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The present study aims to investigate the effects of intra-family parameters; educative styles and academic knowledge of parents and their economic condition on teenagers’ personality and behavior. The present study is a descriptive survey. The statistical sample of the study included 166 teenage students from Baku, Azerbaijan and 332 of their parents were selected through stratified random sampling based on the size of the population. The data were collected through Eysenck personality questionnaire specifically designed for adolescents and adults along with Baumrind parental authority questionnaire. Results from data analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between educative styles of parents and adolescent personality types, that is, teenagers' personality types differ according to their parents’ parenting styles. Parents with logical parenting styles tend to have children with more extrovert personalities. The relationship between fathers' educational level and educational models of parents is also significant. And, the relationship between mothers’ educational level and educational models of parents is significant as well. The study failed to find a significant relationship between personality types in adolescents and their residence; however, the relationship between their personality types and economic status of the family is significant. Since findings of the present study approve the relationship between parenting styles of parents and personality types of adolescents, it is strongly suggested that parents be taught the outcomes of strict and easy going parenting through educational programs.
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INTRODUCTION

Family and its structure play a critical role in the formation of mental health in its members and specifically the children (Henrich et al., 2012). Dynamic organizational personality is among all the internal and mental processes facilitating adaptability of human to his environment (Schultz translated by Sayid-Mohammadi, 2006: 45). Family is the primary effective context for personality to be created and to grow (Grusec, 2002; Smetana, 2011; Steinberg and Silk, 2002; Grusec and Davidov, 2007). In the triplet organization of culture,
parents and children, parents act as a bridge covering the
 gap between cultural beliefs and assumptions existing in
 children's daily life. It is generally accepted that only two
 types of information are to be transferred to the future
generations: the genetic data and the cultural information
both of which could be transmitted through parents
(Bornstein, 2006). According to two major approaches,
the interaction between parents and children affects
socialization of children. In the first one, typology is used
to investigate parenting styles and the second one
applies social interaction approach to study the internal
interactions between a parent and the child (Park and
Buriel, 2006).

Families take different approaches in educating their
children. Parenting methods include all relatively stable
methods and models parents have in their relationship
with other members of the family and provide the ground
for mutual interactions (Stevenson and Akister, 2008).

In spite of the roles family has in the formation of
behaviors in children, studies have shown that family
problems are the most important pathological causes for
mental disorders in children. Parenting styles of parents,
their mental disorders, courtship problems, and other
stressful conditions in a family are all among culprits
(Madrigal, 2007). On the other hand, children's
personality traits including his disorders affect families
and parents (McCortney and Philips, 2006).

Several statistical studies have shown that the major
causes of children visiting mental health specialists are
behavioral disorders. Ineffective parenting styles,
unsupportive behavior, poor supervision, and antisocial
behavior from parents are among the most critical
prognosticating factors of behavioral disorders in children
(Cord, 2004).

Accordingly, the present study attempts to consider
theoretical frameworks of personality types and
educational models along with economic and social
factors in the family environment and investigate the
relationship between parenting methods applied by
parents in Baku and personality types authoritative
adolescents. Moreover, the study aims to probe the
relationship between authoritative personality types in
adolescents and their parents' levels of academic
knowledge and economic status.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Personality has been investigated from various points of
view. The nature of growth, health, disorders and
personality types are some of these perspectives.
Several theories have been proposed by scholars on
different personalities and based on these theories,
various gauging devices have been suggested (Siasi

The concept of personality type indebts its existence to
the works of prominent Swiss psychologist Carl Jung and
two American women named Catherine Briggs and her
daughter, Isabel Briggs. Jung as a psychoanalyst
following Sigmund Freud concluded that behaviors
seemingly unpredictable could be understood and
identified provided that the bases for mentalities and
approaches of individuals are recognized. While Jung
was working on his discoveries, Catherine Briggs,
astonished by similarities and differences between
human personalities, devised a special system for
determining personality types (Tiger and Tiger, 2004).

Psychologists have studied personalities from different
perspectives. Some like Gordon Alport and Raymond
Cattell have focused on traits and scholars like Freud
have investigated them according to psychoanalysis
principles. Others like Krechmer and William Sheldon
have concentrated on biological aspects; yet, humanistic
aspects were investigated by psychologists like Abraham
Mazlow and Carl Rodgers along with social aspects are
studied by scholars like Eric Erikson. In the 1960s and
1970s, as will be discussed later in this paper, Meyer
Friedman and Ray Rosenman proposed Personality
types A and B (Khenifer et al., 2008).

Humanistic approach with theorists like Abraham
Mazlow and Carl Rogers focus on self and its powers are
humanistic forces leading humans to self-actualization.
In this regard, human values and interests are the first
priorities. This approach dates back to over 2000 years
ago. Alport, Cattell and Eysenek believe that personality
traits are affected by heredity and recent studies have
proved the biological basis for main personality traits. In
the 1980s, various models were introduced based on trait
approach and factor analysis to determine personality
structure. Robert McCrea and Paul Costa advanced the
famous five major domains of Openness to experience,
Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness,
Neuroticism in personality and tried to prove the
convergence of different approaches around this theory.
Strong evidences suggest that traits like neuroticism,
psychopathicism and introversion are hereditary traits
according to Eysenek. Personality theorists like Adler,
Hurnay, Frum, Mazlow, Rogers and even Alport and
Cattell believe that the social environment we are living in
affects personality. Erikson stated that social and
historical and social factors influence the formation of
personality (Schultz et al., 2003: 555).

Typology offered by Baumrind is the most common
plan for outlining parenting styles. According to his
typology, parenting is conducted on two basic
dimensions: demandingness and warmth. Combinations
of these two dimensions including high criteria,
obligations of maturity, perfection and control for
demandingness and compassion, reception, support and
sensitivity of parents for warmth present four major
parenting styles. Baumrind, in the first stage of his study,
focused on three authoritative, authoritarian and
indulgent styles. In his later work with Macobi and Martin
(1983), derived the neglectful style from the indulgent one
and as a result, the fourth group of negligent parents were added to the first three styles (cited in Smetana, 2011). Various studies conducted on these three styles have revealed that they have the potential to increase negative and positive outcomes in children (Olsen et al., cited in Diaz, 2011).

In the present study, theoretical framework will be presented along with a review over studies conducted in the field and experts’ views toward the relationship between parenting styles and personality types. It is a fact that several studies have been conducted on the role of parents and their parenting style on personality growth and behavioral disorders of the children; however, not many studies have focused their attention on the relationship between parenting styles and personality types. This proves the significance this study has.

Background

Davari-Fard and Mami (2015) compared personality traits and parenting styles of mothers of female primary school students suffering externalized disorders with mothers of normal students and concluded that the difference between personality traits and parenting styles of mothers of normal students and mothers of children with externalized disorders is not significant. In other words, personality traits and parenting styles of mothers of normal children and mothers of students with externalized disorders are similar. Personality traits and parenting styles of mothers are important factors for children suffering from externalized disorders. Therefore, this study suggested that both parents of boys and girls be compared and investigated.

Ekhtiari (2009) concluded that there is a significant relationship between authoritarian and indulgent parenting styles and externalized behavioral disorders; yet, the relationship between authoritative parenting style and externalized behavioral disorders was not significant. Rahmani et al. (2006: 182) conducted a study titled “the relationship between parenting styles and behavioral problems of adolescent students of Tabriz” (2003) on 360 students of public schools in Tabriz samples selected through cluster sampling. It is reported that their parents had an authoritative style and the students had mild behavioral problems (39.7 and 39.2% respectively). The relationship between parenting style and behavioral problems was significant.

Sohrabi and Hassani (2006: 221) investigated the effects of parenting styles of parents on social behaviors of adolescent girls in Tehran and revealed that authoritarian style of parenting significantly affected disruption in family, drug abuse and antisocial behavior in teenage girls. However, parents’ age and number of their children do not have a significant effect on their antisocial behavior. This study suggested that authoritative (democratic) style is the recommended style for preventing antisocial behavior in teenagers.

According to studies conducted by Kaming (2005), children’s continuous exposure to family quarrels and conflicts induce externalization behaviors. Researchers believe that stress and internalized behavior cause introversion and anxiety in girls and make boys demonstrate aggression or disobedience (Chronis et al. 2011).

Another study on parenting styles revealed that authoritative, authoritarian and indulgent parenting styles can increase or decrease positive or negative outcomes in children (Olsen, 2001 cited in Diaz, 2011).

A study on primary school children revealed that children with behavioral disorders had mothers with high aggression and depression levels, received little or no social support and used parenting styles of negligence or punishment (Gimpel and Holland, 2011).

Winslow et al. (2005) demonstrated that the relationship between authoritative parenting style and externalized behavior in boys is significant.

Furnham and Chang (2000) said authoritative parenting style affects self esteem in individuals. Deci and et.al. (2001) conducted a study and concluded that basic psychological needs have a significantly positive effect on self esteem and negative effect on anxiety.

Karavasilis et al. (2003) found a positive and significant relationship between authoritative parenting style and safe attachment; however, indulgent parenting induced avoidant attachment.

Chen and Goldsmith (1991) and Clopper et al. (1981) investigated single-child families and found that indulgent parenting is more popular with them giving the child more freedom to act and less punishment experience (cited in Hussainian et al., 1996: 135). Psychology has shed light on the interesting point that children from authoritative and securing families have the greatest effects on their parents (Lewis, 1982).

In the present study, the relationship between parenting styles and personality types is investigated in teenagers in Baku. This study probes the effects of interfamily factors like indulgent, strict and democratic parenting styles on adolescents’ personality types, their parents’ personality types and parents’ level of education along with the relationship between adolescents’ personality types and their residence and their parents’ professional, economic and social status.

Research hypotheses

1) There is a relationship between parenting styles of parents and personality types of adolescents.
2) There is a relationship between parenting styles of parents and fathers’ level of education.
3) There is a relationship between parenting styles of parents and mothers’ level of education.
4) There is a relationship between adolescents’
personality types and their residence.
5) There is a relationship between adolescents' personality types and their families' level of income.

METHODOLOGY

Since this study aims to investigate the relationship between indulgent, authoritative, authoritarian, and democratic parenting styles with personality types of adolescents, it is an applied research from the point of view of purpose. It also is a descriptive survey study of a correlation nature.

Statistical population of the study included all boys and girls aged 15 to 18 studying in public high schools of Baku. This population included 2160 students and 1064 of their parents. The statistical sample of the study included 166 subjects selected through cluster sampling. This sample answered the 80-question Eysenek personality questionnaire on personality types. Their parents were asked to answer parenting styles 48-question Eysenek short form (adults) personality test. Parents included 332 subjects. According to Morgan table and based on the population of Baku, 80 of the students were boys and the remaining 86 were girls. The parents of these 166 students formed the 332 parents' group. The data for the study were collected using three tools.

Parenting styles questionnaire

This adaptation tool is based on Baumrind theory on indulgent, authoritative, and authoritarian parenting styles. This questionnaire included 30 articles on the most indulgent, 10 articles on authoritative and the other 10 articles on authoritarian parenting styles. In this test, fathers and mothers expressed their ideas individually by checking a scale ranging from zero as completely disagree to four as completely agree. Adding up the scores gives three separate scores on the most indulgent, authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles for each subject (Sina Institute on Behavioral Studies, Ravan Taj-hiz):

1) 10 expressions related to indulgence scale: 1- 6- 10- 13- 14- 17- 19- 21- 24- 28
2) 10 expressions related to authoritarianism scale: 2- 3- 7- 9- 12- 16- 18- 25- 26- 29
3) 10 expressions related to authoritarianism scale: 4- 5- 8- 11- 15- 20- 22- 23- 27- 30

Reliability and validity

In the present study, the validity of the data collection tool was determined by content validity and specifically face validity. In this regard, the validity of the questionnaires was reviewed and evaluated by five prominent professors of state universities in Tabriz who were expert in educational sciences, psychology, and social sciences. The questionnaires were used only after they were approved by experts. According to the findings from the present study, it could be concluded that reliability coefficient of Eysenek questionnaire for adults and for the scales of psychotism, neuroticism, extroversion and introversion and lies detecting with 12 questions for each scale. In this test, the validity of questions for men and women was 0.84 and 0.80 respectively. For neuroticism, the validity was 0.88 and 0.84. Validity of the questions on extroversion was 0.62 and 0.61 and finally the validity of the questions for lie detecting scale was 0.77 and 0.73.

Reliability and validity

In the present study, the validity of the data collection tool was determined by content validity and specifically face validity. In this regard, the validity of the questionnaires was reviewed and evaluated by five prominent professors of state universities in Tabriz who were expert in educational sciences, psychology, and social sciences. The questionnaires were used only after they were approved by experts. According to the findings from the present study, it could be concluded that reliability coefficient of Eysenek questionnaire for adults and for the scales of psychotism, neuroticism, extroversion and introversion and lies detecting was 0.71 based on α-Cronbach table and since the standard level is 0.7, the questions of the questionnaire are of good reliability. The α-Cronbach coefficient was 0.718 for psychotism scale and since the standard level is 0.7, the questions concerning that scale are of good reliability. The α-Cronbach coefficient was 0.71 for neuroticism scale and since the standard level is 0.7, the questions concerning that scale are of good reliability. Finally, the α-Cronbach coefficient was 0.72 for extroversion scale and since the standard level is 0.7, the questions concerning that scale are of good reliability.

Eysenek personality test for adolescents

Eysenek (1974) conducted an expansive study on personality using symptoms introduced by psychologists treating 700 neurotic soldiers. Some of these signs were external data including age, job and family status and others were clearly identified mental ones. Two of the factors including neuroticism and extroversion-introversion were the focus of attention by Eysenek. According to Eysenek, these two factors are sufficient for basic clarification of
personality (Lee, 1994: 84). These two dimensions are in concordance with Hippocrates’ quartet natures. Eysenek adds a third dimension to these two major ones and named it psychotic. Eysenek and Lang (1986) (cited in Parvin, 1995: 15) believe that they have found numerous evidence on the existence of these dimensions. This evidence may at the same time prove the hereditary nature of these dimensions. In 1963, Eysenek and his wife did some modifications on Maudsley Personality Index and created a new questionnaire with 48 topics half of which focused on extraversion, introversion and neuroticism. Results from this study revealed that personality is of three limits each with an opposite side:

1) Introversion and extroversion
2) Neuroticism and lack of neuroticism
3) Psychotic and non-psychotic

The Iranian norm Eysenek personality test for adolescents has 80 yes-no questions with no true false or misleading item. Content validity of a test is usually determined by experts in the field and depends greatly on referees’ views (Bazargan et al., 2000; Tabtabayi, 1995; Sarookhani, 1998). In order to evaluate the reliability of the questions factor analysis and α-Cronbach model were applied. Results revealed that reliability coefficient of Eysenek questionnaire for adults were 0.812 in case of introversion and extraversion, neuroticism and lack of neuroticism, psychotic and non-psychotic scales. Since the standard level for reliability is 0.7, the questions in this questionnaire are of good reliability.

Research plan and data analysis models

Data in this study were analyzed using SPSS 15 computer application. In order to predict parenting styles using parents' education, job, age, social status, economic status, gender, and residence, the Wilks's lambda distribution test was conducted. Fathers' authoritarianism was determined through step by step multiple regression test and using parameters of gender, age, education and social status.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

51.8% of students in Baku were girls and the remaining 48.2 % were boys. 10.2% of fathers under study were illiterate, 42.8% had finished primary school education, 30.7% had finished high school and the remaining 16.3% held university degrees. 28.9% of mothers were illiterate. 45.2% of women had finished primary school education, 22.3% had high school diploma and the remaining 36% of women held university degrees. 24.7% of families were low-income, 48.8% had average income and 26.5% had a high income. 16.3% of the families under study were living in rental houses and the remaining 83.7% had their own houses. 10.5% of families had indulgent parenting style, 23.3% were authoritarian and 66.3% were authoritative in their parenting style. In case of boys, 11.3% of the families were indulgent, 25% were authoritative and 63.8% were authoritative. In case of boys and girls, 10.8% of families were indulgent, 24.1% were authoritarian and the remaining 65.1 were authoritative in their parenting style. 50% of girls were extroverts, 18.6% were neurotics and 31.4% were lie detectors. Yet, 23.8% boys were extrovert, 16.3% were neurotic, 10% were psychotic and the remaining 50% were lie detectors. The dominant personality type in boys was lie detectors and girls were dominantly extroverts. 17.5% of all adolescents under study were neurotic, 37.3% were extroverts, 4.8% were psychotic and 40.4% were lie detectors. The face in this distribution is for the adolescents with extrovert personality types. On the other hand, 6.6% of parents were lie detectors, 46.6% were psychotic, 20.5% were extroverts and 26.5% were neurotic.

Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between parenting styles of parents and personality types of adolescents.

According to the data in Table 1, it can be concluded that the relationship between parenting styles and personality types in adolescents is significant with $X^2$ of 13.02 with the level of significance of 0.04. The severity of the relationship according to Cramer V coefficient was 0.198. Therefore it could be said that adolescents’ personality types differ according to their parents’ parenting style and parents with more indulgent parenting style have extrovert children.

Hypothesis 2: There is a relationship between parenting styles of parents and fathers’ level of education.

According to the data in Table 2, it can be concluded that the relationship between parenting styles and dominant personality types in adolescents is significant with $X^2$ of 16.99 with the level of significance of 0.009. The severity of the relationship according to Cramer V coefficient was 0.226 with the level of significance of 0.009. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is a significant relationship between fathers’ level of education and their parenting style.

Hypothesis 3: There is a relationship between parenting styles of parents and mothers’ level of education.

According to the data in Table 3, it can be concluded that the relationship between parenting styles and dominant personality types in adolescents is significant with $X^2$ of 16.85 with the level of significance of 0.01. The severity of the relationship according to Cramer V coefficient was 0.225 with the level of significance of 0.01. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is a significant relationship between mother’ level of education and their parenting style.

Hypothesis 4: There is a relationship between adolescents’ personality types and their residence.

According to the data in Table 4, it can be concluded that the relationship between place of residence and personality types in adolescents is not significant with $X^2$ of 1.63 with the level of significance of 0.652. Therefore,
### Table 1. The relationship between parents’ parenting style and adolescents’ personality types (Baku).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality type</th>
<th>Parenting style</th>
<th>Indulgence</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(X^2 = 13.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(Cramer V = 0.198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotism</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Level of significance = 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie detecting</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(Cramer V = 0.198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Level of significance = 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. The relationship between fathers’ education and their parenting style (Baku).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers’ level of education</th>
<th>Parenting style</th>
<th>Indulgent</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(X^2 = 16.99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. The relationship between mothers’ education and their parenting style (Baku).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mothers’ level of education</th>
<th>Parenting style</th>
<th>Indulgent</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(X^2 = 16.854)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. The relationship between adolescents' place of residence and their personality type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality type</th>
<th>Families' residence</th>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Proprietorship</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$X^2 = 1.631$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotism</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Level of significance= 0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie detection</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. The relationship between family income and adolescents' personality types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality type</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$X^2=71.352$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Level of significance= 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotism</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cramer V= 0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie detection</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Level of significance= 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

it could be concluded that there is no significant relationship between place of residence and their parenting personality type.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is a relationship between adolescents' personality types and their families' level of income.

According to the data in Table 5, it can be concluded that the relationship between family income and personality types in adolescents is significant with $X^2$ of 71.35 with the level of significance of 0.000. The severity of the relationship is above average according to Cramer V coefficient was 0.464 with the level of significance of 0.000. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is a significant relationship between family income and their adolescents' personality type. Families with low incomes have more of neurotic personalities; families with average income have more of lie detecting personalities and families with high levels of income are generally extroverts.

**DISCUSSION**

The present study aimed to investigate the relationship between parenting styles of parents and personality types in adolescents considering environmental components. Results on the first hypothesis revealed that the relationship between parental styles and adolescents'
personality types is significant with $X^2$ of 13.02 with the level of significance of 0.04. Therefore, it could be concluded that adolescents’ personality types differ according to their parents’ parental styles, that is, parents with more authoritative parenting style have more extrovert children.

The results from this study agree with findings from a study conducted by Fakhr (1996) who reported that unlike authoritarian families, authoritative and democratic families in Iran have more social children. Besides, the results also confirm Jazayeri (2004) who concluded that the relationship between democratic parenting style and personality growth in adolescents is significant. They also agree with findings from Rahmani et al. (2006) who found that the highest percentage of students and adolescents in Tabriz has reported an authoritative or democratic parenting style for their parents.

Schultz et al. (2002: 549-559) reported that violent and punishing parents may suppress extraversion, openness, complacency and sociability as main characteristics of sociable and extrovert individuals. On the other hand, the present study concluded that psychotic parents take authoritarian parenting style and this concords with findings of Baldwin (1945) who reported that authoritarian, and rejecting parents have rebellious, aggressive and unstable children (cited in Pervin, 1993). These results also confirm findings of Karen Hornay (cited in Pervin et al., 1999: 175) concluding that interpersonal relationships are the axis for healthy or unhealthy behavior in individuals. In Iran, the findings of this study agree with findings of Taghavi and Kalantari (2006) who reported that adolescents with authoritarian parents are more depressed compared to adolescents with democratic parents. The results also agree with findings of Oliver et al. (2009), Komsi et al. (2008), Olson et al. (2005), Usher cited in Zankman and Bonomo (2004) and Lei Yin et al. (2011). They demonstrated that emotional stability, parental styles leading to loyalty and parents’ personality type are the factors predicting personality traits, behaviors and psychological actions of adolescents.

Results on the second hypothesis revealed that the relationship between parenting styles and fathers’ level of education is significant with $X^2$ of 16.99 with the level of significance of 0.009. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is a significant relationship between parenting styles and fathers’ level of education. Moreover, results on the third hypothesis revealed that the relationship between parenting styles and mothers’ level of education is significant with $X^2$ of 16.85 with the level of significance of 0.01 and the severity of relationship with Cramer V coefficient of 0.225 and the level of significance of 0.01. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is a significant relationship between parenting styles and mothers’ level of education.

Thus, it can be concluded that the relationship between parenting style and fathers’ level of education is significant. Fathers with higher levels of education had a more logical view toward parenting compared to illiterate fathers or the ones with primary school education who were more authoritarian in their parenting style. These findings agree with findings of Shokraneh (2006) who reported less pressure from parents with several children on their children and have more democratic view toward parenting them. These findings also confirm the findings of Jarami (1986), Poor (2001), Salehin and Zadeh (2003) who reported a significant relationship between parenting styles and parents’ level of education. In other words, the higher the level of education, the more democratic parenting styles are applied and as the level come down, authoritarian styles are become more popular. The relationship between parenting styles and mothers’ level of education in Baku is also significant with $X^2$ of 16.58 and the level of significance of 0.01.

As it was discussed earlier, parenting styles and parents’ level of education are significantly related. Nevertheless, since reaching higher levels of education does not necessarily end in better jobs or higher incomes and some individuals have no proper job in spite of their high level of education along with illiterate people with highly paying jobs, attending higher education institutes does not imply higher self-confidence and social status to have a motivated lifestyle with little problem with life's ups and downs. All of these may end in high resistance power, better adaptability against crises of life and more logical and constructive parenting styles. In order to further elaborate on the significance of education on post-divorce life, Sarookhani (1997) states that as the level of education goes higher, the sensitivity toward issues increases and literacy acts as an informative factor inducing sympathy to other people and understanding of their problems. Besides, it could be said that as the level of education increases, individuals feel more responsible to act according to their social status and avoid improper acts (Sarookhani, 1997: 11).

Results on the fourth hypothesis revealed that the relationship between place of residence and adolescents’ personality type is not significant with $X^2$ of 1.63 with the level of significance of 0.652. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is no significant relationship between place of residence and adolescents’ personality type. Moreover, results on the fifth hypothesis revealed that the relationship between family income and adolescents’ personality types is significant with $X^2$ of 71.35 with the level of significance of 0.000. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is a significant relationship between family income and adolescents’ personality type, that is, families with lower incomes have more neurotic adolescents, families with average income levels have more lie detecting adolescents and families with high levels of income have more extrovert children.

In this regard, it could be said that financial welfare and better job opportunities help individual overcome their problems efficiently and manage all the expenses like
arents, childcare, education costs and health care in a better way compared to those with lower incomes and weaker financial welfare. Better financial condition leads to a better ground for improving personality traits. In low-income families, the main concern of family is supplying daily needs and this puts extra pressure on family and children ending in neglecting social and psychological life of children. Families with low income may have a warm environment at home; yet stress is prevalent in these families and this affects parenting styles and personality types of children. Another important point worth mentioning on the significant relationship between family income and personality types in adolescents is that higher income reduces concern over petty needs (according to Mazlow) and the concerns of family move to growth and improvement of life. However, if families worry about providing themselves with basic needs of life, their interactions will be seriously affected and the possibility for an unpleasant life increases.

Parenting as a family duty plays vital roles in guiding children’s behavior (Kann and Hanna, 2008). As it was expected, results revealed that authoritative parenting style has significant relationship with reducing extroversion problems. This finding agrees with findings from studies by Berahman (2002), Hammen (2003) and Ekhtiari (2009). Results also revealed that authoritarian and indulgent parenting styles have relationship with increased extroversion problems. This finding confirms the results reached by Venezilo et al. (2005), Hart (2001), Ekhtiari (2009) and Moosavi (2008).

Conclusion

The study therefore revealed that families with more democratic and cooperative parenting styles have the higher possibility for adaptation with condition and provision of a better environment for their children. These parents supervise their children and limit them with logical requests. Besides, these parents use passionate behaviors like hugging and kissing of their kids. They take very moderate behavior in parenting their children and while expecting obedience from their child; take his or her ideas into account by taking logical measures against them. Good levels of responsibility, intimacy, control and limitation are the elements used by authoritative parents. These behaviors reduce the possibility of behavioral disorders in children. In case of authoritarian parenting style, caring and relationship decreases and the structure turns into an improper one. This structure provides an indecent ground for child growth and induces behaviors with negative labels. These parents wish everything they say to be accepted by their children and this reduces the relationships in the family. These parents use severe punishments to control their children’s behavior and this causes behavioral disorders in higher levels. In indulgent parenting style, the lowest level of caring and structure is experienced. These families tend to give more encouragement, passion and freedom of action along with appropriate levels of physical and mental expectations from their children. Children grown up in this way, lack self-confidence and cannot control their wishes and desires. Lack of supervision from their parents and parents’ negligence toward child and their behavior may induce extrovert behavioral disorders in the child for they have not learned the necessary life skill.

Suggestions and applications of the results

1) Considering the results from this study it seems as if authoritative and trust-giving parenting (democratic) styles are proper styles of parenting children. Teaching parenting styles by teachers, media and universities are apparently necessary.

2) Special classes for parents in parent-teacher meeting must be held in order to let parents get familiar with proper parenting styles by experts and specialists in proper times and occasions. This will help parents consider the ages and conditions of their adolescents and follow decent parenting styles in their homes.

3) Considering the role of family in the evolution of personality in children and adolescents, it is suggested that various TV and Radio programs be made using expert views and with the help of university professors, psychologists, sociologists and all those whose ideas may be of any help.

4) Booklets and brochures with the suggested titles of “proper personality of children”, “parenting styles” and “how to behave our children?” must be prepared by authorities and experts in related fields and be given to parents to be used in parenting their children.

5) Considering the relationship between parenting styles and mothers and fathers’ level of education, it is suggested that parents and especially younger ones continue their education to university levels and higher education by education authorities.

6) In the present study, the focus was on 15 to 18 year olds; it is suggested that further studies concentrate on sibling roles, their order of birth in the family, and the number of children in the family be investigated in families with low income. In childhood and adolescence of primary and secondary schools by researchers in the field of personality and family studies.
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