

# The Impact of Parental Rearing Pattern on Suicidal Attitude Among Junior High School Students

Hou Yongmei<sup>1\*</sup>, Wan Ling

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, School of Humanities and Management, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan, Guangdong, China;

\* Corresponding author: Hou Yongmei,

**Abstract: Objective:** To explore the status of parental rearing style and suicide attitude among junior high school students, and analyze the relationship between the above two variables. **Methods:** Stratified cluster sampling was used to select 343 junior high school students. They were investigated with Egma Minnen AV Bardndosnauppforstran (EMBU), and Questionnaire of Suicide Attitude (QSA). **Results:** First, A1 in this group was at a high level, 6 dimensions like F1, F3, M1, M2, A2, and A4 were at a moderate level, and the other 8 dimensions including F2, F4, F5, F6, M3, M4, M5, and A3 were at a low level. Second, A1 is positively predicted by F1 and M1 ( $\beta=.192, .195$ , all  $P<.05$ ), and negatively predicted by six factors including F2, F4, F5, M3, M4, and M5 ( $\beta=-.126\sim-.244$ , all  $P<.05$ ). A3 is positively predicted by the following six factors, including F2, F3, F5, F6, M3, and M4 ( $\beta=.113\sim.233$ , all  $P<.001$ ), and negatively predicted by the following 2 factors such as F1 and M1 ( $\beta=-.091, -.115$ , all  $P<.05$ ). A4 is negatively predicted by the following 3 factors like F6, M3 and M4 ( $\beta=-.139, -.097, -.107$ , all  $P<.05$ ). **Conclusion:** The suicide attitude of junior high school students is vague, contradictory, and unstable, and the parenting style may be one of the important influencing factors of their suicide attitude.

**Keywords:** Junior high school students, Parental rearing pattern, Suicide attitude

Suicide refers to the act of voluntarily ending one's own life. Teenage suicide is a dangerous behavior that endangers their physical and mental health, causing huge losses to families and society. The situation of adolescent suicide is becoming more and more severe. In 2014, the World Health Organization's first report on suicide prevention stated that suicide is the second leading cause of death among adolescents aged 15-29 worldwide [1]. The domestic situation is neither optimistic. Zhu Qi et al. [2] found that the incidence of suicidal ideation among middle school students is about 25%. Chen Shanshan et al. [3] found that the incidence of suicidal ideation among middle school students is about 28.3%, with the incidence of suicidal behavior of 4% to 32% [4]. The 2018 edition of the China Health Statistics Yearbook shows that the suicide mortality rate (1/100000) among Chinese adolescents aged 10-14 in 2017 was 0.96 in urban areas and 0.94 in rural areas, close to 1 in 100000 [5].

Suicide attitude is an important influencing factor for adolescent suicidal ideation and behavior. Previous studies [6-11] have shown that the more negative and repulsive attitudes towards suicidal behavior, suicide

victims, and euthanasia are, the lower the risk of suicidal ideation; On the contrary, the higher.

Parental rearing style is a combination of parenting concepts, behaviors, and emotional expressions towards children formed by parents during the parenting process [12]. Parental upbringing is a general and frequent practice and characteristic of parents in the discipline and upbringing of their children, which is stable and not easily changing with the environment. It reflects the essence of parent-child interaction [12]. Parental upbringing is an important risk factor for suicide behavior among junior high school students (OR=1.983) [13], and 50% of adolescents commit suicide due to poor parenting styles [14]. However, there have been few studies, especially in the past five years, on the impact of parental upbringing on suicide attitudes among junior high students at home.

Based on the above analysis, this article intends to explore the relationship between parental rearing styles and suicide attitudes of middle school students, in order to provide reference opinions for the mental health education of adolescents.

## I. Objects and Methods

### 1.1 Objects

A stratified cluster sampling is used to select 365 students from 6 classes of ordinary middle schools in Dongguan, with two classes in each grade. Three hundred and forty-three valid questionnaires are collected, with an effective rate of 94.0%. Among them, there are 177 males and 166 females; 114 students in Grade 1, 115 students in Grade 2, and 114 in Grade 3. The age range is 12 to 16 years old, with an average of (14.58 ± 1.03) years old.

### 1.2 Tools

#### 1.2.1 Egma Minnen AV Bardndosnauppforstran, EMBU

Compiled by Perris et al. (1980) [15], and revised by Yue Dongmei et al (1999) [16] into Chinese version [16]. EMBU is divided into father subscale and mother subscale. The father's subscale consists of 58 items, divided into six factors including emotional warmth and understanding (F1), punishment and severity (F2), inordinate interference (F3), preference for subject (F4), rejection and denial (F5), and overprotection (F6); The Mother's subscale consists of 57 items, divided into 5 factors: emotional warmth and understanding (M1), excessive interference and protection (M2), refusal and denial (M3), punishment and severity (M4), and preference for subject (M5). Likert 4-point scoring method is used to score from 1 to 4 points corresponding to "never" to "always". The higher the score, the more obvious the tendency of the subject on that item or factor. In this study, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient of the total scale 0.793, and Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficients of 11 factors are 0.662 to 0.746.

#### 1.2.2 Questionnaire of Suicide Attitude, QSA

Compiled by Xiao Shuiyuan et al. (1999) [16], with 29 items divided into 4 dimensions: understanding the nature of suicidal behavior (A1), attitude towards suicides (A2), attitude towards the family members of suicide victims (A3), and attitude towards euthanasia (A4). Likert 4-point scoring method is used to score from 1 to 4 points corresponding to "completely agree" to "completely disagree". The higher the score, the less obvious the tendency of the subject on that item or factor. Taking 2.5 and 3.5 as two dividing points, suicidal attitudes are divided into three situations. A certain item or dimension with an average score of  $\leq 2.5$  indicates an attitude of affirmation, recognition, understanding, and tolerance towards suicide. A certain item or dimension with an average score of  $>2.5$  and  $<3.5$  indicates an attitude of contradiction or neutrality. A certain item or dimension with an average score of  $\geq 3.5$  indicates an attitude of opposition, negation, exclusion, and discrimination

towards suicide. In this study, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient of the total scale is 0.867, and Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficients of four dimensions are 0.735 to 0.805.

### 1.3 Data processing

SPSS 20.0 is used for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics is used to calculate the average score and standard deviation of each scale; Pearson product moment correlation is used to explore the correlation between variables; Linear stepwise regression analysis is used to analyze the impact of parental rearing style on attitude towards suicide.

## II. Results

### 2.1 An overview of the parental rearing styles and suicide attitudes of junior high school students

From Table 1, it can be seen that A1 in this group is at a high level, with 6 dimensions including F1, F3, M1, M2, A2, and A4 having a moderate level, and 8 dimensions including F2, F4, F5, F6, M3, M4, M5, and A3 having a low level.

TABLE I: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SCORES OF EMBU AND SAQ (N=343)

Dimension	Number of items	X $\pm$ s (Dimension)	Min	Max	X $\pm$ s (item)
F1 Emotional warmth	19	48.51 $\pm$ 10.31	22.00	73.00	2.55 $\pm$ 0.57
F2 Punishment and severity	12	19.22 $\pm$ 6.12	12.00	37.00	1.60 $\pm$ 0.53
F3 Inordinate interference	10	20.56 $\pm$ 4.50	11.00	35.00	2.56 $\pm$ 0.48
F4 preference for subject	5	8.69 $\pm$ 3.85	5.00	18.00	1.74 $\pm$ 0.79
F5 Rejection and denial	6	10.07 $\pm$ 3.41	6.00	21.00	1.68 $\pm$ 0.59
F6 Overprotection	6	10.99 $\pm$ 2.75	6.00	20.00	1.83 $\pm$ 0.49
M1 Emotional warmth	19	51.20 $\pm$ 11.53	23.00	74.00	2.69 $\pm$ 0.64
M2 Inordinate interference	16	35.29 $\pm$ 7.41	18.00	58.00	2.23 $\pm$ 0.48
M3 Rejection and denial	8	13.92 $\pm$ 4.92	8.00	28.00	1.74 $\pm$ 0.63
M4 Punishment and severity	9	13.70 $\pm$ 4.95	9.00	30.00	1.52 $\pm$ 0.57
M5 preference for subject	5	8.67 $\pm$ 3.76	5.00	17.00	1.73 $\pm$ 0.78
A1 Understanding the nature of suicide behavior	9	32.13 $\pm$ 5.63	19.00	43.00	3.57 $\pm$ 0.65
A2 Attitude to suicide victims	10	25.62 $\pm$ 5.18	12.00	42.00	2.56 $\pm$ 0.54
A3 Attitude to families of suicides	6	14.04 $\pm$ 3.02	6.00	23.00	2.34 $\pm$ 0.52
A4 Attitude to authanasia	4	13.05 $\pm$ 3.26	5.00	20.00	3.26 $\pm$ 0.86

## 2.2 Frequency statistics

Further frequency statistics shows that 40.2% of junior high school students hold a contradictory or neutral, 54.8% hold a negative or discriminatory, and 5.0% hold a positive or understanding attitude towards the nature of suicide behavior (A1); 46.6% hold a contradictory or neutral, 48.7% hold a positive or understanding, and 4.7% hold a negative or discriminatory attitude towards suicide victims (A2); 32.1% hold a contradictory or neutral, 65.9% hold a positive or understanding, and 2.0% hold a negative or discriminatory attitude towards suicidal family members (A3); 39.4% hold a contradictory or neutral, 39.9% hold a negative or discriminatory, and 20.7% hold a positive or understanding attitude towards euthanasia (A4).

## 2.3 The influence of parental rearing styles on the attitudes towards suicide among junior high school students

### 2.3.1 A correlation analysis between parental parenting styles and suicidal attitudes

According to Table 2, The score of A1 is significantly positively correlated with the scores of F1 and M1 ( $r=0.192, 0.195$ , all  $P<0.01$ ), and significantly negatively correlated with the scores of six dimensions including F2, F4, F5, M3, M4, and M5 ( $|r|=0.126\sim 0.244$ , all  $P<0.05$ ); The score of A3 is significantly positively correlated with the scores of six dimensions, including F2, F3, F5, F6, M3, and M4 ( $r=0.113\sim 0.233$ , all  $P<0.05$ ), and significantly negatively correlated with the scores of F1 and M1 ( $r=-0.115, -0.091$ , all  $P<0.05$ ); The score of A4 is significantly negatively correlated with three dimensions of F6, M3, M4 ( $r=-0.139, -0.097, -0.107$ , all  $P<0.05$ ).

Table 2. Correlation analysis between EMBU and QSA scores

Factor	A1	A2	A3	A4
F1	0.192**	-0.044	-0.115*	0.017
F2	-0.175**	0.033	0.233**	-0.053
F3	-0.096	-0.022	0.137*	-0.015
F4	-0.152**	-0.047	0.072	-0.079
F5	-0.210**	0.061	0.216**	-0.019
F6	-0.019	0.000	0.113*	-0.139*
M1	0.195**	-0.039	-0.091*	0.031
M2	-0.039	-0.053	0.031	-0.003
M3	-0.204**	0.007	0.149**	-0.097*
M4	-0.244**	0.055	0.164**	-0.107*
M5	-0.126*	-0.024	0.079	-0.066

Notes: \* $P<0.05$ , \*\* $P<0.01$ .The same below

### 2.3.1 Multiple linear stepwise regression analysis of the impact of parental rearing styles on suicidal attitudes

Taking scores of A1, A3, and A4 as the dependent variable respectively, and 11 factors of EMBU as the independent variables, multiple linear stepwise regression analysis is conducted within a 95% confidence interval, and the results are shown in Table 3.

According to Table 3, A1 is positively predicted by F1 and M1 ( $\beta = 0.192, 0.195$ , all  $P < 0.05$ ), and negatively predicted by six factors including F2, F4, F5, M3, M4 and M5 ( $\beta = -0.126 \sim -0.244$ , all  $P < 0.05$ ); A3 is positively predicted by six factors like F2, F3, F5, F6, M3 and M4 ( $\beta = 0.113 \sim 0.233$ , all  $P < 0.001$ ), and negatively predicted by 2 factors such as F1 and M1 ( $\beta = -0.091, -0.115$ , all  $P < 0.05$ ); A4 is negatively predicted by three factors like F6, M3 and M4, ( $\beta = -0.139, -0.097, -0.107$ , all  $P < 0.05$ ).

TABLE IV: MULTIPLE LINEAR STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF IMPACT OF EMBU FACTORS ON TOTAL SCORES OF QSA

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	B	SE	$\beta$	t value	P value	$R^2$	$R_{adj}^2$
A1	F1	1.059	0.316	0.192	5.027	<0.001	0.439	0.433
	M1	0.523	0.146	0.195	3.991	<0.001		
	F2	-0.441	0.829	-0.175	-9.225	<0.001		
	F4	-0.395	0.660	-0.152	-3.958	<0.001		
	F5	-0.355	0.547	-0.210	-2.011	0.048		
	M3	-0.577	0.132	-0.204	-4.629	<0.001		
	M4	-0.488	0.089	-0.244	-7.004	<0.001		
	M5	-0.305	0.078	-0.126	-11.800	<0.001		
A3	F2	0.541	0.117	0.233	9.171	<0.001	0.426	0.429
	F3	0.338	0.683	0.137	4.390	<0.001		
	F5	0.504	0.093	0.216	6.303	<0.001		
	F6	0.301	0.073	0.113	3.845	<0.001		
	M3	0.381	0.079	0.149	13.004	<0.001		
	M4	1.227	0.099	0.164	9.465	<0.001		
	F1	-0.324	0.075	-0.115	-2.377	0.019		
	M1	-0.237	0.058	-0.091	-3.721	0.002		
A4	F6	-0.358	0.084	-0.139	-2.113	0.038	0.375	0.365
	M3	-0.272	0.066	-0.097	-7.014	<0.001		
	M4	-0.268	0.055	-0.107	-5.461	<0.001		

### III. Discussion

A1 in this group is at a high level, with 6 dimensions including F1, F3, M1, M2, A2, and A4 having a moderate level, and 8 dimensions including F2, F4, F5, F6, M3, M4, M5, and A3 having a low level. Frequency statistics shows that nearly half of junior high school students hold a contradictory, neutral, or positive attitude towards the nature of suicidal behavior (A1), 95.3% hold a contradictory, neutral, or positive attitude towards suicides (A2), 98.0% hold a contradictory, neutral, or positive attitude towards family members of suicides (A3), and 60.1% hold a contradictory, neutral, or positive attitude towards euthanasia (A4). The above research results are consistent with previous studies [7-11], indicating that the parental rearing style of middle school students is relatively reasonable, and their understanding of suicide-related phenomena is not clear and correct enough. They tend to believe that suicide is unacceptable and cannot solve the problem, but they provide more support,

sympathy, and less blame to the suicide victims and their families. There is more opposition than support for euthanasia. Suicide is a complex social phenomenon, and whether it is suicidal behavior, the personality of the suicide victim, the suicide victim's family, or euthanasia, it cannot be simply summarized as "right" or "wrong", "good" or "bad". The dialectical logical thinking of junior high school students is in its infancy, with significant superficiality and one-sidedness [17]. They fail to fully and deeply understand the nature and cause and effect of suicide, and often view it simply as "liberation" and express sympathy. However, they also have a vague awareness of "life only once". The interweaving and overlapping of these two ideas, leads them to fall into contradiction and lack a clear and constructive opinion, makes the suicide attitude unstable and full of plasticity [18].

Multiple linear stepwise regression analysis shows that multiple factors of EMBU have independent predictive effects on the A1, A3, and A4. Simply put, F1 and MI factors positively predict A1, while negatively predict A3. Six factors, including F2, F4, F5, M3, M4, and M5, negatively predict A1. Six factors, including F2, F3, F5, F6, M3, and M4, positively predict A3. Three factors, including F6, M3, and M4, negatively predict A4. The results of this study are consistent with previous literature [19], suggesting that good parental rearing styles can help junior school students establish a correct view of life and death, seek positive solutions, cherish life, oppose suicide behavior, sympathize with and support the families of suicide victims. However, poor parenting styles hinder junior high school students from establishing a correct view of life and death, making it difficult for them to actively seek solutions and live better. As a result, they hold a positive attitude towards suicidal behavior and a discriminatory attitude towards suicide victims and their families.

#### **Acknowledgements:**

The paper is supported by the projects of "Zhanjiang Planning Projects for Philosophy and Social Science" (No. ZJ23YB53).

#### **References**

- [1] Bolton S, Brunier A. First WHO report on suicide prevention: WHO calls for coordinated action to reduce suicides worldwide[R/OL]. (2014-9-4)[2019-6]. <https://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2014/suicide-prevention-report/en/>
- [2] ZHU Q, XIA QH, YU Y, et al. Analysis on prevalence of suicide ideation and its related factors among junior school students [J]. *Chin J Sch Health*, 2017, 38(11): 1637-1640. (in Chinese)
- [3] Chen SS, He Y, Yuan MY, et al. Mediating role of depression symptom in the association among peer bullying and suicidal ideation in junior high school student [J]. *Chin J Sch Health*, 2022, 43(10): 1456-1460.
- [4] SHEN JX, WANG Y. Suicide attempts in Chinese mainland middle school students with suicidal ideation: A Meta-analysis between 2009 and 2018 [J]. *Mod Prev Med*, 2020, 47(12): 2206-2210. (in Chinese)
- [5] National Health Commission. 2018 China Health Statistical Yearbook [M]. Beijing: China Union Medical College Press, 2018: 286-303.
- [6] Cheng ST, Chan AC. Multiple pathways from stress to suicidality and the protective effect of social support in Hong Kong adolescents[J]. *Suicide Life Threat Behav*, 2007, 37(2):187-196.
- [7] He XY, Zhao GQ, Yan Y, et al. A study on the correlation between suicide behavior and attitudes among middle school students in Lin'an City [J]. *Jiangsu Preventive Medicine*, 2010, 21(3): 9-13.
- [8] Shi YR. Analysis of the current situation and causes of suicide among minors in Japan [J]. *Foreign*

- Primary and Secondary Education, 2012, (1): 24-30.
- [9] Yu Y, Peng NN. A Study on suicide attitude and suicide intention among high school students in Shanghai [J]. *Chinese School Health*, 2012, 33(1): 38-40.
- [10] Chen SL, Wang YQ. Analysis of suicidal attitudes among middle school students in Hangzhou [J]. *Chinese School Health*, 2009, 30(8): 710-712.
- [11] Liu JT, Zhang WX, Wang Y, et al. Path analysis of individual susceptibility factors to suicidal ideation among middle school students [J]. *Journal of Psychiatry*, 2013, 26(2): 111-114.
- [12] Zhang WX. *Social Development of Children* [M]. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press, 1999.
- [13] Liu RK, Wang WQ, Jia YH, et al. Investigation on the incidence and risk factors of suicidal ideation among middle school students in Tianjin [J]. *Medical Animal Prevention*, 2007, 23 (11): 808-810.
- [14] Zhang SK. On the family factors of adolescent suicide [J]. *Youth Exploration*, 2011, (5): 79-82.
- [15] Perris C, et al. Development of a new inventory for assessing memories of parental rearing behavior. *Acta Psychiatr. Scand*, 1980, 61: 265-274.
- [16] Wang XD, Wang XL, Ma H. *Handbook of Mental Health Assessment Scales: Revised Edition* [M]. Beijing: China Journal of Mental Health, 1999.
- [17] Lin CD. *Developmental Psychology* [M]. Beijing: People's Education Press. 2018, 05.
- [18] Zou M. The impact of anchoring information on adolescent suicide attitudes [J]. *China Journal of School Hygiene*, 2015, 36(10): 1554-1556.
- [19] Liu CY, Zhang HM, Li H, et al. Suicide attitudes and family influencing factors among male adolescents with severe online gaming addiction [J]. *Chin J Drug Depend*, 2013, 22(1): 56-60.