

PARENTAL BONDING TOWARDS CHILDREN AND ITS AFFECT ON CHILDREN'S SELF- ESTEEM AND SELF-EFFICACY

Aftab Hussain*, Asghar Ali Shah**, Aqeel Ahmad Khan, Maria Fiaz

*Islamia University Bahawalpur
International Islamic University*

*Emails: *aftab_hussain12@yahoo.com
**drasgharali@iiu.edu.pk*

Abstract: The study intended to study the relationship between parental bonding and its effect on children's self-esteem and self-efficacy in both girls and boys. To conduct the study a sample of 100 boys and 100 girls from different schools through convenience sampling. The Parental Bonding Scale, Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale and General Self Efficacy scale were used in the research. This research highlights the impact of parental bonding on the self-esteem and self-efficacy of children. It shows that there exists significant effect of parental bonding on self-efficacy, but it does not have a significant effect on self-esteem. Boys reported slightly higher self-esteem than girls, but there is no difference between boys and girls on self-efficacy. Our research also reported that boys have a slightly higher parental bonding than females. Among the demographic variables, family structure was found to be non-significant to predict self-esteem and self-efficacy. The study also confirms that parental bonding is significantly related to age. These findings confirmed the need of considering multidimensional aspects of parental bonding and the different perspective in explaining the parental impacts on children self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Keywords: Self-esteem, Self-efficacy, Parental bonding

Introduction

Parental bonding is an appropriate sign that aids in understanding the parent-child affiliation which is believed to be a basic part in the development of Theory of Mind and in dealing with judgments towards the self (Alessia, Andrea and Concetta 2015). The initial parent-child relationship has been connected with several aspects of behavior and growth (Cassidy and Shaver 2008).

Significantly much have been learnt about bonding. As the firm attachments amongst guardians and their youngsters give the child's initial model to hint connections and to encourage a doubt that all is well and good with positive confidence. The everyday associations amongst newborn, children and energetic youngsters and their relatives help in driving their passionate, physical, and scholarly improvements (Brazelton and Cramer 1990). At the point when guardians are touchy and receptive to youngsters' hints, they add the organized overall correspondence amongst parent and child (Tronick 1989). These cooperations enable childrens to build up a feeling of self (Tronick and Beeghly 2011) and display different enthusiastic expressions and in addition, passionate direction abilities (e.g., self-quieting and composed skills). The Attachment amongst parent and child supposes an essential part in the fruitful progress of the child. Consequently frustrations in parental bonding will be connected with the progress of mental disorders sometime in later life.

Parental Bonding is a vital point that gives a gigantic understanding about a parent-child relationship. It can be said as a connection between the adolescent and the parent. The Attachment theory depends on the possibility that individual differences are present regarding how newborns children get emotionally attached to their parental figures and how these earliest connection encounters have an impact on the future progressions of babies in social, psychological and emotional perspectives (Bowlby 1969). Six-hundred-eighty-two students

(358 ladies and 324 men) finished four measures: Parental Bonding Instrument, Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale, Satisfaction with Life Scale, and the General Health Questionnaire. A basic equation demonstrating technique was utilized to look at the model of best fit for parental bonding (overpampered and cared), psychological well-being, self esteem prosperity and life satisfaction. Results demonstrated that self esteem completely intervened the connection between parental bonding (parental over-protection and parental care) and general mental well-being. This investigation exhibited the system through which perceived child rearing style impacts Japanese young grown-ups' psychological well-being (Yamawaki, et al 2010).

Self esteem suggests to a person's feeling of his or her esteem or importance, or the degree to which anyone worths, supports of, acknowledges, prizes, or likes him or herself (Blascovich and Tomaka 1991). Self-esteem can be said as trust in one's self-respect, one's own value or capacities. Self-esteem is an identification trait of a person, which implies that it has a tendency to be steady and persevering. Self-esteem can include various beliefs about the self, for example, the examination of one's own appearance, convictions, feelings, and practices (Chapman & Mullis, 1999; Kammeyer, Mueller, Judge, & Scott, 2009).

The significance of self-esteem as a worldwide pointer of mental wellbeing has supported research into the impact of factors, for example, child rearing on self-esteem improvement. The parent-kid relationship speaks to the soonest and most persisting social connections of the human life expectancy. In like manner, the nature of the parent-child relationship has been contended to significantly affect the capability, flexibility, and prosperity of all people (Lara and Eleonora 1999). Two major parts of child rearing have been distinguished as essential for youngsters' modification or maladjustment.

The first of these has been distinguished as warmth, nurturance, and acknowledgment or responsivity. This measurement has been appearing to be bipolar. It has been characterized by parental love, empathy, and closeness on one post and coldness, apathy, and disregard of the other (Baumrind 1968; Coopersmith 1967). Youth who gets high state of acknowledgment demonstrate a hoisted view of their self-esteem and capability. Conversely, youth who are liable for less tolerating child rearing practices indicate low self-confidence, poor self-observation, and low confidence (Baumrind 1968).

The second measurement has been characterized by the measure of structure, control and contribution, the or demandingness that parental figures show toward their children. This measurement has been separated as far as viable, empathic, and formatively proper administration versus manipulative or correctional Caregiving (Baumrind 1968; Maccoby and Martin 1983). At the point when characterized by overprotection (Parker, Tupling and Brown 1979) rather than the stipend of freedom and self-sufficiency, this measurement has been found to relate adversely with self-esteem.

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in his or her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments (Bandura 1977). Self-efficacy imitates self-reliance in the ability to exercise control over one's own motivation, behavior, and social environment. These cognitive self-evaluations influence on the over all mode of human experience, including the goals for which people strive, the amount of energy expended toward goal achievement, and likelihood of attaining particular levels of behavioural performance. Unlike traditional psychological constructs, self-efficacy beliefs are hypothesized to vary depending on the domain of functioning and circumstances surrounding the occurrence of behaviour (Michael, Carey and Andrew, n.d.).

Children, adolescents and adults who have a secure attachment with their parents tend to be less prone to psychological strain and distress and a decreased likelihood of reporting suicidal ideations and attempts (Indhumathy and Ashwini 2007). Research on attachment and interaction has led to a large body of knowledge and resulted in an entire field of study, infant mental health. The work of Mary Ainsworth and her colleagues (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall 1978). The work of Mary Ainsworth and her colleagues (Ainsworth et al

1978) demonstrated how responsive parenting support the emotional health and security of infants and young children. It also showed how different parenting styles contribute to different types of relationships.

Inside Western societies, self-esteem reliably has been shown to be conversely related to child rearing styles described by low levels of acknowledgment and elevated amounts of overprotection (i.e., affectionless control). Despite the fact that in customary collectivist societies there might be an inclination for this child rearing style, inside a solid collectivist system, it isn't thought to negatively affect self-esteem. In any case, for migrant teenagers, the social setting of the community may never again maintain such a child rearing style as versatile, especially in light of the fact that they have a tendency to culturally assimilate more rapidly than their parents. To examine this proposition, 118 Vietnamese Australians and 120 Anglo-Australian teenagers, aged of 11 to 18 years, were selected. They directed the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory; the Parental Bonding Instrument, a cultural assimilation measure; and two subscales of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire. Child rearing portrayed by elevated amounts of overprotection and low levels of acknowledgment related adverse to self-esteem for the two specimens of adolescents (Lara 1999).

The self-confidence and self-esteem of both women were affected by the over- and under-involvement of their paternities. Whereas it comforts that children know their parents are there to care them practically and emotionally, parents also need to be comfortable stepping back to allow their children to make decisions, struggle, fail, and discover their own individual desires, strengths, and weaknesses is the basis.

In 1971, Baumrind performed a study comprised of interviews and observations with parents and children, concluding within the identity of 3 forms of parenting primarily based on stages of demandingness (control, maturity demands, supervision) and sensitivity (warmth, acceptance, involvement) and closing effect on children's Self-Efficacy. These parenting patterns she called authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. The authoritarian parenting approach is defined as a black and white fashion of parenting, wherein guidelines are expected to be followed without question or there might be the results. Those dads and mom tend to be strict and disturbing, while not treating their youngsters as equals. They do now not seem very aware of their youngsters. The authoritative parenting approach is also one with rules that should be accompanied, however the dad and mom have a tendency to be more open approximately their reasoning and recollect their children's evaluations more so than authoritarian parents. Authoritative dad and mom tend to speak approximately issues with their youngsters in a supportive manner instead of genuinely causing punishment. Permissive mothers and fathers tend to act greater responsively and claim much less from their children; in turn they do not generally discipline their kids as often. They may also be communicative and nurturing.

This study focused on Parenting considered by high levels of overprotection and low levels of acceptance related negatively to self-esteem for both samples of adolescents. According to study, disturbances in parental bonding will be linked with the development of mental disorders later in life. It mainly works for the children and parents caretaking because Attachment between parent and child plays a crucial role in the healthy development of the child. A lot more about bonding is being learnt. As the strong ties between parents and their child provide the baby's first model for intimate relationships and foster a sense of security and positive self-esteem. The study will reveal that a child's ability to form and maintain healthy self-related thoughts throughout life may be significantly impaired by having an insecure attachment to their parents.

A study was conducted by Bexell and Jönsson (2017) on the topic of Responsibility and the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals, United Nations summit documents on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were adopted in 2015. The hypothetical help of the investigation gives to make the investigation of SDG responsibility more composed by separating three principle senses of liability i.e. cause, obligation, and accountability. The hypothetical supports the investigation of two SDG summit archives, Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. As per the main feeling of the examination, the causal awareness of other's expectations is covered up between the lines in

sections on poverty, debt and environmental issues. As a result, underlying reasons of issues won't not be suitably talked to. Second, SDG summit archives bargain largely with duty in the sense of commitment. Bexell and Jönsson raise issues with revised thought for national conditions and with unclear commitments for non-governmental performers. Third, with respect to accountability, Bexell and Jönsson broaden that quantitative pointers have unintended pushing impacts both pre and post the survey stage. The focus is on indicators, shadowing more extensive obligations, e.g., international human rights. In all its three ways, duty in key SDG archives remains state-driven with remarkable space for state power, self-direction and regard for national conditions.

Method

Objectives

- To investigate the effect of parental bonding on children's self-esteem and self-efficacy.
- To investigate the relationship between parental bonding, self-esteem and self-efficacy.
- To investigate gender differences among children on self-esteem, self-efficacy with parental bonding towards children.
- To find out the difference between children belonging to nuclear and joint family types on self-esteem, self-efficacy and parental bonding.
- To assess the difference between children of different age on self-esteem, self-efficacy and parental bonding towards children.

Hypotheses

- 1.Higher parental bonding leads to higher self-esteem and high self-efficacy of children.
- 2.There is a difference between boys and girls on self-efficacy, self-esteem and parental bonding.
- 3.There is a difference between children belonging to nuclear family and joint family, self-efficacy and parental bonding.
- 4.There is a significant difference among children of different ages on self-esteem, self-efficacy and parental bonding.

Sample

Sample of respondents is drawn from students of different schools and colleges of Islamabad. The sample will contain 200 respondents i.e. 100 males and 100 females. Their ages would be between 08 to 16 years. The sample was selected through probability sampling i-e random sampling. Only the educated individuals will be included as the participants of the study.

Conceptual definitions

Parental Bonding

Parental Bonding is the formation of a mutual emotional and psychological closeness between parents (or primary caregivers) and their newborn child. Babies usually bond with their parents in the minutes, hours, or days following birth. Parental bonding is a relevant predictor that helps in understanding the parent-child

relationship which plays an important role in the development of Theory of Mind and in organizing judgments towards the self (Alessia, Andrea and Concetta 2015).

Self-esteem

Self esteem is a concept of personality, for it to grow, we need to have self worth, and this self worth will be sought from embracing the challenges that result in the showing of success (Branden 1969).

Self-Efficacy

Self-Efficacy refers to an individual's perception in his or her capacity to perform behaviors necessary to provide particular overall performance accomplishments (Bandura 1977). Self-efficacy displays a self belief in the capability to exert manage over one's own motivation, conduct, and social surroundings. Those cognitive self-evaluations impact all manner of human involvement in, which include the dreams for which people try, the quantity of strength expended towards intention fulfillment, and likelihood of reaching specific levels of behavioral overall performance. Not like conventional psychological constructs, self-efficacy ideals are hypothesized to differ depending on the area of functioning and circumstances surrounding the occurrence of a behaviour.

Instruments

Survey through Questionnaire technique is done for this research. After secondary data collection over the internet, a primary research will be carried out through a questionnaire. The questionnaire is well structured and the responses were sought from the respondents. The nature of the questions was such that it avoid ambiguous responses from the respondents and it also helps in quick analysis of the data collection. The Scale used in this study Parental Bonding Scale and the other scale which was used is Demographic Data Sheet, Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale and General Self Efficacy Scale.

Demographic data sheet

The Demographic data sheet was utilized to obtain the demographic data of participants. Demographic data sheet includes age, gender and family structure.

Parental Bonding Scale(PBS)

Two scales termed 'care' and 'over protection' or 'control', measure fundamental parental styles as perceived by the child. The measure is 'retrospective', meaning that adults (over 16 years) complete. A measure of how they remember their parents during their first 16 years. The measure is to be completed for both mothers and fathers separately. There are 25 item questions, including 12 'care' items and 13 'over protection' items. (Parker, Tupling and Brown 1979)

Rosenberg Self Esteem Instrument(RSEI)

A 10-item scale that measures global self-worth by measuring both positive and negative feelings about the self. The scale is believed to be uni-dimensional. All items are answered using a 4-point Likert scale format ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. (Rosenberg 1965).

General self efficacy scale(GSES)

This scale is a self-report measure of self-efficacy. The GSE is a 10-item scale designed to assess optimistic self-beliefs used to cope with a variety of demands in life. The scale was designed to assess self-efficacy that is the belief that one's actions are responsible for successful outcomes. It is available in 30 languages. All items are answered using a 4-point Likert scale format ranging from not at all true to exactly true (Jerusalem and Schwarzer 1981).

Procedure

The participants were approached by going to different schools and data was gathered through probability sampling technique (i.e. Random sampling). After having the required consent, the three scales were given to the respondents asking them to read each statement carefully and respond to each item of the scales. Participant filled the scales in the presence of the researcher. The researcher answered questions seeking clarification of certain items briefly. For the demographic information, i.e. age, gender. A separate sheet was filled by each participant. Confidentiality of information and its restricted use for research purpose was also assured. All the information collected from convenient sampling was then organized, statistically analyzed and scored.

Results

Table 1 Frequency and percentages for the demographic variables. (N=200)

Demographic variables	f	%
Gender		
Male	100	50.0
Female	100	50.0
Family structure		
Nuclear	93	46.5
Joint	107	53.5
Age range		
8 -10 years	53	26.5
11-13 years	69	34.5
14-16 years	68	39.0

Table 1 indicates that our sample consisted of children. The Sample consisted of 50% (n=100) boys and 50% (n=100) girls, out of them 46.5% live in a nuclear and 53.5% live in joint family structure. 26.5 % Participants were of age range 8-10 years, 34.5% from 11-13 years and 39.0% of 14-16 years.

Table 2. Reliability analysis of RSEI, PBS and GSES(N=200).

Scale	No. of Items	A
RSEI	10	.52
PBS	25	.62
GSES	10	.41

Table 2 indicates that Rosenberg Self Esteem Instrument, Parental Bonding Scale and General Self-efficacy scale are reliable to be used for the current data.

Table 3. Pearson Product Moment Correlation for PBS and RSEI (N=200).

Variables	1	2
RSEI	-	.120
	.089	
		200
PBS		-

Table 3 indicates that there is not any significant correlation between the RSEI instrument and PBS.

Table 4. Pearson Product Moment Correlation for PBS and GSES. (N=200)

Variables	1	2
PBS		.261**
		.000
		200
GSES		-

Table 4 indicates that there is a significant correlation between GSES and PBS. Correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

Table 5 Linear regression for Parental bonding on Self- Efficacy. (N=200)

Predictor	B	SE B	B	t	p
PBS	.80	.21	.25	3.81	.000
R square	.068				
F	14.46				

Table 5 represents that the predictor variable Parental Bonding significantly affects Self-Efficacy. As B is positive thus, the relationship between parental bonding and self-efficacy is also positive, which means there is positive effect of parental bonding on Self-efficacy.

Table 6 Mean, Standard deviation, and t-values for RSEI, PBS on GSES. (N=200).

RSEI	Gender	n	M	SD	t	df	p	95% CL	
								LL	UL
	Male	100	20.34	3.026	-121	198	.230	-1.30	.30
	Female	100	20.83	2.727					
	Male	100	20.61	3.542	-0.12	198	.900	-1.00	.88
	Female	100	20.67	3.226					5

PBS	Male	100	52.79	7.823	1.50	198	.13	-.727	5.41
	Female	100	50.45	13.439				4	

Results in the table 6 suggests that both groups, male and female differ significantly on Self Esteem ($t = -1.21$, $df = 198$). The table indicates that boys ($M = 20.34$, $SD = 3.026$) show slightly more self-esteem than girls ($M = 20.83$, $SD = 2.727$) and it also shows that there is no significant amount of difference in case of Self-Efficacy ($t = -0.12$, $df = 198$) among the boys ($M = 20.61$, $SD = 3.524$) and girls ($M = 20.67$, $SD = 3.226$). It also suggests that boys and girls differ significantly in case of parental bonding too. Boys ($M = 52.79$, $SD = 7.823$) have slightly more parental bonding than girls ($M = 50.45$, $SD = 13.439$).

Table 7 Mean, Standard deviation, and t-values for RSEI, PBS on GSES (N=200).

								95% CL	
	Family	n	M	SD	t	df	p	LL	UL
RSEI	Nuclear	93	20.80	3.161	.96	198	.40	-0.41	1.20
	Joint	107	20.40	2.620	3			-0.41	1.21
					.95				
					1				
GSES	Nuclear	93	20.74	3.365	.39	198	.70	-0.76	1.14
	Joint	107	20.55	3.404	7			-0.75	1.14
					.39				
					7				
PBS	Nuclear	93	51.58	12.528	-	198	.95	-3.16	3.01
	Joint	107	51.65	9.603	.04			-3.22	3.08
					7				
					-.63				

Results in the table 7 suggest that children belonging to different family structures differ significantly on Self Esteem. The table indicates that children living in a nuclear family ($M = 20.80$, $SD = 3.161$) those living in joint family ($M = 20.40$, $SD = 2.620$) do not differ significantly in self-esteem and it also shows that there is no significant amount of difference in case of Self-Efficacy ($t = -0.12$, $df = 198$) among those children, living in a nuclear family structure ($M = 20.74$, $SD = 3.365$) and those living in joint family ($M = 20.55$, $SD = 3.404$). It also suggests that there is also not any significant difference in case of parental bonding in case of those living in significantly in the case of those living in joint family system ($M = 51.65$, $SD = 9.603$) and nuclear family ($M = 51.58$, $SD = 12.528$).

Table 8. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on age for RSEI, PBS and GSES. (N=200).

	SS	df	MS	f	p
RSEI					
Between Groups	0.956	2	0.478	0.057	.945
Within Groups	1653.599	197	8.394		
Total	1654.555	199			

PBS						
Between Groups	2810.688	2	1405.344	12.936	.000	
Within Groups	21402.432	197	108.642			
Total	24213.120	199				
GSES						
Between Groups	59.639	2	29.819	2.655	.073	
Within Groups	2212.441	197	11.231			
Total	2272.080	199				

Table 8 represent that there exists a significant difference among children of different ages in case of Parental bonding but there is no significant difference in case of self-esteem and self-efficacy.

Discussion

The results of study showed that there is a significant relation between two variables that is parental bonding and self-efficacy, but there is no significant correlation between self-esteem and parental bonding. The scales utilized in the study were parental bonding scale, Rosenberg self-esteem scale and General self-efficacy scale for children. Results were analyzed on the basis of demographic variables which includes age, gender and family structure. The results told us that there is a significant difference when analyzed on the basis of result obtained from three scales. Values obtained from analysis shows that there exists significant effect of Parental Bonding on Self-Efficacy but self-esteem is not affected by parental bonding.

The results suggest that both groups, male and female differ significantly on self-esteem it indicates that boys show slightly more self-esteem than girls and it also shows that there is no significant amount of difference in case of self-efficacy among the boys and girls It also suggests that boys and girls differ significantly in case of parental bonding too. Our results suggested that boys show more parental bonding than girls. Analyses of our next demographic variable values indicate that children living in a nuclear family or those living in joint family show no significant amount of difference in case of any of our variables i.e. self-esteem, self-efficacy and parental bonding.

The result obtained showed that there is no significant effect of parental bonding on self-esteem of children, which prove to be inconsistent with the prior researches that the role of early relationships with parents in determining the way in which the children developing their beliefs about their worth as a separate, unique person and where they stand in relation to others (Matas, Arend, and Sroufe 1978). Self-esteem is a significant psychological construct and a central component of individuals' daily experience. Self-esteem was found to be positively related to mother and father care. Our result demonstrated that there is a positive correlation between self-efficacy and parental which are consistent with the previous researches.

References

- Alessia ,Passanisi,; Gensabella, Andrea ; Pirrone, Concetta., 2015, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 June, Vol.191,1702-1706[Peer Reviewed Journal]
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., and Wall, S., 1978, *Patterns of attachment* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brazelton, T. B. and Cramer, B. G., 1990, *The earliest relationship: Parents, infants, and the drama of early attachment*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Bowlby, J. 1969, *Attachment and loss, Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blascovich, J. and Tomaka, J.,1991, *Measures of selfesteem. Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*, 1, 115-160.

- Branden, N., 1969, *The Psychology of Self-Esteem: A New Concept of Mans Psychological Nature*. Los Angeles, CA: Nash Publishing.
- Bandura A., 1977, Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review* , 84, 191–215. Crossref, Medline
- Baumrind, D., 1968, Authoritarian vs authoritative parental control. *Adolescence*, 3, 255-272
- Cassidy J., Shaver P. R., 2008, *Handbook of attachment, Theory, research, and clinical applications* New York, NY Guilford 131-157 2nd edition
- Jerusalem, M. and Schwarzer, R., 1981, SWE - scale for general self - efficacy evaluation [author description; Questionnaire]. In Leibniz Center for Psychological Information and Documentation (ZPID) (Eds), *Electronic Test Archive*. Online in the Internet URL: <https://www.zpid.de/Testarchiv>
- Lara; H, Eleonora. G., 1999, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(6), 742-761. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022199030006005>
- Matas, L., Arend, R. A., and Sroufe, L. A., 1978, Continuity of adaptation in the second year: The relationship between quality of attachment and later competence. *Child Development*, 49, 547–556.
- Parker, G., Tupling, H., and Brown, L. B., 1979, A parental bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52, 1–10
- Rosenberg, M., 1965, *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Tronick, E., and Beeghly, M., 2011, Meaning making and infant mental health. *American Psychologist*, 107-119.
- Tronick E.Z., 1989, Emotions and emotional communication in infants. *American Psychologist*; 44:112–119. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.44.2.112. [PubMed] [Cross Ref]
- [Bexell.M and Jönsson.K, 2017, Issue 1: A Changing Global Development Agenda?; 44: 13-29. doi.org/10.1080/08039410.2016.1252424](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08039410.2016.1252424)
- <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08039410.2016.1252424>