

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

---

# Parenting Styles and Resilience in Secondary Education Students

---

[Ana María Carroza-Pacheco](#)\*, [Carolina Bringas Molleda](#), [Benito León del Barco](#)

Posted Date: 26 September 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202509.2204.v1

Keywords: parenting styles; resilience; secondary education; students; internal resources; external resources



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

## Article

# Parenting Styles and Resilience in Secondary Education Students

Ana María Carroza-Pacheco <sup>1,\*</sup>, Carolina Bringas-Molleda <sup>2</sup> and Benito León-del-Barco <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centro Asociado UNED Mérida, National University of Distance Education, 06800 Mérida, Spain

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology and Anthropology, University of Extremadura, 10003 Cáceres, Spain

\* Correspondence: anacarroza@merida.uned.es

## Abstract

Parenting style plays a key role in adolescent development and well-being. This study set out to examine how different dimensions of perceived parenting styles influence resilience levels among a sample of 609 Spanish secondary school students aged 11 to 17. Data were collected using the School Resilience Scale (SRS) and the Parenting Style Assessment Scale (PSAS). Statistical analyses included Pearson correlations, multiple linear regression, and multinomial logistic regression. The results revealed that the dimensions of Affection and Communication, Revelation, and Humour were significantly and positively associated with both the internal and external resources dimensions of resilience. These dimensions also increased the probability of adolescents being classified in the high-resilience group. The findings highlight the importance of warm and emotionally expressive parenting practices in promoting adolescent resilience and suggest potential directions for school-based and family-focused intervention programs.

**Keywords:** parenting styles; resilience; secondary education; students; internal resources; external resources

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Parenting Styles

There are various external factors associated with the emergence of specific disorders during childhood and adolescence, but one of the most influential on children's behaviour is the parenting style. In this regard, parenting styles that rely on affection and involvement strategies promote adequate social adjustment in children and adolescents [1].

Traditionally, the concept of parenting styles has been linked to multiple terms and expressions such as child-rearing styles, educational patterns, parental styles, socialisation models, and upbringing models. All these aim to describe the regulatory dimensions that frame the educational and socialisation strategies exercised by parents over their children, which are in turn determined by numerous factors, such as the number and gender of children, their birth order, physical health and appearance, and the family's cultural and religious background [1].

It is also unquestionable that parents play a crucial role in the development of their children [2], and that parenting styles shape the psychological environment in which children will develop throughout the different stages of their growth. At the same time, they transmit a set of values and norms that facilitate their integration into the social group [3], and may even influence behavioural patterns adopted later in life, including during emerging adulthood [4] and adulthood itself, where responses are shaped by varying levels of self-confidence and psychological strength [5].

Moreover, research on parenting practices has shown that those based on dialogue and the promotion of autonomy have more positive effects, as they are associated with competences such as empathy, self-control, self-esteem, sociability, and reduced impulsivity [3]. In this line, [6] proposed that parenting style is a multidimensional concept and that, beyond the traditional types identified

by [7] based on the dimensions of Control and Affection, other relevant variables should also be considered. These include the dimensions of Affection and Communication, Promotion of Autonomy, Behavioural Control, Psychological Control, Revelation, and Humour. Thus, a good parenting style could be defined as one that integrates these dimensions (with the exception of Psychological Control), rather than belonging to one specific category within the known typologies [8].

In fact, one of the main challenges in researching parenting styles lies in the observation that parents do not usually adopt a single, clearly defined style. Parenting styles are not mutually exclusive; parents often display a predominant style while also incorporating specific practices from others. Moreover, the child's developmental stage, behaviour, and attitudes can also influence parental practices [9]. To this must be added the fact that children react to and perceive their parents' educational strategies in different ways, especially during adolescence, when changes in self-perception, perception of parents, and their relationship become more pronounced [10].

Among all the abilities that develop in a child depending on the parenting style to which they are exposed, resilience has drawn particular attention. Various studies confirm that family-related factors play a key role in child development: effective parenting supports the development of resilience and also has a direct mediating role in how children respond to situations such as puberty, illness, the loss of a loved one, or community violence [8].

### 1.2. Resilience

Resilience is commonly understood as a dynamic and evolving process that arises when individuals face stressful, challenging, or adverse situations, allowing them to adapt in a constructive manner [11–13]. The literature offers multiple perspectives on this concept: some scholars characterise it as a personal ability to manage hardship and maintain a productive life [14], whereas others emphasise its link to emotional intelligence, highlighting its role in safeguarding well-being in threatening contexts [15]. Despite its prominence in diverse academic fields, there is no universally accepted definition; nonetheless, the most widespread interpretation frames resilience as a multidimensional and dynamic process aimed at optimising personal resources and fostering positive adaptation in the face of adversity [16]. In any case, it is a multi-dimensional construct that encompasses a range of internal factors, protective elements, and empathy [17]. It varies according to context, time, age, sex, and cultural background, and is influenced by biological factors that interact and come into play at different moments to respond to situations perceived as risky [18].

Furthermore, in light of the difficulties that adolescents may face before consolidating themselves as functional human beings, resilience has been found to predict higher quality of life during this developmental stage. It may act as a determinant of academic performance [19], and as a moderating factor in the experience of cyberbullying victimisation and fatalism [20], thus contributing to student well-being in the face of both academic and social stress. In this context, it helps meet needs related to quality of life and provides support for adaptability to change across different settings, as a fundamental component of the effective management of emotional intelligence, both personally and socially [5].

Finally, several studies have identified resilience as the result of an interaction between risk and protective factors, contributing to positive adaptation, acting as a buffer against environmental difficulties, and preventing psychological maladjustment. In this way, it becomes a key factor in empowering adolescents from disadvantaged backgrounds [18].

### 1.3. Parenting Styles and Resilience

Although to date few studies have examined the relationship between parenting styles and resilience in adolescent populations [8,18], some research, such as that of [21], found that depending on the predominant parenting style, children tended to develop certain emotional skills over others. For example, it was observed that children with authoritarian mothers exhibited greater interpersonal abilities. Other studies mention parenting styles as potential predictors of psychological

and personality disorders [22], as well as their association with attachment and with individual responses to situations such as bullying, academic performance, or hyperactivity [23,24]. In the university context, parenting styles have also been linked to entrance exam anxiety and to psychological adjustment problems, such as depression and anxiety [5].

The findings reported by [8] indicate that parenting style is directly related to the resilience developed by adolescents, with Affection and Communication showing the strongest correlation, and Behavioural Control and Psychological Control displaying the weakest correlation with resilience. Similarly, the results of [18] confirm that parenting styles are indeed related to resilience, establishing a positive relationship between the two variables and highlighting a stronger correlation between resilience and the dimension of Responsibility and Warmth.

Other studies, such as that of [25], suggest that a style based on autonomy and parental support (understood as making an effort to adopt the child's perspective and encouraging them to set their own goals and solve problems independently) is positively associated with higher levels of resilience in children. These parents, who respect the internal psychological world of their children, promote the development of their identity. Parenting styles, therefore, may play a key role in how adolescents effectively self-regulate in the face of specific situations [18].

Finally, the results obtained by [9] highlight the relationship between parental involvement (an aspect related to the democratic parenting style) and higher levels of emotional intelligence in children. In contrast, rigid or inflexible disciplinary practices (characterised by excessive restrictions and punishments without room for negotiation or self-correction) can negatively affect the child's emotional development.

Building on the above literature and adopting a socio-educational perspective, the purpose of this work is to examine how the various dimensions of parenting styles influence the resilience levels of secondary school students. This age range is considered a critical period, given that it is during this stage that adolescents consolidate their identity and their ability to cope with personal, academic, and social adversities.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Participants

A multi-stage cluster sampling method was employed for participant selection. Initially, each of the 130 secondary education schools in the Extremadura region was assigned a numerical code. Three schools were then chosen at random using a computer-generated sequence. Within each selected school, there were four classes per academic year, from which two classes per grade were randomly drawn using the same procedure.

The final sample, determined with a 95% confidence level and a  $\pm 5$  margin of error, consisted of 609 students aged between 11 and 17 years ( $M = 13.43$ ,  $SD = 1.31$ ). The gender distribution was almost even, with 305 girls (50.1%) and 304 boys (49.9%). By year group, 160 students (26.3%) were in the first year, 140 (23.0%) in the second, 158 (25.9%) in the third, and 151 (24.8%) in the fourth.

### 2.2. Materials

The School Resilience Scale (SRS; [26]) has good internal consistency and is designed to assess resilience in children and adolescents aged 9 to 14 years. It consists of 27 self-administered items rated on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 5 ("Strongly agree").

The instrument comprises five dimensions:

- Identity–Self-Esteem Dimension (ISD): internal strengths and structural aspects of personality, such as identity, self-image, and self-assessment ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ;  $\Omega = 0.78$ ).
- Networks–Models Dimension (NMD): perceived support networks, social relationships, guidance, and goal perception ( $\alpha = 0.83$ ;  $\Omega = 0.84$ ).
- Learning–Generativity Dimension (LGD): expression, help-seeking, ability to face difficulties, and learning capacity ( $\alpha = 0.81$ ;  $\Omega = 0.82$ ).

- Internal Resources Dimension (IRD): personal resources mobilised in response to challenges ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ;  $\Omega = 0.84$ ).
- External Resources Dimension (ERD): interactional aspects with the environment that influence resilient behaviour ( $\alpha = 0.89$ ;  $\Omega = 0.89$ ).

For this study, the SRS showed high internal consistency, which is reflected in each of the dimensions. The total score yielded  $\alpha = 0.91$  and  $\Omega = 0.91$ .

A confirmatory factor analysis was carried out to verify whether the factor structure proposed by the original authors was reproduced in our data. As shown in Table 1, the fit indices approached recommended values, supporting the validity of the scale for this sample.

**Table 1.** Goodness-of-fit indices of the proposed model, School Resilience Scale (SRS).

Model	$\chi^2$	$\chi^2/df$	GFI	IFI	TLI	CFI	RMSR	RMSEA
3 related factors and 2 second-order factors	1058.976	3.664	0.989	0.900	0.864	0.888	0.056	0.060

Notes:  $\chi^2$  = chi-squared statistic;  $\chi^2/df$  = chi square divided by degrees of freedom; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; CFI = comparative goodness-of-fit index; RMSR = root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square residual of approximation.

Parenting Style Assessment Scale (PSAS; [27]) also has a good internal consistency, and is designed to evaluate dimensions of parenting styles as perceived by adolescents from age 12 onwards. It comprises 41 self-administered items rated on a 6-point Likert scale, from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 6 (“Strongly agree”), with total scores ranging between 41 and 246.

The scale includes six dimensions:

- Affection and Communication (PAC): Expression of parental support and affection, availability, and ease of communication (Cronbach’s  $\alpha = 0.88$ ; McDonald’s  $\Omega = 0.89$ ).
- Behavioural Control (PBC): Setting limits and parental monitoring of children’s behaviour outside the home ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ;  $\Omega = 0.78$ ).
- Psychological Control (PPC): Use of manipulative strategies such as emotional blackmail or guilt induction; considered a negative dimension ( $\alpha = 0.86$ ;  $\Omega = 0.86$ ).
- Promotion of Autonomy (PPA): Encouragement of independent thought and decision-making ( $\alpha = 0.86$ ;  $\Omega = 0.86$ ).
- Humour (PHM): Perception of parents as optimistic and possessing a good sense of humour ( $\alpha = 0.90$ ;  $\Omega = 0.90$ ).
- Revelation (PRV): Frequency with which adolescents voluntarily share personal matters with their parents ( $\alpha = 0.82$ ;  $\Omega = 0.82$ ).

For this study, the PSAS showed high internal consistency, which is reflected in each of the dimensions. The total score showed good internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.87$ ;  $\Omega = 0.85$ ).

Finally, in order to verify whether the structure proposed by the authors of the Parenting Style Assessment Scale is supported by our data, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis using fit indices (see Table 2). As can be seen, the indices are close to the desired values, indicating validity for the generalisation of our results.



**Table 2.** Goodness-of-fit indices of the proposed model, Parenting Style Assessment Scale for Adolescents (PSAS).

Model	$\chi^2$	$\chi^2/df$	GFI	IFI	TLI	CFI	RMSR	RMSEA
6 related factors	2065.74	2.703	0.971	0.900	0.900	0.900	0.052	0.053

Notes:  $\chi^2$  = chi-squared statistic;  $\chi^2/df$  = chi square divided by degrees of freedom; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; CFI = comparative goodness-of-fit index; RMSR = root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square residual of approximation.

2.3. Procedure

Data collection took place on dates previously agreed with the school principals and tutors, within the classrooms corresponding to each course and participant group, utilising the tutoring hours scheduled in the school calendar. Each session lasted approximately one hour, during which the test and its completion instructions were presented, emphasising the importance of answering all items honestly and thoroughly.

Prior to the main data collection, a pilot test was conducted with secondary education students aged 11 to 16 to estimate the average time required to complete the test and to ensure the clarity of item wording appropriate to their comprehension levels. The pilot results indicated that all participants required less than 25 minutes to complete the test, and any doubts regarding the statements were minimal and readily clarified by the researcher and her team.

Participation was voluntary and unpaid, with prior informed consent obtained from parents or legal guardians, as well as approval from the school principals.

Despite clear instructions at the start of each session and upon submission of completed booklets, some booklets contained unanswered items. Following standardised procedures, booklets with 10% or more unanswered items were excluded from the analysis. For booklets with fewer unanswered items, mean imputation based on the sample was applied.

2.4. Data Analysis

Initially, reliability analyses (Cronbach’s alpha and McDonald’s omega) and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for both the Parenting Style Assessment Scale (PSAS) and the School Resilience Scale (SRS), to verify whether the conceptual structures originally described were adequately supported by our data.

This study represents the second part of a broader investigation previously published [19], which examined the relationship between resilience and academic performance in the same sample. The present study focuses specifically on how parenting style dimensions relate to resilience. This connection is highlighted to aid readers in understanding the relationship between both studies.

Subsequently, three statistical analyses were carried out:

- (1) Pearson’s correlation coefficients were computed to explore associations between the study variables.
- (2) Multiple linear regression analyses were performed to identify which PSAS dimensions significantly predicted students’ resilience levels. The dependent variables were the Internal Resources (IRD) and External Resources (ERD) dimensions of the SRS. Predictor variables included the six PSAS dimensions: Affection and Communication (PAC), Behavioural Control (PBC), Psychological Control (PPC), Promotion of Autonomy (PPA), Humour (PHM), and Revelation (PRV). Assumptions of normality, independence, and collinearity were checked prior to analyses.
- (3) To complement the multiple regression results and to better understand the predictors’ influence on the likelihood of belonging to low, medium, or high resilience groups, multinomial logistic regression analyses were conducted. The dependent variables, IRD and ERD, were categorised into three levels based on percentiles: low (< 33%), medium (33–66%), and high (> 66%). The six

PSAS dimensions were included again as predictor variables, allowing for estimation of odds ratios and classification probabilities.

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 21.0 for Windows and Free JASP. The present study shares with our previous work [19] the use of the School Resilience Scale (SRS), the same participant sample and sampling procedure, and some elements of the statistical analysis, while addressing a distinct research question and incorporating additional variables not examined in the earlier study.

3. Results

Initially, the potential relationship between the different dimensions of parenting styles and the scores obtained on the School Resilience Scale (SRS) was examined. To this end, Pearson’s bivariate correlations were calculated between the six dimensions of the Parenting Style Assessment Scale (PSAS) and the two resilience dimensions: Internal Resources and External Resources. The results showed positive and significant correlations in all cases ( $p < .001$ ), with particularly strong associations observed between PAC and IRD ( $r = 0.519$ ), as well as between PAC and ERD ( $r = 0.641$ ). Moderate correlations were also found between PPA and IRD ( $r = 0.442$ ), and between PRV and ERD ( $r = 0.502$ ), suggesting that certain parenting style dimensions are meaningfully associated with the development of resilience in adolescents (see Table 3).

**Table 3.** Pearson correlations between the dimensions of parenting styles (PSAS) and the dimensions of resilience.

	IRD (Internal Resources)	ERD (External Resources)
PAC (Affection and Communication)	.519*	.641*
PPA (Promotion of Autonomy)	.442*	.519*
PBC (Behavioural Control)	.161*	.162*
PPC (Psychological Control)	-.261*	-.365*
PRV (Revelation)	.487*	.502*
PHM (Humour)	.465*	.580*

\*  $p < .001$ .

Once the existence of significant associations among the variables had been established, multiple linear regression analyses were performed to determine the extent to which the PSAS dimensions predicted resilience. Two regression models were computed: one for the Internal Resources (IRD) dimension and another for the External Resources (ERD) dimension. Both models were significant, explaining 31.7% and 44.3% of the variance, respectively. Table 4 presents the standardised beta coefficients ( $\beta$ ), significance values, and collinearity statistics. In the case of IRD, the most relevant predictors were PAC ( $\beta = 0.265$ ,  $p < .001$ ), PRV ( $\beta = 0.250$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and PPA ( $\beta = 0.104$ ,  $p = .043$ ). For the ERD dimension, the strongest predictors were PAC ( $\beta = 0.395$ ,  $p < .001$ ), PHM ( $\beta = 0.147$ ,  $p = .004$ ), and PRV ( $\beta = 0.141$ ,  $p = .001$ ).

**Table 4.** Results of multiple linear regression models to predict resilience dimensions from parental educational styles.

Predictor Variable			$\beta$ (IRD)	$p$ (IRD)	$\beta$ (ERD)	$p$ (ERD)	Tolerance	VIF
PAC	(Affection and Communication)	and	.265	< .001	.395	< .001	.332	3.010
			.104	.043	.081	.083	.423	2.365

PPA (Promotion of Autonomy)	-.061	.117	-.059	.092	.751	1.331
PBC (Behavioural Control)	.042	.324	-.017	.656	.621	1.611
PPC (Psychological Control)	.250	< .001	.141	.001	.541	1.848
PRV (Revelation)	.084	.139	.147	.004	.349	2.863
PHM (Humour)						

Notes: IRD = Internal Resources Dimension; ERD = External Resources Dimension;  $\beta$  = standardised coefficient Beta; VIF = Variance Inflation Factor. All models were significant: IRD (adjusted  $R^2 = 0.317$ ,  $p < .001$ ); ERD (adjusted  $R^2 = 0.443$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Overall, the results show that certain parenting style dimensions are significantly associated with resilience among the participating adolescents. In particular, Affection and Communication (PAC) emerged as the most consistent predictor of both resilience dimensions—internal and external. Revelation (PRV) was also significantly related to both dimensions, while Promotion of Autonomy (PPA) and Humour (PHM) showed more specific effects on only one of them. In contrast, Psychological Control (PPC) and Behavioural Control (PBC) did not show significant associations in the regression models, suggesting that their influence on resilience may be limited or mediated by other contextual variables.

Finally, the multinomial regression analysis for the predictor variable Internal Resources (IRD) showed a satisfactory fit ( $\chi^2 = 159.914(12)$ ,  $p < .001$ ; Nagelkerke  $R^2 = 0.398$ ), correctly classifying 76.1% of cases. As shown in Table 5, with the low-IRD level as the reference category, the parameter estimates revealed that three factors were significantly and positively associated with the high-IRD group: Affection and Communication ( $B = 0.107$ ,  $p < .001$ ); Revelation ( $B = 0.116$ ,  $p < .001$ ); and Humour ( $B = 0.067$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Furthermore, the odds ratio estimates indicated that the probability of belonging to the high-IRD group was 1.113 times greater among adolescents who reported a parenting style based on Affection and Communication; 1.123 times greater for those who described a style characterised by Revelation; and 1.069 times greater for those reporting a style based on Humour.

For the predictor variable External Resources (ERD), the multinomial regression analysis showed a satisfactory fit ( $\chi^2 = 250.739(12)$ ,  $p < .001$ ; Nagelkerke  $R^2 = 0.561$ ), correctly classifying 83.4% of cases. The model, using the low-ERD group as the reference category, showed that the same factors previously identified as related to high Internal Resources were also significantly and positively associated with high External Resources: Affection and Communication ( $B = 0.193$ ,  $p < .001$ ), Revelation ( $B = 0.066$ ,  $p < .05$ ), and Humour ( $B = 0.110$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Similarly, the odds ratio estimates indicated that the probability of being in the high-ERD group was 1.213 times greater among students with a parenting style based on Affection and Communication, 1.069 times greater among those with a Revelation-based style, and 1.116 times greater among those who reported a parenting style characterised by Humour (see Table 5).

**Table 5.** Results of multinomial logistic regression analysis for the prediction of Internal Resources (IRD) and External Resources (ERD) levels.

	High Level Internal Resources <sup>1</sup>				High Level External Resources <sup>2</sup>			
	B	OR	IC 95%		B	OR	IC 95%	
PAC	.107**	1.113	1.047	1.184	.193**	1.213	1.129	1.303
PPA	.021	1.021	.978	1.066	.032	1.032	.985	1.082
PBC	-.034	.967	.925	1.011	-.029	.972	.926	1.019



PPC	.018	1.018	.986	1.051	-.003	.997	.964	1.032
PRV	.116**	1.123	1.064	1.184	.066*	1.069	1.009	1.132
PHM	.067*	1.069	1.001	1.141	.110**	1.116	1.039	1.200

Notes: PAC = Affect and Communication; PPA = Autonomy Promotion; PBC = Behavioural Control; PPC = Psychological Control; PRV = Revelation; and PHM = Humour. Reference categories: <sup>1</sup> Low Internal Resources (IRD); <sup>2</sup> Low External Resources (ERD); \*\**p* < .001 \**p* < .05.

4. Discussion

The present study aimed to analyse the relationship between adolescents’ perceived parenting styles and their levels of resilience, adopting a multidimensional approach that considers both internal and external adaptive factors. Based on the idea that parental practices play a decisive role in emotional and social development during adolescence, the study sought to identify which specific dimensions of parenting style act as significant predictors of resilience. The results contribute to a better understanding of the family-related factors that promote positive coping in the face of adversity, providing relevant information for the design of socio-educational interventions aimed at strengthening the family environment as a protective context.

The findings of this study provide empirical evidence of the relationship between adolescents’ perceived parenting styles and their levels of resilience. Although all parenting styles were significantly correlated with both internal and external resources of resilience, the style based on affection and communication (PAC) emerged as the strongest and most consistent predictor of both dimensions. According to [28], this type of warm and stable family interaction is a key source of psychological protection for young people, as it reinforces both emotional security and coping capacity. This relationship becomes particularly relevant when considering that an affectionate and communicative parenting style is not only associated with higher levels of resilience, but also significantly increases the likelihood that adolescents will develop both internal and external resources. This suggests that when parents provide a context of emotional closeness, active listening, and affective validation, adolescents feel more secure, confident, and capable of coping with the challenges of this developmental stage, while also establishing supportive bonds with their environment [8].

Other dimensions, such as Promotion of Autonomy (PPA), Revelation (PRV), and Humour (PHM), also showed significant associations, particularly in relation to the external resources dimension of resilience. In line with the findings of [29], the opportunity to share emotions and thoughts with parents (PRV), as well as the presence of a relaxed and humorous family environment (PHM), appear to facilitate access to support networks and enhance adolescents’ perception of social competence, which contributes to greater external resilience. However, in our study, although Promotion of Autonomy did not emerge as a predictor of the external resources dimension, it did predict internal resources. In contrast, Revelation and Humour were not only significantly associated with resilience scores, but also acted as relevant predictors in the regression models and were linked to a greater likelihood of adolescents being classified in the high-resilience group. These findings reinforce the idea that the emotional context in which adolescents develop not only buffers them against adverse situations, but also actively enhances their personal and social capabilities.

In contrast, Behavioural Control (PBC) and Psychological Control (PPC) did not show significant effects as predictors of resilience levels. While some degree of control has been noted to play a structuring role during childhood, our results suggest that, during adolescence, parenting styles centred on monitoring or imposition (especially when perceived as intrusive or restrictive) do not directly contribute to the strengthening of resilience, at least from the adolescents’ own perspective [23]. Moreover, recent studies have indicated that parental psychological control may have detrimental effects on adolescents’ emotional and social adjustment, and that resilience may function as a moderating or mediating variable in this relationship [30,31].

The findings of this study have relevant implications for both the educational and family contexts. The evidence supports the importance of fostering parenting styles based on affection, communication, and autonomy, as these appear to significantly contribute to the development of adolescent resilience [6,28]. In this regard, we agree with [29] that parent training programmes could incorporate components aimed at improving emotional expression, the use of humour in family life, and mutual trust between parents and children, as means to enhance young people's psychosocial adjustment. Furthermore, in the school context, understanding these factors may be useful for designing preventive and well-being promotion interventions that take family dynamics into account.

### *Limitations*

As with any research, certain limitations should be acknowledged. The most important relates to the use of self-reports as the sole method of data collection. The assessment of parenting styles and resilience relied exclusively on students' subjective perceptions, which may be affected by contextual or momentary factors. Another limitation concerns the cross-sectional design, which precludes establishing causal or developmental relationships between the variables analysed. Following the recommendations of [32], it would be valuable—albeit an ambitious undertaking—to incorporate longitudinal designs in future research, enabling the observation of these relationships over time and the establishment of more robust causal links.

In addition, although cluster sampling was used (by classroom), multilevel modelling techniques were not applied, as no classroom-level or contextual variables were collected. All measures were individual, and a runs test indicated that the assumption of independence between observations was not violated ( $p = .10$ ). Nevertheless, the possibility of unobserved group-level effects cannot be ruled out, and future research is encouraged to consider multilevel approaches when appropriate hierarchical variables are available, to avoid potential overestimation of effects.

Finally, the cultural context in which this study was carried out—Spanish secondary education—should be borne in mind when interpreting the findings. Educational practices, the conceptualisation of resilience, and family expectations may vary considerably between countries and school systems. Consequently, the generalisation of these results to other populations should be made with caution, and replication in diverse cultural and educational settings is recommended to validate the external applicability of the conclusions.

## **5. Conclusions**

This study examined the relationship between the dimensions of parenting styles as perceived by adolescents and their levels of resilience within the context of secondary education. Regression analyses revealed that certain parenting style dimensions (such as Affection and Communication, Revelation, and Humour) were significantly associated with both internal and external resilience factors, with Affection and Communication emerging as the strongest predictor. These findings offer a clear picture of the parenting styles that support the development of resilience-related competencies, which may inform the design of interventions aimed at strengthening adolescents' psychological well-being.

Taken together, these results (consistent with recent studies) underscore the importance of promoting parenting styles based on warmth, respect, and autonomy as a means of enhancing young people's coping capacity in the face of personal, social, and academic challenges. The growing focus on resilience as an educational goal reinforces the need to integrate this perspective into both family training and school intervention policies.

Finally, future research could further explore the mediating or moderating role of variables such as self-esteem, school support, or peer relationships, as well as investigate differences based on gender, age, or sociocultural context.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualisation, A.M.C.-P., C.B.M. and B.L.-d.-B.; methodology, B.L.-d.-B.; validation, A.M.C.-P., C.B.M. and B.L.-d.-B.; formal analysis, B.L.-d.-B.; investigation, A.M.C.-P. and B.L.-d.-B.; resources, A.M.C.-P.; writing—original draft preparation, A.M.C.-P.; writing—review and editing, A.M.C.-P., C.B.M. and B.L.-d.-B.; supervision, C.B.M. and B.L.-d.-B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This work has been fully supported by the corresponding author. No external funding was received.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Given the characteristics and non-interventional design of the study, the topics investigated (parenting styles and resilience), and the provisions of the Regulations of the Bioethics and Biosafety Committee of the University of Extremadura (approved by the Governing Council on 21 March 2023), it was determined that review and approval by said Committee was not necessary, since the research did not involve clinical experimentation methods with humans and was based on anonymous, collective, and non-identifiable data.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due to ethical and legal restrictions related to the confidentiality of participant information. Access to the data is therefore limited in order to protect the privacy of the individuals involved.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## References

1. Martín, N.; Cueli, M.; Cañamero, L.M.; González-Castro, P. ¿Qué sabemos sobre los estilos educativos parentales y los trastornos en la infancia y adolescencia? Una revisión de la literatura. *R. Psicol. Educ.* **2022**, *17*, 44-53. <https://doi.org/10.23923/rpye2022.01.215>
2. Mendo-Lázaro, S.; León-del-Barco, B.; Polo-del-Río, M.I.; Yuste-Tosina, R.; López-Ramos, V.M. The role of parental acceptance–rejection in emotional instability during adolescence. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2019**, *16*, 1194-1207. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16071194>
3. Juárez, J.F.; Frago, R. Prácticas parentales e inteligencia emocional en estudiantes de Secundaria. Un estudio correlacional. *IJODEP INFAD* **2019**, *2*, 93-106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17060/ijodaep.2019.n2.v1.1371>
4. Axpe, I.; Fernández-Zabala, A.; Goñi, E.; Ramos-Díaz, E. La percepción de la socialización paterna y materna sobre la resiliencia de adolescentes. *An. Psicol.* **2023**, *39*, 425-434. <https://dx.doi.org/10.6018/analesps.477231>
5. Córdova, L.A.; Becerra, S.N.; Chávez, A.; Ortiz, N.G.; Franco, J.M. Factores de los estilos de crianza parental como mediadores en la relación entre la resiliencia y calidad de vida en universitarios. *Rev. Investig. Psicol.* **2022**, *25*, 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.15381/rinvp.v25i1.22015>
6. Oliva, A.; Parra, Á.; Arranz, E. Estilos relacionales parentales y ajuste adolescente. *Infanc. Aprendiz.* **2008**, *31*, 93-106. <https://doi.org/10.1174/021037008783487093>
7. Baumrind, D. The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *J. Early Adolesc.* **1991**, *11*, 56-59.
8. Díaz, M.; Melgar, C.; Marquina, E.; Isasa, P. Estilo parental y resiliencia en adolescentes de educación superior. *Perspect. Fam.* **2017**, *2*, 63-76.
9. Carrillo, A.; Estévez, C.; Gómez-Medina, M.D. ¿Influyen las prácticas educativas en el desarrollo de la inteligencia emocional de sus hijos? *IJODEP INFAD* **2018**, *1*, 203-212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17060/ijodaep.2018.n1.v1.1190>
10. Abellán, L. Relación entre modelos educativos parentales y problemas de conducta en estudiantes. *IE Rev. Investig. Educ. REDIECH* **2021**, *12*, 1-14. [https://doi.org/10.33010/ie\\_rie\\_rediech.v12i0.1120](https://doi.org/10.33010/ie_rie_rediech.v12i0.1120)
11. Frias, C.E.; Cuzco, C.; Martín, C.F.; Pérez-Ortega, S.; Triviño-López, J.A.; Lombraña, M. Resilience and emotional support in health care professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J. Psychosoc. Nurs. Ment. Health Serv.* **2020**, *58*, 5-6. <https://doi.org/10.3928/02793695-20200506-02>

12. Haktanir, A.; Watson, J.C.; Ermis-Demirtas, H.; Karaman, M.A.; Freeman, P.D.; Kuraman, A.; Streeter, A. Resilience, academic self-concept, and college adjustment among first-year students. *J. Coll. Stud. R: R. T. & P.* **2021**, *23*, 161-178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025118810666>
13. Rosales, N. Análisis de la integración del concepto resiliencia en la planeación de la Ciudad de México. *EST* **2023**, *23*, 131-158. <https://doi.org/10.22136/est20232021>
14. Oducado, R.M.; Parreño-Lachica, G.; Rabacal, J. Personal resilience and its influence on COVID-19 stress, anxiety and fear among graduate students in the Philippines. *IJERI* **2021**, *15*, 431-443. <https://doi.org/10.46661/ijeri.5484>
15. Waugh, C.E.; Sali, A.W. Resilience as the ability to maintain well-being: An allostatic active inference model. *J. Intell.* **2023**, *11*, 15874. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence11080158>
16. Kotliarenco, M.A. *Resiliencia y su Importancia en la Educación del Grupo Familiar, fundamentalmente la Madre, y en el Crecimiento y Desarrollo de los Niños y Niñas*. CEANIM: Santiago, Chile, 2021.
17. González-Arratia, N.I. Resiliencia y personalidad en niños y adolescentes. In *Cómo Desarrollarse en Tiempos de Crisis*, 2nd ed.; Eón. Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México: México D.F., México, 2016.
18. Fuentes, C.; Saavedra, E. Resiliencia y estilos parentales en adolescentes que practican arte en un liceo municipal de Talca. *Int. Acad. Psicol.* **2021**, *9*, 48-60.
19. Carroza-Pacheco, A.M.; León-del-Barco, B.; Bringas, C. Academic performance and resilience in secondary education students. *J. Intell.* **2025**, *13*, 56. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence13050056>
20. Lozano, M.E.M.; Aranzábal, D.F.C. Clima social familiar y resiliencia en estudiantes de 3º, 4º y 5º año de secundaria. *Apunt. Univ.* **2019**, *9*, 73-82. <https://doi.org/10.17162/au.v9i2.361>
21. Ramírez-Lucas, A.; Ferrando, M.; Sainz, A. ¿Influyen los estilos parentales y la inteligencia emocional de los padres en el desarrollo emocional de sus hijos escolarizados en 2º ciclo de educación infantil? *Acción Psicol.* **2015**, *12*, 65-78. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5944/ap.12.1.14314>
22. González, R.; Custodio, J. Estilos parentales y sintomatología psicológica en estudiantes universitarios de Mar del Plata. In *XI Congreso Internacional de Investigación y Práctica Profesional en Psicología. XXVI Jornadas de Investigación. XV Encuentro de Investigadores en Psicología del MERCOSUR. I Encuentro de Investigación de Terapia Ocupacional. I Encuentro de Musicoterapia*. Facultad de Psicología de la Universidad de Buenos Aires: Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2019. <https://www.aacademica.org/000-111/687>
23. Gómez-Ortiz, O.; Del Rey, R.; Romera, E.M.; Ortega-Ruiz, R. Los estilos educativos paternos y maternos en la adolescencia y su relación con la resiliencia, el apego y la implicación en acoso escolar. *An. Psicol.* **2015**, *31*, 979-989. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.31.3.180791>
24. Molina, M.F. Perceived parenting style and self-perception in children with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Int. J. Psychol. Res.* **2015**, *8*, 61-74. <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/ijpr/v8n1/v8n1a06.pdf>
25. Crocetti, E.; Moscatelli, S.; Kaniushonytė, G.; Branje, S.; Žukauskienė, R.; Rubini, M. Adolescents' self-perception of morality, competence, and sociability and their interplay with quality of family, friend, and school relationships: A three-wave longitudinal study. *J. Youth Adolesc.* **2018**, *47*, 1743-1754. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0864-z>
26. Saavedra, E.; Castro, A. *Escala de Resiliencia Escolar (E.R.E.) para Niños entre 9 y 14 Años*. CEANIM: Santiago, Chile, 2009.
27. Oliva, A.; Parra, Á.; Sánchez-Queija, I.; López, F. Escala para la evaluación del estilo parental. In *Instrumentos para la Evaluación de la Salud Mental y el Desarrollo Positivo Adolescente y los Activos que lo Promueven*; Oliva, A., Antolín, L., Pertegal, M., Ríos, M., Parra, Á., Hernando, A., Reina, M.D., Eds.; Consejería de Salud: Seville, Spain, 2007; pp. 219-234.
28. Masten, A.S. Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Develop.* **2014**, *85*, 6-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12205>
29. Ruiz-Robledillo, N.; De Andrés-García, S.; Pérez-Blasco, J.; González-Bono, E.; Moya-Albiol, L. Highly resilient coping entails better perceived health, high social support and low morning cortisol levels in parents of children with autism spectrum disorder. *Res. Dev. Disabil.* **2014**, *35*, 686-695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2013.12.007>
30. Li, Q.; Liu, Z. Parental psychological control and adolescent smartphone addiction: Roles of reactance and resilience. *BMC Psychol.* **2025**, *13*, 139. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02477-7>

31. Song, C.; Ge, S.; Zhang, W. The impact of parental psychological control on adolescents' physical activity: The mediating role of self-control and the moderating role of psychological capital. *Front. Psychol.* **2025**, *16*, 1501720. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1501720>
32. González-Cámara, M.; Osorio, A.; Reparaz, C. Measurement and function of the control dimension in parenting styles: A systematic review. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2019**, *16*, 3157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16173157>

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.