-4.56	1.28	$p < .01$
MOTIVATIONAL BELIEFS	SELF EFFICACY	Authoritative	Authoritarian	10.51	1.31	$p < .01$
			Neglectful	12.99	1.29	$p < .01$
			Indulgent	7.23	1.35	$p < .01$
			Neglectful	-5.74	1.49	$p < .01$
			Indulgent	-5.74	1.49	$p < .01$
	INTRINSIC VALUE	Authoritative	Authoritarian	9.83	1.02	$p < .01$
			Neglectful	8.96	1.00	$p < .01$
			Indulgent	5.08	1.05	$p < .01$
			Authoritarian	-4.75	1.17	$p < .01$
			Neglectful	-3.88	1.16	$p < .01$
TEST ANXIETY	Authoritative	Authoritarian	-3.49	.88	$p < .01$	

## Discussion

This study revealed that self-regulated learning strategies (cognitive and metacognitive self-regulated learning) and motivational beliefs (intrinsic value, self efficacy) were influenced by parenting styles. The students with authoritative parents were found to use more self-regulated learning strategies than the students with authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful parents. The students with indulgent parents were also found to use more cognitive and metacognitive strategies than do the students with authoritarian and neglectful parents.

Both authoritative and indulgent parents are responsive. They intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation and self-assertion by being attuned and supportive. They also try to meet children's special needs and demands (Baumrind, 1991). Supportive parenting attitudes and behavior toward the child's psychological autonomy can result in higher levels of self-esteem and behavioral regulation abilities in children (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Therefore, authoritative parenting styles and encouragement of the expression of individuality may help children to be able to implement self-regulated learning strategies and to concentrate on work. A review of the research shows a strong positive relation between supportive parenting attitudes and children's self-regulation behaviors and academic success (Grolnick and Ryan 1989). Otto, Perels and Schmitz (2008) revealed that significant correlations exist between parental support for autonomy and children's self-regulated learning.

Purdie, Carroll and Roche (2004) also indicated strong correlations between adolescents' perceived parenting involvement and academic and social self-regulation abilities in the areas of family, friends, community, environment, health and self. They further asserted that parental acceptance and involvement are more effective in academic self-regulated learning skills than the control and autonomy dimensions of parenting styles. Georgiou (2007) indicated that parental involvement can be seen as an important predictor of students' learning behavior and performance.

Maccoby and Martin (1983) emphasized that children who have authoritative parents have higher levels of academic achievement, social development, self-perception and academic efficacy than those who have authoritarian, neglectful and indulgent parents. All this earlier

research supports the findings of the work described here.

While authoritative parents are both demanding and responsive, indulgent parents are more responsive than they are demanding. Demanding parents try to force children to become integrated into the family whole, by their demands for maturity, their supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys (Baumrind, 1991). Authoritative parents monitor their children's conduct and impart clear standards. Their disciplinary methods are supportive rather than punitive. Indulgent parents, on the other hand, are non coercive. They are lenient, do not require mature behavior and avoid confrontation. The control factor regarding the obedience levels of children to rules has an important impact on providing a democratic family atmosphere, as do accepting parenting and psychological autonomy (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby, 1980; Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Stable and consistent parenting styles and behavior in implementing the rules in families can act as a model on the basis of which the child can develop self-regulation abilities. So we can conclude that parenting control can have positive effects on children's self-regulated learning strategies. In a study of university students Chung Wha (1999) revealed that psychological control by parents of children has positive effects on academic success. But these positive effects of parenting control over children are only possible if the parents are reliable and flexible in their attitudes and behavior towards their children. Otherwise, if in order to rear their child according to their beliefs and if the parents have strict and coercive attitudes and behavior to control the child, they can cause the child's self-esteem to diminish because they do not give the child enough opportunities to manage him/herself.

These circumstances can affect the self-regulation abilities of the child in a negative way and produce anxiety. So the positive impact of parenting control on self-regulation of children is only possible with accepting parenting and psychological autonomy granted to the child. On the other hand, students with authoritarian and neglectful parents use self-regulated learning strategies less than the other students. Authoritarian parents are highly demanding and controlling, but not responsive. These parents provide well-ordered and structured environments with clearly stated rules. Neglectful parents are low in both responsiveness and demandingness.

Both authoritarian and neglectful parents are not responsive. They have a problem with meeting their children's needs and demands. However, every individual needs to be loved and needs acceptance of their behavior. If parents fail to meet the needs of the child, the child can become passive and suffer lack of self confidence and have poor self-regulated learning ability.

The present study also indicates that self efficacy of those students with authoritative parents is higher than that of the students with indulgent, authoritarian and neglectful parents and that they feel less test anxiety than do the students with authoritarian parents. If the parents give their child enough opportunities to be autonomous and involve their child's needs enough, they can provide suitable conditions for the child to be self-efficient. Under such conditions the children's autonomous feelings are fostered and they become more competent at determining their own learning objectives, start to believe in their own skills and abilities more, and feel less test anxiety. However, children need to be loved, supported verbally, protected and respected by the parents. All these constitute the emotional needs of the child and any problem regarding these needs develops anxiety in the child.

As Wood, McLeod, Sigman, Hwang and Chu (2003) have posited, parental acceptance, control and the modality of parents in terms of anxious behaviors are directly related to a child's anxiety level. Wolfradt, Hempel and Miles (2003) in a study of adolescents, revealed that parental involvement is negatively related with children's anxiety. Similarly Peleg-Popko and Kligman (2002), in their study of 6<sup>th</sup> grade students, examined the relation between family environment and children's text anxiety. They indicate a significant negative relation between dialogue between parents and children, supporting personal development and children's test anxiety. Parenting control may also be a factor that increases test anxiety: the more coercive style of parenting control exercised in order to impose parents' own standards on their children can lead to children's becoming more and more anxious.

Niggemeyer-Hall (2001) indicates that the adolescents report more anxiety if they have higher perceived parental control and more conflicts in the families. In the same study it was found out that "passion level" in the family is negatively related to the child's anxiety. Bögels and Melick (2004) in their studies conducted on 9-12 year old children show that there is a significant negative relation between parental

autonomy and a child's anxiety levels. Sümer and Güngör (1999) report that Turkish adolescents coming from those families where the acceptance /involvement levels are higher, have lower levels of anxiety than do adolescents from families where there is a lower level of acceptance/involvement and a higher level of control.

According to these results it can be concluded that parents should be both responsive and demanding. The parents should set clear rules, monitor their children's behavior and expect success from their children but all the while supporting their children and satisfying their psychological needs. These parenting styles seem to complement each other. If one of them is missing, particularly responsiveness, children's use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, as well as their motivation, will be diminished.

## References

- Aunola, K., Stattin, H. and Nurmi, J. E. (2000) Parenting style and adolescents' achievement strategies. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23 (2), 205-222.
- Bandura, A. (1994) Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (pp. 71-81). Newyork: Academic Press.
- Baumrind, D. (1991) The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1996) The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relation*, 45(4), 405-415.
- Boekaerts, M. (1996) Self-regulated learning at the junction of cognition and motivation. *European Psychologist*, 1 (2), 100-112.
- Boveja, M. E. (1998) Parenting styles and adolescents' learning strategies in the urban community. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 26 (2), 110-120.
- Bögels, S. M. & Melick, M. V. (2004) The relationship between child-report, parent self-report, and partner report of perceived parental rearing behaviors and anxiety in children and parents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37 (8), 1583-1596.
- Chung Wha, K. (1999) *Social-cognitive factors influencing success on college entrance exams in South Korea*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, United States, California. Retrieved April 11, 2005 from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=730646331&sid=2&Fmt=2&clientId=46825&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F. & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987) The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244- 1257.
- Georgiou, S. N. (2007) Parental involvement: Beyond demographics. *Intentional Journal about Parents in Education*, 1, 59-62.
- Glasgow, K. L., Dornbush, S. M., Troyer, L., Steinberg, L. and Ritter, P. (1997) Parenting styles, adolescent's attributions, and educational outcomes in nine heterogeneous high schools. *Child Development*, 68 (3), 507-529.
- Gonzalez, A. R., Holbein, M. F. D. & Quilter, S. (2002) High school student's goal orientation and their relationship to perceived parenting styles. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27, 450-470.
- Grolnik, W. S. & Ryan R. M. (1989) Parent styles associated with children's self-regulation and competence in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2, 143-154.
- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L. & Dornbush, S. M. (1991) Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.
- Leung, P. W. L. & Kwan, K. S. F. (1998). Parenting styles, motivational orientations, and self-perceived academic competence: A mediational model. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 44(1), 1-19.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1980). *Social development: Psychological growth and the parent-child relationship*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publisher.
- Maccoby, E. E. & Martin, J. A. (1983) Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) and E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vo.4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., pp.1-101) Newyork: Wiley.
- Martinez-Pons, M. (1996) Test of a model of parental inducement of academic self-regulation. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 64(3), 213-228.
- McClun, L. A. & Merrel, K. W. (1998) Relationship of perceived parenting styles, locus of control orientation, and self-concept among junior high age students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(4), 381-390.
- Niggemeyer-Hall, A. E. (2001) *Family interaction factors and anxiety in adolescent females*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seattle Pacific University, Washington. Retrieved April 11, 2004, from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=729036801&sid=4&Fmt=2&clientId=46825&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

- Ostovar, S. & Khayyer, M. (2004) Relations of motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning outcomes for Iranian college students. *Psychological Reports*, 94(3), 1020-1204.
- Otto, B., Perels, F. & Schmitz, B. (2008). The correlation of parental behavior with the self-regulative learning of elementary school students. *Psychologie in Erziehung und Unterricht*, 55 (4), 288-300.
- Peleg-Popko, O. & Klingman, A. (2002) Family environment, discrepancies between perceived actual and desirable environment, and children's test and trait anxiety. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 30(4), 451.
- Perry, N. E. (1998) Young children's self-regulated learning and contexts that support it. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 715-729.
- Pintrich, P. R. (1999) The role of motivation in promoting and sustaining self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31, 459-470.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 451-502). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Pintrich, P. R. & De Groot, E. V. (1990) Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82 (1), 33-40.
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T. & McKeachie, W. J. (1991) *A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)* (Tec. Rep. No. 91-B-004). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, School of Education.
- Purdie, N., Carroll, A. & Roche, L. (2004). Parenting and adolescent self-regulation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27, 663-676.
- Schunk, D. H & Zimmerman B. J. (2008). *Motivating and self-regulated learning*. Newyork: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Steinberg, L. Elmen, J. D. & Mounts, N. S. (1989) Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development*, 60, 1424-1436.
- Sümer, N. & Güngör, D. (1999) Çocuk yetiştirme stillerinin bağlanma stilleri, benlik değerlendirmeleri ve yakın ilişkiler üzerindeki etkisi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14 (44), 35-58.
- Uredi, I. (2005) *Algılanan anne baba tutumlarının ilköğretim 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin öz-düzenleyici öğrenme stratejileri ve motivasyonel inançları üzerindeki etkisi*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yıldız Technical University, Turkey.
- Wolfradt, U., Hempel, S. & Miles, J. N. V. (2003) Perceived parenting styles, depersonalization, anxiety and coping behaviour in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(4), 521-532.
- Wolters, C. A., Yu, S. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002) The relation between goal orientation and students' motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8 (3), 211-238.
- Wood, J. J., McLeod, B. D. Sigman, M. Hwang, W. & Chu, B. C. (2003) Parenting and childhood anxiety: Theory, empirical findings, and future directions. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 44 (1), 134
- Yılmaz, A. (2000). Anne-baba tutum ölçeğinin güvenilirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. *Çocuk ve Gençlik Ruh Sağlığı*, 7 (3), 160-172.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81 (3), 329-339.