

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHILDREARING PRACTICES TO THE
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF INDONESIAN STUDENTS OF
ADVENTIST UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES

Suneeta Joys Sihombing

Ketty Mondoringin

Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Borobudur

adjstwo@gmail.com

Abstract

This study sought to determine the relationship between child rearing practices to the Emotional Intelligence of Adventist University of Philippines (AUP) Indonesian students. In this study the researcher would brought up several considered question such as the profile of the respondents, the categories of the emotional intelligence of AUP Indonesian students as a whole and also to understand the childrearing practice of AUP Indonesian students' parent and to see how would it be related to the emotional intelligence of AUP Indonesian students. In adding up to the understanding of the relationship of childrearing practices and emotional intelligence of AUP Indonesian students taken as a whole, the researcher would also include the moderator variables which are gender and the socio-economic status as well as to breakdown the relationship of childrearing practices with each emotional intelligence subscales that consist of 15 subscales.

Methodology used for the study is a correlation design. The population consisted of 45 Indonesian students of the AUP, with the average age of 18 – 22 years old. Twenty-two of them are females and twenty-three are males. The instruments are two separate test (Parenting style and BarOn Emotional Quotient Test).

This study therefore concludes that the emotional Intelligence of AUP Indonesian student is influenced by the childrearing practices of their parents. Other factors that also correlated are gender and socio-economic status. The fifteen area of emotional intelligence are also influenced by the childrearing practices except, the emotional self-awareness, empathy, stress tolerance, and problem solving.

Keywords: Childrearing Practices, Emotional Intelligence, Gender, Socio-economic Status

INTRODUCTION

Emotional Intelligence is greater than IQ in terms of personal success (Goleman, 1995). Goleman, the famous author of the bestseller, Emotional Intelligence, states that academic intelligence has little to do with emotional life. People who are emotionally adept – who know and manage their own feelings well and who read and deal effectively with other people's feelings – are at an advantage in any domain in life, whether romance and intimate relationships or picking up the unspoken rules that govern success in organizational politics. They are more likely to be content and effective in their lives, mastering the habits at

mind that foster their own productivity; people who cannot marshal some control over their emotional life fight inner battles that sabotage their ability for focused work and clear thought. In other words, as in reality, many intelligent people fail at the height of greater challenges and difficulties. Therefore, psychologists have determined that the ability to sense, understand and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotions as a powerful way to cope with life. Since emotional Intelligence is so crucial, it is important to understand the factors that influence the growth of the emotional intelligence.

Daniel Goleman's (1995) theory telling us that the human brain is by no means fully formed at birth. It continues to shape itself through life, with the most intense growth occurring during childhood. Goleman stated that brain is divided into two parts; one is an act of the emotional mind, the other of the rational mind. In a very real sense we have two minds; one that thinks and one that feels. These two fundamentally different ways of knowing interact the construct of our mental life. One, the rational mind is the mode of comprehension we are typically conscious of: more prominent in awareness, thoughtful, able to ponder and reflect. But alongside that there is another system of knowing: impulsive and powerful, sometimes illogical, it's the emotional mind. He also said, based on experience, when it comes to shaping our decision and our actions, feeling comes every bit as much-and often more- than thought. For better or worse, intelligence can come to nothing when the emotions hold sway. Goleman focused on the development of emotional intelligence in terms of having good empathy, contentious, optimistic, and have the ability to restraint negative feeling are more likely to be success in life (Goleman, 1994). That makes the parent style of rearing children so important, for it would determine how the child would probably be as a human.

Global studies made by John Mordechai Gottman (1997) titled Emotion Coaching described that in the last decade or so, science has discovered a tremendous amount about the role emotions play in our lives. Researchers have found that, even more than IQ, emotional intelligence--being aware of and able to handle feelings--will determine your success and happiness in all walks of life, including family relationships. For parents, having EQ,-as many now call it-means being aware of your child's feelings and being able to empathize, soothe,

and guide him. For children, who learn most lessons about emotions from their parents. It includes the ability to control impulses, delay gratification, motivate themselves, and read other people's social cues. Children's emotional intelligence is determined to some degree by temperament--that is, the personality traits with which a child is born—but it's also shaped by the child's interactions with his parents. This influence begins in the earliest days of infancy, when a child's immature nervous system is being formed.

What parental behaviors make the difference? As a research psychologist studying parent-child interactions, Gottman (1997) have spent much of the past twenty years looking for the answer to his question. Working with research teams at the University of Illinois and at the University of Washington, he have conducted in depth research in two studies of 119 families, observing how parents and children react to one another in emotionally charged situation. They have traced children physiological responses during stressful parent-child interactions. They have carefully observed and analyzed parent's emotional reactions to their kids' anger and sadness. Then they have checked in with these families over time to see how their children developed in terms of health, academic achievement, emotional development, and social relationships.

They have found that most parents fall into one of two broad categories: those who give their children guidance about the world of emotion and those who don't. He call the parents who get involved with their children's feeling "emotion coaches". Much like athletic coaches, they teach their children strategies to deal with life's ups and downs. They don't object to their children's displays of anger, sadness, or fear. Nor do they ignore them. Instead, they accept negative emotions as a fact of life and they use emotional moments as opportunities for teaching their kids important life lessons and building closer relationships with them.

Results of their follow-up study showed them that children with emotion-coaching parents are better off in areas of academic performance, social competence, emotional well-being, and physical health. Their math and reading scores are better. They get along better with their friends, they have stronger social skills, and their parents report that these children have fewer negative and more positive emotions. Children who are emotion-coached still get sad, angry, or

scared under difficult circumstances, but they are better able to soothe themselves, bounce back from distress, and carry on with productive activities. Indeed, their research shows that emotion-coaching can even protect children from the proven harmful effects of an increasingly common crisis for American families—marital conflict and divorce.

Another surprising discovery from our research has to do with fathers. Our studies found that when fathers adopt an emotion-coaching style of parenting, it has an extremely positive impact on the children's emotional development. When fathers are aware of their children's feelings and try to help them solve problems, children do better in school and in relationships with others. In contrast, an emotionally distant father—one who is harsh, critical or dismissing of his children's emotions—can have a deeply negative impact. His children are more likely to do poorly in school, fight more with friends, and be in poor health.

Further Gottman (1997) said, Emotion-coaching parents might be described as “Warm” and “Positive”, and indeed they are. But taken alone, warm, positive childrearing does not teach emotional intelligence. In fact, it's common for parents to be loving and attentive yet incapable of dealing well with their children's negative emotions. Among these parents who fail to teach their children emotional intelligence, Gottman have identified three types: @Dismissive Parents, who disregard, ignore, or trivialize children's negative emotions. @Disapproving parents, who are critical of their children's displays of negative feelings and may reprimand or punish them for emotional expression; and; @Laissez-faire parents, who accept their children's emotions and empathize with them, but fail to offer guidance or set limits on their children's behavior.

This study would determine the relationship between childrearing practices as one of the factors to the emotional intelligence. The researcher would considering the three kinds of parenting styles which are authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive, and determine which one of the three is the best help in developing a high emotional intelligent. The statement of the problems would cover the six research question as below:

- 1.) What is the profile of the respondents?
- 2.) What is the emotional intelligence of AUP Indonesian students?
- 3.) What is the childrearing practice of AUP Indonesian students' parents?
- 4.) Is there any significant relationship between childrearing practices (authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting style) to emotional intelligence of AUP Indonesian students taken as a whole?
- 5.) Is there a significant relationship between childrearing practices and emotional intelligence, considering: a. Gender and b. Socio-economic status?
- 6.) Is there a significant relationship between childrearing practices to each emotional intelligence subscales of AUP Indonesian students (Emotional Self-Awareness, Assertiveness, Self-Regard, Self-Actualization, Independence, Empathy, Interpersonal Relationship, Social Responsibility, Problem Solving, Reality Testing, Flexibility, Stress Tolerance, Impulse Control, Happiness, and Optimism).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Emotional Intelligence (E.I) is the ability to sense, understand and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotions as a source of human energy, information and influence (Research-on-line. Emotions and Emotional Intelligence (<http://www.search.com>)). E.I emerges not from the musings of complex intellect, but from the workings of the human heart. It is type of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use information to guide one's thinking and actions.

E.I is not about sales tricks or how to work a room; it is not about putting a good face on things, or the psychology of control, exploitation or manipulation. E.I requires that we learn to acknowledge and value feelings in ourselves and others that we appropriately respond to them, effectively applying the information and energy of emotions in our daily life and work. It is E.I that motivates us to pursue our unique potential and purpose, and activate our innermost values and aspiration, transforming them from thing we think about to what we live. (Goleman, 1998).

Daniel Goleman (1994) define 15 subscales of Emotional Intelligence that could be measured through the inventory/questioner as the instrument as describe below:

- 1.) Emotional Self-Awareness – The ability to be aware of one’s emotions and feelings and be able to express them.
- 2.) Assertiveness – The ability to realize and express one’s feelings, thoughts, and believe openly and defend their thoughts in a nondestructive manner.
- 3.) Self-Regard – The feeling of good self-respect.
- 4.) Self-Actualization – The ability to realize one’s potential and become involved in pursuits that lead to meaningful and rich life.
- 5.) Independence – The ability to do things and to decide by oneself, without depending to others.
- 6.) Empathy – The ability to understand and feel what other feels, to put oneself in someone else’s shoes.
- 7.) Interpersonal Relationship – The ability to establish and maintain mutually satisfying relationship.
- 8.) Social Responsibility – The ability to realize one’s role in society.
- 9.) Problem Solving – The ability to cope up with difficulties and to solve problems that arises.
- 10.) Reality Testing – The ability to see things in the right perspective.
- 11.) Flexibility – The ability to adjust oneself to the situation.
- 12.) Stress Tolerance – The ability to deal with problems and to handle stress.
- 13.) Impulse Control – The ability to control one’s impulse.
- 14.) Happiness – The feeling of contentment and relieve.
- 15.) Optimism – The ability to see things and situations positively.

There is no doubt that parents differ in their approach to raising children. Regarding discipline, some parents prefer to spank, believing “spare the rod, spoil the child”. Other parents prefer to discipline by explaining and modeling appropriate behavior, using corporal punishment as at least resort or not all. (Document-on-line. Stein, Henry T. PhD.)

Researches have been able to identify at least two dimensions on which the differences in parenting can be found: the degree of control the parent has over

the child, and the level of affection and responsiveness to the child's needs. The combination of these two dimensions can result in three parenting styles: authoritarian, authoritative or democratic, and permissive.

Parenting styles are defined as the "manner in which parents express their beliefs about how to be a good or bad parent. All parents (at least 99%) want to be a good parent and avoid doing what they consider to be a bad parent. Parents adopt the styles of parenting learned from their parents because: 1) They don't know what else to do or 2) They felt that this is the right way (good) to parent. (Document-on-line. Stein, Henry T. PhD.).

The three parenting styles differ in their standards, the way in which their values are expressed to the children and in parental of how their children should behave.

1.) Authoritarian Style

Also called traditional, is characterized by the use of strict discipline, and children must follow the rules without any further explanation. Obedience is often enforced through harsh punishment and parents attempt to control their children to make them conform to an absolute set of standards. Emphasis is placed on obedience, respect for authority, and respect for tradition. Child's needs are not considered.

2.) Authoritative Style

Also called democratic style. Parents that practicing this style maintain the good middle ground, they are clearly in control while at the same time encouraging the child to strive for personal autonomy in certain areas. The parents set clear rules and are consistent in enforcing rules, but are more flexible in control (explain rules) based upon needs of the child (within reasonable limits).

3.) Permissive Style

Parents exercise less explicit control over their children's behavior than do authoritarian or authoritative parents, either because they believe children must learn how to behave through their own experience or because they believe children must learn how to behave through their own experience or because they do not take the trouble to provide discipline. They give their

children a lot of leeway to determine their own schedules and activities, and often consult them about family policies. They demand less achievement and put up with less mature behavior than do authoritative or authoritarian parents. (Document-on-line. Huxley, Ron.)

Referring to gender in regard to child care, parents of daughters felt that both parents could take part in all aspects of childrearing, but parents of sons thought that mothers and fathers have different duties in respect to bringing up boys...Some parental actions may not be so conscious, but nonetheless powerful, since they are expressions of the sex-role stereotypes held by the parents. (Parke, 1986). Both mothers and fathers contribute to the learning of both boys and girls...Gender-role learning is strongly influenced by parental warmth and power. Parental absence and divorce affect children's learning and relationship. (Parke, 1986).

A child begins life in the social and economic position of her family. According to Smart (Santrock, 1990), physical care, parental teaching, family interaction, and opportunities for development vary with the socioeconomic position of the family... The upper-class child does not learn social striving, nor does he experience social anxiety since his family is already at the top, relaxed and poised, exercising quite good taste. Democracy in the family life has been more typical of the middle-class than of others. Behavior patterns of a very poor people includes present-orientation, fatalistic thinking, limited verbal communication, low self-esteem, strict gender roles, exploitation and mistrust of the opposite sex, marital conflict, inconsistency in nurture and punishment of children, harsh physical punishment.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative methodology of correlational design, with child rearing practices-authoritarian, authoritative, permissive as the independent variables, emotional intelligence as the dependent variable, and gender and socioeconomic status, as moderator variables. The study is conducted to forty-five (45) Indonesian students of Adventist University of the Philippines, with the average age of 18-22 year old. Twenty-two of them are females and

twenty-three are males. The subjects came from different background, taking Business, Psychology, Medical Technology, Biology, and Computer as their respective courses in AUP.

The researchers used the random sampling equi-probability (equal chance to be selected) to choose the sample. The instruments used in the study are two separate tests. One is a parenting style test to distinguish the kind of parenting style that the population receiving from their particular parents. While another one is the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Test to measure the emotional intelligence of those population. The researcher then will relate the result of the two tests using the SPSS in order to get the assumption.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Research Question 1: What is the profile of the respondents?

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
1. Gender		
Female	22	48.9
Male	23	51.1
2. Course		
College of Business	30	66.7
College of Art & Science	8	17.8
College of Nursing	5	11.1
College of Education	1	2.2
College of Technology	1	2.2
3. Year in college		
First	6	13.3
Second	12	26.7
Third	11	24.4
Fourth	16	35.6
4. Birth order		
Eldest	20	44.4
Middle	11	24.4
Youngest	12	26.7
Only Child	2	4.4
5. Socio-economic status		
Low	4	8.9
Middle	40	88.9
High	1	2.2

Table 1: Profile of the Respondents

Research Question 2: What is the emotional intelligence of AUP Indonesian students?

Variable	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Happines	3.90	Strong EQ
Self-Actualization	3.81	Strong EQ
Problem Solving	3.79	Strong EQ
Interpersonal Relationship	3.76	Strong EQ
Empathy	3.76	Strong EQ
Self-Regard	3.74	Strong EQ
Social Responsibility	3.73	Strong EQ
Optimism	3.58	Strong EQ
Emotional Self-Awareness	3.50	Moderate EQ
Impulse Control	3.46	Moderate EQ
Reality Testing	3.38	Moderate EQ
Flexibility	3.35	Moderate EQ
Stress Tolerance	3.35	Moderate EQ
Assertiveness	3.31	Moderate EQ
Independence	3.26	Moderate EQ
Emotional Quotient	3.60	Overall EQ: Strong

Tabel 2. Emotional Intelligence

LEGEND

- 5 – VERY STRONG EQ
- 4 – STRONG EQ
- 3 – MODERATELY STRONG EQ
- 2 – WEAK EQ
- 1 – VERY WEAK EQ

Research Question 3: What is the childrearing practice of AUP Indonesian students' parents?

Variable	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
A. Fathers		
Authoritative	4.12	High
Authoritarian	2.49	Low
Permissive	2.19	Low
B. Mothers		
Authoritative	4.23	High
Authoritarian	2.36	Low
Permissive	2.20	Low

Table 3. Parenting Style

LEGEND

- 5– VERY HIGH, 4– HIGH, 3– MODERATE, 2– LOW, 1– VERY LOW

Research Question 4: Is there any significant relationship between childrearing practices (authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting style) to emotional quotient as a whole, of AUP Indonesian students?

Childrearing Practices	Emotional Quotient		
	r	p	Decision
A. Fathers			
Authoritative	.1041	.517	Not Significant
Authoritarian	-.4643	.002	Significant
Permissive	-.1053	.512	Not Significant
B. Mothers			
Authoritative	.4312	.005	Significant
Authoritarian	-.5369	.000	Significant
Permissive	-.0574	.721	Not Significant

Table 4. Correlation between childrearing practices and emotional quotient

*Significant F=.050 level

Research Question 5.1: Is there a significant relationship between childrearing practices and emotional quotient as a whole, of AUP Indonesian students, considering gender?

Childrearing Practices	Emotional Quotient			
	Female		Male	
	r	p	r	P
C. Fathers				
Authoritative	.2341	.307	-.0012	.996
Authoritarian	-.3844	.085	-.5068	.023
Permissive	.0243	.917	-.2311	.327
D. Mothers				
Authoritative	.6274	.002	.1360	.567
Authoritarian	-.3854	.084	-.6850	.001
Permissive	.1105	.634	-.2019	.393

Table 5.1. Correlation between childrearing practices and emotional quotient, considering gender.

Research Question 5.2: Is there a significant relationship between childrearing practices and emotional quotient as a whole, of AUP Indonesian students, considering socio-economic status?

Childrearing Practices	Emotional Quotient			
	Socio-economic status			
	Low		Middle	
	r	p	r	P
E. Fathers				
Authoritative	.8545	.146	.0336	.846
Authoritarian	-.8545	.146	-.3793	.023
Permissive	-.8545	.146	.1765	.303
F. Mothers				

Authoritative	.8308	.169	.3863	.020
Authoritarian	-.8363	.169	-.4390	.007
Permissive	-.7297	.270	.1705	.320

Table 5.1. Correlation between childrearing practices and emotional quotient, considering socio-economic status.

Research Question 6: Is there a significant relationship between childrearing practices to each emotional intelligence subscales of AUP Indonesian students (Emotional Self-Awareness, %Assertiveness, Self-Regard, Self-Actualization, Independence, Empathy, Interpersonal Relationship, Social Responsibility, Problem Solving, Reality Testing, Flexibility, Stress Tolerance, Impulse Control, Happiness, and Optimism).

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Accept

Table 6.1. Subscale: Emotional Self-Awareness

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
Authoritative Father	.34469	.09832	10%	5.79783	.0204	.344693	Reject

Table 6.2. Subscale: Assertiveness

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
Authoritative Mother	.34790	.10011	10%	5.78359	.0207	.347904	Reject

Table 6.3. Subscale: Self-Regard

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
1. Authoritative Mother	.35382	.10485	10.5%	6.15352	.0171	.353822	Reject
2. Authoritarian Mother	.48207	.19584	20%	6.35759	.0039	-.32744	Reject

Table 6.4. Subscale: Self-Actualization

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
Authoritarian Mother	.34899	.10137	10%	5.96363	.0188	-.3490	Reject

Table 6.5. Subscale: Independence

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Accept

Table 6.6. Subscale: Empathy

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
1. Authoritative Mother	.41499	.15296	15.3%	8.94585	.0046	.414988	Reject
2. Authoritarian Mother	.53817	.25580	26%	8.56204	.0008	-.34269	Reject
3. Permissive Mother	.61244	.32936	33%	8.20287	.0002	.298683	Reject

Table 6.7. Subscale: Interpersonal Relationship

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
Authoritarian Father	.34623	.09941	10%	5.85687	.0198	-.3462	Reject

Table 6.8. Subscale: Social Responsibility

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Accept

Table 6.9. Subscale: Problem Solving

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
1. Authoritarian Mother	.43677	.17150	17%	9.90127	.0030	-.437	Reject
2. Permissive Father	.52780	.24338	24%	7.91598	.0012	-.298	Reject

Table 6.10. Subscale: Reality Testing

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
Authoritarian Father	.38551	.12882	13%	7.50626	.0089	-.3855	Reject

Table 6.11. Subscale: Flexibility

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Accept

Table 6.12. Subscale: Stress Tolerance

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
Authoritarian Mother	.50909	.24111	24%	14.3438	.0005	-.5091	Reject

Table 6.13. Subscale: Impulse Control

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
Authoritative Mother	.39459	.13606	13.6%	7.92963	.0073	.39458	Reject

Table 6.14. Subscale: Happiness

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
Authoritarian Mother	.32303	.08302	8.3%	4.89314	.0325	-.3230	Reject

Table 6.15. Subscale: Optimism

*Significant F=.050

Variable that enter	Multiple R	R ²	Variance accounted for	F Value	F Sig.	Beta	Decision for Ho.
1. Authoritarian Mother	.53691	.27002	27%	15.79588	.0003	-.5369	Reject
2. Authoritative Mother	.61510	.34562	35%	11.56350	.0001	.311152	Reject

Table 6.16. Emotional Quotient

*Significant F=.050

CONCLUSION

This study therefore concludes that the emotional Intelligence of AUP Indonesian student is influenced by the childrearing practices of their parents. Whether the influence would be negative or positive it depend on the style of parenting that is used by the parents. Other factors that also correlated are gender and socio-economic status. The fifteen area of emotional intelligence are also influenced by the childrearing practices except, the emotional self-awareness, empathy, stress tolerance, and problem solving.

REFERENCES

- Bar-On, Reuven, Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory EQ-i. (Technical Manual) New York: Multi-Health System, 1997
- Baumrind, Diana. The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Abuse. Journal of Early Adolescents.
- Baumrind, Diana. Reciprocal Rights and Responsibilities in Parentchild Relations. Dushkin: Guilford, Co., 1084
- Berks, Laura E. Child Development. Illinouis State University: A Division of Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1991
- Brisbane, Holly E. The Development Child. Illinois: Chas A Inc., 1980
- Brooks, Jane B. The Process of Parenting. USA: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1987.
- Burns, Roberta M. Child Family Communication. : Holt, Renchaart and Winston Inc., 1989.
- Cole, Michael. The Development of Children, 1989.
- Dumas, Lyne S. IQ vs EQ. Internet.
- Goleman, Daniel. Emotional Intelligence. USA: Scientific American, Inc., 1994.
- Goleman, Daniel. Working With Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books, 1998.

- Jaffe, Michael. Understanding of Parenting. Illinois: Winston Brown Publishers Co., 1989.
- Larawell, Marcia. Marriage and Families. West Publishing Company, 1986.
- Menninger, William C. Angelican Digest. Co., 1986.
- Myers, David G. Psychology. USA: Worth Publishers, Inc., 1995.
- Norton, Ron. Parenting. Michigan: Baker Book House and Co., 1984.
- Parke, Ross. Child Psychology. New York: Macgraw-Hill Inc., 1986.
- Santrok, John. Children. New York: Mac Milan Publishing, 1990.
- Schultz, Duane. Theories of Personality. California: Wadsworth, Inc., 1981.
- Winkley, Linda. Emotional Problems in Children and Young People. London: Cassel, 1996.
- Cooper, Robert and Sawaf, Ayman. What is Emotional Intelligence? [Document-on-line]. <http://www.search.com>.
- Emotions and Emotional Intelligence. [Research-on-line]. <http://www.search.com>.
- Huxley, Ron. The Four Styles of Parenting. [Document-on-line]. <http://www.parentingtoolbox.com> internet.
- Stein, Henry T. Phd. The Impact of Family Atmospheres on Children. [Document-on-line]. <http://www.search.com> internet.
- Stein, Henry T. Phd. The Impact of Family Atmospheres on Children. [Document-on-line]. <http://www.search.com> internet.
- Gottman, John Mordechai. Emotional Coaching. (Erick Document). Source: Parents (ISSN: 0195-0967) v 72. P 68-70. March 1997.