

The Relation of Thinking Styles with Child -Rearing Practices in the Girl Students of the Third Grade of Secondary School

Safoora Davari¹, Rana rahmani², Msoud Bagheri³

^{1,2}MSc in general psychology

³Ph.D Assistant professor, faculty member of Shahid Bahonar, University of Kerman department of psychology

ABSTRACT

In order to investigate the relation of the thinking styles of the teenager students (girl) of the third grade of the secondary school with the child -rearing practices of their parents, 108 students of the third grade of the secondary school in Roudan's town were chosen by the multistage cluster sampling .They answered the Stenberg and Wagner's thinking style questionnaire and their parents answered the Robinson et al.'s child -rearing practices questionnaire. The child -rearing practices were considered as the complex parenting of both mother and father. The result of the analysis of these data by two tests of chi-square and goodness-of-fit-test shown that there is a meaningful relation between child -rearing practices and thinking styles from the function and domains points of view but there isn't a meaningful relation between child -rearing practices and thinking styles from the form, levels and tendencies points of view.

KEYWORDS: thinking styles; child -rearing practices.

INTRODUCTION

Thinking, learning and cognitive styles are three known domains in the field of styles (Zhang & Stenberg,2006 quoted from Weiqiao & Zhang, 2009). Other than many studies in 1950s to 1970s, recently due to the dissatisfaction of the old theoretical model that considered styles more one-or two-dimensional, a re-interest has been emerged on working on the styles (Zhang & Postigliohe, 2001; Zhang, 2002).

Generally, an style is a way of thinking and this term is not synonymous with ability but is a way to apply ability. In other words, "style is the preferred way of thinking that shows how to use the potential ability" (Stenberg, 1949 translated by Ahari & Khosravi, 2003 ; Stenberg, 1977 quoted from Babaali, 2005). "Evidence obtained from studies related styles indicates that the most documented and scientific approach to style is the approach presented by Stenberg (1994, 1997)" (Fatholahi & Hooman, 2005, P:96).

According to this theory (Stenberg, 1988 , 1977 quoted from Zhang, 2002), there are 13 thinking styles which are placed in 5 dimensions including: 1. Functions: including legislative, executive and judicial 2. Forms : including monarchic (opinionated, mono-centered, monopole), hierarchic (hierarchy, organized), oligarchic (multi-centered) and anarchic (anarchist, disorganized) 3.levels: including global and local 4.domains: including internal and external 5.leanings: including liberal and conservative (Stenberg, 1949 translated by Ahari and Khosravi, 2002 ; Stenberg ,quoted from Jahanshahi 2009).

Various studies show the relationship between thinking styles with processes such as creativity (Babaali, 2006 ; Imamipour & Seif, 2003), problem solving, decision making and academic progress (Shokri et al. 2006 ; Imamipour & Seif, 2003), teaching methods and educational evaluation (Imamipour & Seif, 2003), achievement motivation (Zhang & Weiqiao, 2001,2009 ; Zhang & Postigliohe, 2009), anxiety(Zhang,2009), self-esteem (Zhang & Postigliohe, 2001), comprehension (Farokhi & Seif, 2005), preferred teaching method (Zhang, 2004), efficiency (Hosseinzadeh & Eskandarzadeh, 1996) and various factors such as personality attributes (Zhang, 2001 , 2002 ; Tullabi & fooladvand, 2009), culture, gender, age, parental styles, schools and different jobs, birth order and socio-economic situation.

Researchers from 1920s onwards have examined parental influences on children's social growth and competency, so that researches showed that (Rahmati, Etemadi & Mehrabi, 2008) early experiences of the child in the family have a dramatic effect on his personality and his next behaviors (Mussen, Kagan, Huston & Conger, translated by Yasayee, 1980 quoted from Hossein Chari, Delavarpour& Dehghani, 2007). "In fact family experiences have a major impact on the individual's development during adolescence and after that and family communications may also affect other aspects of adolescent's life" (Byne & Haddock, 2002, quoted from Rahmani, Seyedfatemi, Rezayee brothers & Sedaghat, 2004, P:11).

One of the most important approaches in the field of family's influence on the child is the study by Darling (1992) in which child rearing practices has been considered a set of behaviors that describes parent-child interactions in a breadth of positions (Rahmati, Etemadi & Mehrabi, 2007 ; Darling quoted from Abdoli, Kadivar & Homayuni, 2009). In this regard, based on longitudinal studies of Diana Baumrind, parents in the three types of child rearing practices are as follows:

1. Authoritarian parents: anti child-centered (Gursimesek & Gorgenli, 2009), limiting, exercise of power, coercive discipline, low warmth and sympathy, forced to obey and respect for traditional values. Children of this group are relatively self-reliant, but unsatisfied, withdrawn, unreliable, and with lower emotional functioning.
2. Authoritative parents: commitment, controllers, two-way communication, receptivity, responsiveness, patience, respect for independence and beliefs, fixed stance and satisfaction to their children. Children of this group are self-reliant, independent, mature adequate, reliable, having positive values, inclined to friendships and high progression.
3. Permissive parents: low control, surrender to the demands and actions, lack of seriousness in the discipline and encouragement, not expecting mature behaviors and compatible with community standards of their children. Children of these parents are less self-reliant, independent and responsible, and reluctant to explore (Mussen et al, translated by Yasayee 2001; Farokhi Golfazani, Mohammad Esmaeel, Raofian Moghadam & Asgari Moghadam, 2003; Sadeghi & Heydari, 2005; Shekuhi Yekta, Parand & Faghihi, 2006).

Various studies show the relationship between child rearing practices with all aspects of children and adolescents' personality and behavior aspects such as behavioral disorders, depression, anxiety, panic, psychosis, physical complaints , risky behaviors (Rahmati, Etemadi & Mehrabi, 2007 ; Zareie, 2009 ; Seifi Gandomani, Kalantari Meybodi & Fath, 2009 ; Bahrami, 2009 ; Kalantari, Molavi & Tavassoli, 2005), mental health and academic success (Bahrami Ehsan, Bagherpour, Kamanchali, Fathi Ashtiani & Ahmadi, 2008), loneliness (Khueenejad, Rajaei & Moheb Red, 2007 ; Lalifaz & Asgari, 2008), stability in adulthood and high capacity for emotional investment and emotional investment in values and ethical standards high level of understanding of social issues (Barm, Segrin & Gallant, 1999), shyness (Hossein Chari, Delavarpour & Dehghani, 2007; Eastburg & Johnson, 1990), non-social behavior, aggression and impulsivity behaviors (Yusefi, 2007), self-concept and control position (Abdoli, Kadivar & Homayuni, 2008; Mazidi & Alborzi, 2009), social skills and academic self-efficacy (Talebi Marand, 2006), self-assertiveness (Shahidi & Sarihi, 2008) decision making ability and positive attitude towards himself and social and academic performance and high compatibility and independence, and behavioral and mood problems (Mahmoodi Jasur, 2006), irrational thoughts (Dorudgar, 2005), identity styles (Khajehpour & After, 2007), academic competency (Rahmani, Seyedfatemi, Rezaei & Sedaghat, 2006), academic achievement motivation of children (Abedi & Arizi, 2005).

Despite many studies, there was not a separate study about thinking styles and child rearing practices in which both variables be examined directly; although there were some which examined the relationship between each of them with similar variable for example the study of Zhang (2009) which showed that thinking styles are associated with anxiety and similarly the study by Seifi Gandomani, Kalantari Meybodi and Fath(2009) confirmed the same relationship with child rearing practices. Or the study of Zhang and Weiqiao(2009) which represents the relationship between thinking styles and achievement motivation; and in the same regard the study by abedi and Arizi (2005) indicated the relationship between authoritative child rearing practice and academic achievement motivation.

Zhang's study (2002) showed a significant relationship between some of thinking styles (executive and conservative) with neurosis and similarly the study of Rahmati, Etemadi and Mehrabi (2007) showed the relationship between child rearing practices with mental disorders of girl second-grad high school students and also another study by Bahrami Ehsan, Bagherpour, Kamanchali, Fathi Ashtiani and Ahmadi (2008) indicated the relationship between child rearing practices with mental health of grade-three guidance school students. Generally future position of children is significantly affected by various child rearing practices of parents and socio-economic situations of the family (Budhwar, Reeves and Farrell, 2000).

Identifying students' thinking styles, according to the relation of these styles with teaching methods and their preferred learning and also academic progress (Shokri et al. 2006; Zhang, 2004) can help teachers to design the teaching method compatible with students' thinking styles and also help the students themselves to use learning methods appropriate to their thinking styles. The study of Jamshidi Selklu and Lotfian (2007) for comparing guidance school students' cognitive style in dealing with child rearing dimensions showed that affection and control dimension of child rearing dimensions has a significant effect on students' cognitive styles; and similarly, Etesamipour's study (2004) also confirmed the relationship between cognitive styles and child rearing practices of parents. Since some of researchers assume learning, cognitive and thinking styles as synonymous and others distinguish between them (Jahanshahi, 2008), investigating the relationship between thinking styles with child rearing is also evaluated to be important.

Given the importance of the mentioned cases and reviewing the previous studies, this study was performed with the aim of investigating the relationship between thinking styles of girl adolescents with their parents' child rearing practices (in combination) and the following questions were examined and analyzed.

1. Is there a significant relationship between child rearing practices and thinking components in terms of function?
2. Is there a significant relationship between child rearing practices and thinking components in terms of form?
3. Is there a significant relationship between child rearing practices and thinking components in terms of levels?
4. Is there a significant relationship between child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of scopes?
5. Is there a significant relationship between child rearing practices and thinking components in terms of leanings?

Understanding this relationship makes parents more aware about use of appropriate child rearing styles to enhance children's thinking styles so that they take maximum advantage of their capabilities.

METHOD

Sample:

Participants of the present study were 108 girl third grade guidance students of Roudan schools that for sampling, all girl guidance schools of the town were considered as clusters and one class from each school and some students from each class were examined randomly.

Questionnaires:

A: Questionnaire of Strenberg and Vagner thinking styles: this questionnaire measures 13 thinking styles and is composed 104 terms. Each style is measured using 8 terms and each term is scored based on the seven-degree Likert scale (Strenberg, translated by Ahari & Khosravi, 2002).

Questionnaire of Strenberg-Vagner thinking styles has showed high reliability for determining thinking styles in both western and eastern cultures (Zhang & Weiqiao, 2009) so that internal validity has been reported above 40 to 80 percent. For most of studies usually Cronbach's alpha coefficients has been with median above 0.70 from 0.50 to 0.80 range for the 13 scales (Zhang, 2002; Zhang, 2006; Strenberg, translated by Ahari & Khosravi, 2002; Manavipour & Khorasani, 2005; Akbarzadeh, 2006; Shokri, Khodei, Daneshvarpour, Tulabi & Fooladvand, 2009). This questionnaire has been normalized for Iranian Community (university students, students) by Imamipour (2001); and reliability coefficients of its functional dimension have been obtained for high school students 0.63 in executive style, 0.66 judicial style and 0.60 legislative style by Mahdavi Rad (2002). In the Abdolazadeh's study (2009). Cronbach's alpha of executive, judicial and legislative styles and the entire questionnaire were obtained 0.74, 0.71, 0.64 and 0.76, respectively.

B: Questionnaire of Robinson et al. child rearing practices: this questionnaire was made in 1995 by Robinson, Mondleces, Olsen and Hart and translated into Persian by Hamid Alizadeh. The questionnaire has 32 items with five alternatives as never, sometimes, almost half of the times, many times and always which is filled by the parents separately and examines 3 types of authoritarian, authoritative and permissive child rearing practices based on Baumrind theories and child rearing styles which has 7 communicational dimensions besides the three child rearing styles.

Khueinejad, Rajaei and Mohebi Rad (2007), Lalifaz and Asgari (2008) and Alizadeh and Anderis (2002) quoted from Kamijani and Maher (2007) have reported internal validity of authoritarian, authoritative and permissive scales 0.90, 0.78 and 0.70 respectively in their studies. In the study of Kamijani and Maher, internal validity of the three scales of authoritative, authoritarian and permissive were estimated 0.91, 0.96 and 0.76, respectively.

RESULTS

Table 1. Status of sample group in terms of thinking Functions component

Functions	Frequency	Percent
Legislative	24	22.2
Executive	62	57.4
Judicial	22	20.4
Total	108	100.0

Table 2. Status of sample group in terms of thinking forms component

Forms	Frequency	Percent
Monarchic	43	39.8
Hierarchic	19	17.6
Oligarch	29	26.9
Anarchic	17	15.7
Total	108	100.0

Table 3. Status of sample group in terms of thinking levels component

Levels	Frequency	Percent
Global	62	57.4
Local	46	42.6
Total	108	100.0

Table 4. Status of sample group in terms of thinking Scopes component

Scopes	Frequency	Percent
Internal	40	37.0
External	68	63.0
Total	108	100.0

Table 5. Status of sample group in terms of thinking Leanings component

Leanings	Frequency	Percent
Liberal	46	42.6
Conservative	62	57.4
Total	108	100.0

Table 6. Descriptive indicators of sample group scores in child rearing practices

Scale	N	Sum	Mean	Standard deviation
Authoritarian	108	5024.00	46.5185	11.06775
Authoritative	108	11772.00	109.0000	26.14696
Permissive	108	2586.00	23.9444	7.16538
Total	108			

Table 7. Table of agreement frequency of the sample group according to the dominant child rearing practices and thinking components in terms of Function

Functions		child rearing practices			Total
		Authoritarian	Authoritative	permissive	
legislative	Frequency	9	6	9	24
	% Total	8.3%	5.6%	8.3%	22.2%
Executive	Frequency	8	26	28	62
	% Total	7.4%	24.1%	25.9%	57.4%
Judicial	Frequency	7	9	6	22
	% Total	6.5%	8.3%	5.6%	20.4%
Total	Frequency	24	41	43	108
	% Total	22.2%	38.0%	39.8%	100.0%

Table 8. Obtained results of chi-square test to investigate the relationship between dominant styles of child rearing and thinking components in terms of Functions

Index	Value	df	P
Chi-Square	8.572 ^a	4	.04
N	108		

Given the above results since the observed P value (0.04) is less than the significant level, consequently the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a relationship between child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of Functions. Results of the fitted chi-square test ($\chi^2=6.54$) in the level of ($P=0.05$) also showed that in the executive thinking style, the tendency is from Authoritarian to permissive. In the legislative thinking style, there was no significant difference for tendency to a particular style of child rearing ($\chi^2=3.22$) ($P=0.23$) and also in judicial style, there was no significant difference for tendency to a particular style of child rearing ($\chi^2=3.78$) in the ($P=0.18$) level.

Table 9 . Table of agreement frequency of sample group based on the dominant style of child rearing and thinking components in terms of thinking forms

Forms		child rearing practices			Total
		Authoritarian	Authoritative	permissive	
Monarchic	Frequency	6	18	19	43
	% Total	5.6%	16.7%	17.6%	39.8%
Hierarchic	Frequency	5	7	7	19
	% Total	4.6%	6.5%	6.5%	17.6%
Oligarch	Frequency	7	10	12	29
	% Total	6.5%	9.3%	11.1%	26.9%
Anarchic	Frequency	6	6	5	17
	% Total	5.6%	5.6%	4.6%	15.7%
Total	Frequency	24	41	43	108
	% Total	22.2%	38.0%	39.8%	100.0%

Table10. The obtained results of the chi-square test to investigate dominant styles of child rearing and thinking components in terms of forms

Index	Value	df	P
Chi-Square	3.853 ^a	6	.697
N	108		

According to the results of the above tables, since the observed P value (0.697) is more than the significance level; thus the null hypothesis is confirmed. Therefore, it can be concluded that there isn't any relationship between child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of thinking forms. The results of the fitted chi-square ($\chi^2=7.51$) for more accurate investigation showed that in the monarchic thinking style, the tendency is toward authoritative and permissive child rearing styles ($P=0.03$) and in oligarchic thinking style a significant tendency was observed toward permissive style ($\chi^2=6.41$) ($P=0.04$) and in anarchic thinking styles ($\chi^2=2.85$) ($P=0.14$) and hierarchic ($\chi^2=2.32$) ($P=0.12$) a significant tendency towards any particular style of child rearing was not found.

Table 11. Table of agreement frequency of sample group based on dominant child rearing style and thinking components in terms of levels

Levels		child rearing practices			Total
		Authoritarian	Authoritative	permissive	
Global	Frequency	12	26	24	62
	% Total	11.1%	24.1%	22.2%	57.4%
Local	Frequency	12	15	19	46
	% Total	11.1%	13.9%	17.6%	42.6%
Total	Frequency	24	41	43	108
	% Total	22.2%	38.0%	39.8%	100.0%

Table 12. The obtained results of chi-square test to investigate the relationship between dominant child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of levels

Index	Value	df	P
Chi-Square	1.188 ^a	2	.552
N	108		

According to the results of the above tables since the observed P value (0.55) is more than the significance level. Thus, null hypothesis is confirmed. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is not any significant relationship between child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of thinking levels. The more accurate investigation obtained from the fitted test with ($\chi^2=7.63$) value showed that both in global thinking style ($P=0.03$) and local ($P=0.04$) ($\chi^2=6.54$), there is a significant difference in various child rearing levels. As it can be observed in the table, in the global thinking style the dominant tendency is towards authoritative and in local thinking style the tendency is towards permissive child rearing style.

Table 13. Table of agreement frequency of sample group based on the dominant child rearing style and thinking components in terms of scopes

Scopes		child rearing practices			Total
		Authoritarian	Authoritative	permissive	
Internal	Frequency	9	9	22	40
	% Total	8.3%	8.3%	20.4%	37.0%
External	Frequency	15	32	21	68
	% Total	13.9%	29.6%	19.4%	63.0%
Total	Frequency	Frequency	41	43	108
	% Total	% Total	38.0%	39.8%	100.0%

Table 14. The obtained results of chi-square test to investigate the relationship between dominant child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of scopes

Index	Value	df	P
Chi-Square	7.683 ^a	2	.021
N	108		

According to the results of the above tables, since the observed P value (0.02) is less than the significance level. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a relationship between child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of thinking scopes. The results of the fitted chi-square test showed a significant difference among frequencies in the internal style with ($\chi^2=6.77$) in the (P=0.05) level. As it is observed the tendency in the internal style is mostly towards negligence child rearing style. Also results of the fitted chi-square test for external thinking style with ($\chi^2=7.87$) in the (P=0.05) level indicated the significant difference of external thinking style in various child rearing styles; as it is observed the most tendency the external thinking style is related to Authoritative child rearing style.

Table 15. Table of agreement frequency of sample group based on the dominant child rearing style and thinking components in terms of leanings

Leanings		child rearing practices			Total
		Authoritarian	Authoritative	Permissive	
Liberal	Frequency	10	18	18	46
	% Total	9.3%	16.7%	16.7%	42.6%
Conservative	Frequency	14	23	25	62
	% Total	13.0%	21.3%	23.1%	57.4%
Total	Frequency	24	41	43	108
	% Total	22.2%	38.0%	39.8%	100.0%

Table 16. The obtained results of the chi-square test to investigate the relationship between the dominant child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of leanings

Index	Value	df	P
Chi-Square	.047 ^a	2	.977
N	108		

According to the results of the above table, since the observed P value (0.97) is more than the significance level; thus, the null hypothesis is confirmed. Therefore, it can be concluded that there isn't any relationship between child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of leanings. The results of the fitted test with ($\chi^2=6.57$) value also showed that there isn't any significant difference in the observed frequency in the liberal thinking style and various child rearing styles (P=0.54). hence, it can be found that there isn't any statistical relationship between liberal thinking style and child rearing styles. Although according to the information of the above table, it seems that in authoritative and permissive styles, liberal thinking is dominant; while conservative style has also the same position with ($\chi^2=8.92$) in the (P=0.07) level in child rearing styles.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Regarding the first question, research findings show that there is a relationship between child rearing practices and thinking components in terms of function (legislative, executive, judicial). Thus in executive thinking style the

tendency is from authoritarian towards permissive; i.e. the more authoritarian child rearing is reduced, executive performance is increased. Of course such a conclusion was unexpected because according to the authoritarian parents' features (limiting, more practicing power, forcing children to obey and respect for values and norms) it was predicted that their children have bad executive thinking style more (preferring work on activities with clear instructions and structures).

One of the reasons of the childrens low tendency to the executive style may be their mental problems and pertinacity to elders and disobeying the orders, that reject each activity with particular instruction (in confirming these problems, the study of Bahrami Ehsan et al. (2008) showed that children of authoritarian parents have the lowest mental health) and the other reason may be due to problems of the study type (questionnaire, relying on the adolescents' self-report). Of course, the study of Seifi Gandomani, Kalantari, Meybodi and Fath(2008) shows the relationship between authoritarian child rearing styles and adolescents' anxiety that this anxiety may affect filling the questionnaire. In other thinking components in terms of function (legislative and judicial) there wasn't any significant difference in the tendency towards any particular child rearing style.

Regarding the second question, research findings didn't show any significant correlation between child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of form (monarchic, hierarchic, oligarchic, and anarchic). Of course the more accurate investigation (goodness-of-fit-test) showed that in the monarchic thinking style, the tendency is towards authoritative and permissive child rearing styles. According to what has been mentioned before, authoritative parents respect their children's independency and beliefs and therefore, their children are self-reliable and in high rank in terms of independence, adequacy and sense of confidence that these features are consistent with monarchic thinking style (willed, determined and self-reliant); and permissive child rearing style provides the grounds for adolescents' independency due to low control (Seifi Gandomani et al. 2009).

Regarding the third question, the study did not find any significant correlation between child rearing style and thinking levels (global and local). Of course the more accurate investigation showed that in global thinking style, the dominant tendency is towards authoritative child rearing style and in local style the tendency is towards permissive child rearing style. Given that global thinking style is of type-1 styles and people these styles have tendency towards more confidence and accepting challenges (Weiqiao & Zhang, 2009) and the issue that permissive child rearing has a relationship with sense of confidence, independency and adequacy in children, the result can be justified to some extent. Local thinking style is of type-2 styles that their major feature is that they are cognitively simple and pay more attention to norms (Zhang and Strenberg, 2005 quoted from Weiqiao & Zhang, 2009); and thus permissive child rearing style is related to independence, willingness to explore and less control over children.

Investigating the fourth question indicated that there is a significant correlation between dominant child rearing styles and thinking domains (internal and external). Thus, in internal thinking style, the tendency is more towards permissive child rearing but in external thinking style, the most tendency is related to authoritative child rearing style. Given that children of negligence parents have good social skills, it was predicted that their thinking style must be more external (preferring doing activities with others' coordination) and its rejection may be the fact that these children due to low responsibility do not tend to accept responsibility in group activities (usually everyone's duty has been specified); however children of authoritative parents prefer group work due to higher social adequacy and tendency to friendship.

Investigating the fifth question indicated that there is not any significant relationship between child rearing styles and thinking components in terms of leanings (liberal and conservative). Of course, it seems that in both powerful and negligence styles, both liberal and conservative thinking are dominant.

Although no similar study has been investigated the relationship between thinking styles with child rearing styles directly, but the obtained results of this study are reported harmonious relations with previous studies in some cases in this field. Of course, some dissimilar results with previous studies have been reported that both cases indicate the necessity of more performing more studies in relation to the effect of child rearing styles on children's thinking styles; so that by controlling various variables, these effects can be more identified.

REFERENCES

- Abdollahzadeh, A. (2009). Comparing the relationship between various thinking styles with learning rate of information and communication among girl and boy technical and vocational school students in Tehran. College of education sciences and psychology, Al-Zahra University, 3, 125-144.
- Abedi, A & Arizi, H. (2005). Investigating the relationship between academic achievement motivation in Isfahan high school students with their family features. Journal of Family Research, 2, 139-147.

- Akbarzadeh, M. (2006). Investigating personal and academic factors related to thinking styles and its relation to academic progress of Kerman Shahid Bahonar University students. MA thesis in planning, college of literature and Humanities of Educational Sciences department, Shahid Bahonar University.
- Babaali, F. (2005). Comparing thinking styles and its relation with creativity among humanities and art students of Tehran universities. MA thesis in Educational Psychology, College of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Al-Zahra University.
- Bahrani; Ehsan, H ,Bagherpour Kamachali, S, Fathi Ashtiani, A & Ahmadi, A.A. (2008). Investigating the relationship between child rearing styles with mental health and academic success of children. *Journal of Psychology and Educational Sciences*, 4, 87-100.
- Beyrami, M. (2009). The effect of teaching child rearing skills to mothers of primary school boys having externalized disorders on their mental health and education methods. *Scientific Journal of fundamentals of Mental Health*, 2, 105-114.
- Bram, A.D, Sgerin, C.h & Gallant, S.J. (1999). A longitudinal investigation of object relations: child- rearing antecedents, stability in adulthood, and construct validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33, 159-188.
- Budhwar, L., Reeves, D & Farrell, P. (2000). Life goals as a function of social class and child rearing practices in india. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 227-245.
- Droodgar, K. (2005). Investigating the relationship between the perceived child rearing styles of parents with 14-16 years old adolescents' irrational thinking rate. MA thesis in general psychology, college of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Shahid Beheshti University.
- Etesamipour, R. (2004). Investigating and comparing cognitive styles of high school students of Jahrom in relation to child rearing styles and cultural, socio-economic situation of the family .MA thesis in general psychology, college of psychology and Educational Sciences. Al-Zahra University.
- Farokhi, N . A & Seif, A. (2005). The joint effect of learning strategies and thinking styles on comprehension of Tehran second-grade guidance school students. *Journal of Psychology and education sciences of Alameh Tabatabaee University*, 10, 13-32.
- Farzi Golfazani, M. , Mohammad Esmaeil, E. , raofian Moghadam, F. & Askari Moghadam, H. (2003). Comparing child rearing styles of mothers having children with depression, anxiety and intellectual and scientific obsession with mothers of normal children. *Research in the field of exceptional children*, 3 & 4, 245-246.
- Fatollahi, A & Hooman, H. A. (2005). Investigating being scientific, validity, reliability and application of Strenberg-Vagner thinking style for managers of higher education institutions of Tehran. *Psychology and education sciences of Alameh Tabatabaee University*, 2, 93-121.
- Gurismsek, I., Goregenti, M. (2009). Educator's beliefs and value about child rearing and education. *Procedia Social Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 957-979.
- Hossein Chari, M , Aghadelavarpour, M. & Dehghani, Y. (2007). Role of child rearing styles of parents in high school students' shyness. *Contemporary psychology* 2, 21-30.
- Imamipour, S. & Seif, A.A. (2003). Evolutional investigation of thinking styles in students and university students and their relation with creativity and academic progress. *Journal of Educational Innovations*, 3, 35-56.
- Jahanshahi, N. (2008). *Thinking styles in Education*. Kerman: Vadiat publications.
- Jamshidi Seloklu, B & Lotfian, M. (2007). Comparing cognitive style of tribal and urban guidance school students in interacting with parents' child rearing dimensions. *Innovative Educational thoughts*, 1 & 2, 21-33
- Kalantari, M , Molavi, H & Tavassoli, M. (2005). The relationship between child rearing styles and behavioral disorders of Isfahan primary school students. *Science and research in psychology in Khorasgan (Isfahan) Islamic Azad University*, 24, 59-68.
- Kaminjani, Z.& Maher, F. (2007). Comparing parents' child rearing styles of adolescents with conduct disorder and normal adolescents. *Science and research in psychology in Khorasgan (Isfahan) Islamic Azad University*, 33, 63-94.
- Khajehpour, M. & Atar, H. (2007). Comparing child rearing styles with identity styles and investigating them in girl and boy preuniversity students of the four regions of Shiraz Education. *Educational and Psychological studies of Ferdosi University*, 29, 179-197.
- Khueenejad, G , Rajaei, A. & MohebiRad,. (2007). The relation of perceived child rearing styles with girl adolscents' loneliness. *Science and Research in Psychology, Khorasgan (Isfahan) Islamic Azad University*, 34, 75-92.
- Lalifaz, A & Asgari, A.A. (2009). The ability to predict the perceived child rearing styles and demographic variables on girl students' loneliness. *Journal of fundamentals of mental health*, 37, 71-78.

- Lashkari, O. , Kadivar, P. , Farzad, V. & Daneshvarpour, Z. (2006). The relationship between thinking styles and learning approaches with academic progress. *Advances in cognitive sciences*, 2, 44-51.
- Manavipour, D. & Khorasani, B. (2005). Validity, reliability and standardization of thinking style questionnaire in university students. *Journal of education science and related fields*, Rudehen Islamic Azad University, 1, 30-87.
- Mazidi, M & Alborzi, M. (2009). Investigating the relationship between children's self-concept and parents' child rearing styles. *Innovative education thoughts of education sciences and psychology college of Al-Zahra University*, 2, 9-24.
- Mussen, P, H. Kagan, J. Huston, A.C. & Conger, J.J. (2002). *Child's growth and personality*. (translated by Mahshid Yasayee). Tehran: Mad Book.
- Pourabdoli, M , Kadivar, P & Homayooni, A. (2008). The relationship between the mother's child rearing styles and perceived child rearing with a control location and self-concept of children. *Science and Research in Psychology*, Khorasgan (Isfahan) Islamic Azad University, 37, 107-128.
- Rahmani, F , SeyedFatemi, N, Baradaran Rezaee, M, & Sedaghat, K. (2006). The relationship between educational style of parents with academic competency rate of Tabriz adolescent students in 1382. *Journal of Fundamental of mental health*, 29 and 30, 11-16.
- Rahmati, A , Etemadi, A & Mehrabi, S. (2007). Comparing girls' mental disorder rate according to parents' child rearing styles in Jiroft high schools. *Psychological studies of psychology and education sciences college*, Al-Zahra University, 4, 9-23.
- Sadeghi, M. S, & Hedari, M. (2005). Investigating the hierarchy of adolescents' value system in various child rearing styles. *Journal of Family Research*, 3, 239-254.
- Sahidi, S & Harisi, N. (2007). The relationship between child rearing styles with self-expression ability and investigating teaching plan of self-expression in students. *Contemporary psychology*, 1, 14-23.
- Seifi Gandomani, M. Y. , Kalantari Meybodi, S. & Fath, N. (2009). Typology of the family child rearing (combining mother and father child rearing style) and its impact on anxiety and depression of boy adolescents: a new approach to child rearing. *Scientific Journal of Fundamentals of Mental Health*, 3, 185-194.
- Shokri, O. , Khodae, A. , Daneshvarpour, Z. , Toolabi, S. & Fooladvand, K. (2009). Applicability of Strenberg's mental self-management theory in academic situations: thinking styles and five major traces of personality. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 4, 279-286.
- Shokuhi Yekta, M. , Parand, A. & Faghihi, A.N. (2006). A comparative study of child rearing styles. *Bi-quarterly of Islamic Education*, 3, 115-140.
- Strenberg, R.J. (2002). *Thinking styles* (translated by alaedin Etemadi Ahari, Ali Akbar Khosravi). Tehran: Dadar Publications.
- Weiqiao, F., Zhang, L. F. (2009). Are achievement motivation and thinking style related? A visit a mong Chinese university student. *Learning and Individual Difference*, 19, 299-303.
- Yusefi, F. (2007). The relationship between parents' child rearing styles with social skills and some aspects of self-concept of high school students. *Bimonthly scientific and research journal of Shahed University*, 22, 37-46.
- Zareie, E. (2009). Investigating the relationship between parents' child rearing styles with adolescents' risky behaviors based on Kelvinger scale. *Scientific Journal of Yazd Shahid Sadughi University of Medical Sciences*, 3, 220-224.
- Zhang, L. F. (2004). Do university student's thinking styles matter in their preferred teaching approaches?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 1551-1564.
- Zhang, L. F. (2006). Thinking styles and the big five personality traits revisited. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 1177-1187
- Zhang, L. F. (2007). Thinking styles and personality types revisited. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 883-894.
- Zhang, L. F. (2009). Anxiety and thinking styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 347-351.
- Zhang, L. F., Postiglione, G.A. (2007). Thinking style, Self- esteem, and socio- economic status. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 1333-1346.
- Zhang, L.F. (2002). Measuring thinking style in addition to measuring personality trails. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 445-458.