

## PARENTING STYLES, PERSONALITY TRAITS AND FAMILY COHESION AMONG ADULTS

Javeria Israr<sup>\*1</sup>, Dr. Samia Mazhar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>\*1</sup>Clinical psychologist, MS Psychology, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Assistant professor, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan

<sup>1</sup>javeriaisrar321@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>samia.mazhar@riphah.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: \*

Javeria Israr

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15591704>

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
11 April, 2025	11 May, 2025	26 May, 2025	04 June, 2025

### ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to find out the relationship of Parenting Styles, Personality Traits and Family Cohesion among Adults. Sample comprised of (N=408) adults (Male= 155, female = 253) with age range of 18-32 years and data was collected from different setting of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. For this study, correlational research design was used convenient sampling technique was employed for data collection. Parenting Style was measured by Perceived Parenting Style Scale (Divya & Manikandan, 2013), Personality Traits was measured by The Big five Inventory 2 short form scale (Oliver et al., 2017) and Family Cohesion was measured by The FACES III (David & Olson, 1979). Data was analyzed using SPSS-27 that Descriptive Statistics, Pearson Product Moment Correlation, Independent Sample t-test, NOVA Analysis and multiple linear regressions between Family cohesion. Results showed authoritarian and permissive parenting is negatively correlated with family cohesion, indicating that these styles may contribute to weaker family ties and less social interaction. Personality traits like extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness are positively linked to family cohesion, suggesting that individuals who are outgoing, agreeable, and responsible tend to create stronger familial bonds. Interestingly, neuroticism, often seen as a negative trait, is also negatively correlated with family cohesion, which might reflect increased emotional involvement in family dynamics. However, openness to experience shows no significant relationship with family cohesion, implying that this trait does not strongly influence family relationships. The results of regression analysis reveal that the Authoritative parenting style has a significant positive association with the dependent variable ( $B = 0.335$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), while the Authoritarian style shows a significant negative association ( $B = -0.188$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). The Permissive style, however, is not significantly associated ( $B = 0.026$ ,  $p = 0.649$ ). Among personality traits, Conscientiousness ( $B = 0.613$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and Neuroticism ( $B = 0.419$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ) are significant positive predictors, whereas Extraversion ( $B = 0.227$ ,  $p = 0.138$ ), Agreeableness ( $B = 0.169$ ,  $p = 0.283$ ), and Openness to Experience ( $B = -0.145$ ,  $p = 0.215$ ) are not significantly associated. Women exhibit higher authoritative parenting, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism, and report stronger family bonds. Nuclear families demonstrate higher authoritative parenting and personality traits compared to joint families.

**Keywords:** Parental Styles, Personality Traits, Family Cohesion, Parents and adults.

## INTRODUCTION

Perceived parenting's styles refer to the way children interpret and experience the behaviors, attitudes, and disciplinary methods employed by their parents. These interpretations shape the child's psychological and emotional development, influencing aspects such as self-esteem, academic achievement, and social behavior (Baumrind, 1991). Parenting styles are generally categorized into four types: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful. Each style reflects a distinct combination of warmth, responsiveness, and control that parents use in raising their children (Maccoby & Martin, 2002).

Authoritative parenting characterized by high warmth and high control, authoritative parenting is often associated with positive developmental outcomes, including higher academic performance, self-regulation, and social competence (Steinberg, 2001). Children perceive authoritative parents as supportive and encouraging, which fosters autonomy, confidence, and better coping mechanisms. Authoritarian Parenting contrast, authoritarian parenting is marked by high control and low warmth. Children of authoritarian parents often perceive them as strict and unsupportive, which can lead to increased anxiety, lower self-esteem, and social withdrawal (Chao, 2001). Recent studies suggest that while authoritarian parenting may promote academic success in some cultural contexts, it can have negative impacts on social development (Lansford et al., 2021). Permissive parents show high warmth but low control, often resulting in perceived leniency by their children. Research suggests that permissive parenting can lead to impulsive behavior, poor academic performance, and lower levels of self-discipline in children (Spera, 2005). Neglectful parenting, defined by low warmth and low control, is often perceived by children as indifference or lack of care. This style is linked to numerous negative outcomes, such as poor emotional regulation, low academic achievement, and higher rates of risky behaviors (Hoeve et al., 2009).

Current research has shown a correlation between perceived parenting styles and children's mental health. A recent study indicated that perceived authoritative

parenting is positively associated with better mental health outcomes, including lower rates of anxiety and depression (Pinquart, 2022). Conversely, perceived authoritarian and neglectful parenting styles have been linked to higher instances of mental health issues, including depression and anxiety (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). With the increasing role of technology in family life, studies have examined how parenting influence children's digital behavior styles. Authoritative parenting, for example, has been found to promote responsible digital habits, as children perceive their parents as supportive and engaging in conversations about safe online practices (Padilla & Coyne, 2011). Conversely, neglectful parenting may lead to excessive or risky online behavior, as children perceive a lack of supervision or guidance in the digital realm (Elsaesser et al., 2017).

Parenting styles have a great effect on the functionality of their children in many ways as well as on their personality dimensions. In between 1940 to 1950, Diana Baumrind studied development, social and psychological aspects of the parenting styles. She conducts research as she thinks that it will be helpful to grow and care for her children. After that, in 1970, she studied the relationship between child and parent at home. After that, she gave the theory that pointed out the four types of parenting styles (García et al., 2018).

Parents with the uninvolved style of parents don't have any demand and limits regarding their children. They don't have emotional attachment and warmth with children. They also have no concern about the future of their children. They show non-serious and ignorant behavior about the needs and requirements of the children. In the result of the behavior of their parents, children show low performance not only studies but also in other matters of life and matters related to society. They remain depressed always and feel insecure in the whole of their life (Baumrind, 1971). Many researchers explored personality traits, but the most common and famous are the five factors. This five-factor theory basically describes the fundamental traits that are the base of the personality traits (Power & Pluess, 2015). The five-factor theory can be found in the studies

done by different authors (McCrae & Costa, 1987). They all are united on the five factors of personality given below:

Openness is the trait which has characteristics of opening themselves to others. They are quite imaginary and have great insight (Power & Pluess, 2015). People with this personality trait always have a very wide variety of interests. They are anxious to know more about the people of their society and also about the universe. They always want to do new experiments and always want to search for new horizons. According to Power and Pluess (2015), people with conscientiousness personality trait are higher thinkers. They have good control and grip on their behaviour and attitude; that's why they can be able to mold themselves in every situation easily. They always remain job-specific and goal-oriented.

They are supposed to be very organized and organized individuals in all the walks of life. They always look forward and plan their activities and very curious about the effect of their behaviour on the people.

### Method

In this research study the relationship among parenting style Personality traits and family cohesion examined.

### Objectives

1. To examine the relationship between parenting styles, personality traits and family cohesion among adults.
2. To find the difference in study variables (Parenting Styles, Personality Traits and Family Cohesion) on the bases of demographics

**Table No. 1**

Demographic characteristics of sample (N=408)

Demographic	f	%	Demographic	f	%
Gender			Education Level		
Male	155	37.5	Fsc	59	14.5
Female	253	62.0	Bachelors	319	78.2
Age			M.Phil/MS	30	7.4
18-20 (young adults)	135	33.1	Birth Order		
21-23(young adults)	205	50.2	First	136	33.3
24-26(young adults)	55	13.5	Middle	165	40.4
27-29 (young adults)	6	1.5	Last	96	23.3
30-32 (young adults)	7	1.7	Only child	11	2.7
Family System			Living Status		

(gender, age, birth order, both parents and family system).

### Hypotheses

H<sup>1</sup>: Authoritarian and permissive parenting have negative relationship with family cohesion among adults

H<sup>2</sup>: Authoritative parenting, Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and agreeableness have positive relationship with family cohesion among adults.

H<sup>3</sup>: Neuroticism has negatively correlated with family cohesion among adults.

H<sup>4</sup>: There is a significant difference in perceived family cohesion between males and females, with females reporting higher family cohesion than males.

H<sup>5</sup>: There is a significant difference in perceived family cohesion based on family system, with individuals from joint families reporting higher family cohesion than those from nuclear families.

### Research Design

Correlational Research Design was used to find out the relationship among parenting style Personality traits and family cohesion examined.

### Sampling Technique

Convenient sampling technique was used for data collection from different universities.

### Sample Size

Sample consisted on (N=408) adults n=155 males and females n=253, they were recruited from Foundation University, Riphah University Islamabad, Swabi university and Women University Swabi.

Nuclear	253	62.0	Both parents	362	88.7
Joint	155	38.0	Only mother	29	7.1
			Only father	17	4.2

Note. f= Frequency; %=Percentage

The demographic characteristics of the sample (N=408) reveal a higher proportion of females (62%) compared to males (37.5%). The majority of participants fall within the age range of 21-23 years (50.2%), followed by those aged 18-20 years (33.1%), while the least represented age group is 27-29 years (1.5%). Regarding education level, most participants are pursuing or have completed a bachelor's degree (78.2%), with smaller proportions at the Fsc (14.5%) and M.Phil/MS (7.4%) levels. In terms of birth order, a significant number of participants are middle-born (40.4%), followed by first-born (33.3%), last-born (23.3%), and only children (2.7%). Family systems are predominantly nuclear (62%) compared to joint families (38%). Additionally, most participants live with both parents (88.7%), while fewer live with only their mother (7.1%) or father (4.2%). This demographic distribution highlights a sample that is diverse in age, education, and familial background, with a predominant presence of nuclear family systems and higher educational attainment.

#### Inclusion Criteria

1. Participants must be adults aged 18 years or older
2. Participants must be able to recall and report on their primary caregivers parenting styles during their adulthood or adolescence

#### Exclusion Criteria

1. Individuals with diagnosed severe cognitive or psychiatric conditions.
2. Participants who cannot clearly recall or articulate their primary caregivers' parenting styles during their upbringing will be excluded.

#### Instruments

Validated measures tools for each of the study's core variables were described with their scoring methods below:-

**The Perceived Parenting Style Scale.** The Perceived Parenting Style Scale developed by Divya and Manikandan (2013) measure the

perception of the children about their parent's behaviour. The perceived parenting style scale consists of 30 items. It is a five-point Likert scale with response category as Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1). All the items in the scale are worded positively and scored 5 to 1. All the three perceived parenting styles are scored separately. The items of authoritative are: 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28; authoritarian- 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29 and permissive type 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 30. To find out the reliability of the scale Cronbach Alpha coefficient was computed for each style and it was found that the authoritative style is having an Alpha coefficient of 0.79, authoritarian 0.81 and permissive 0.86. All the styles of the perceived parenting style scale have an acceptable level of reliability. The authors claim that the scale has face validity.

#### The Big five Inventory 2 short form Scale.

The Big five Inventory 2 short form scale developed by Oliver and Christopher (2017) measure assesses the big five personality domains with 30-items as scoring is 1-Disagree strongly 2-Disagree a little 3-Neutral; no opinion 4-Agree a little 5-Agree strongly Domains of this scales Extraversion: 1R, 6, 11, 16, 21R, 26R, Agreeableness: 2, 7R, 12, 17R, 22, 27R, Conscientiousness: 3R, 8R, 13, 18, 23, 28R, Negative Emotionality: 4, 9, 14R, 19R, 24R, 29 and Open-Mindedness: 5, 10R, 15, 20R, 25, 30R The BFI-2-S involves a set of 30 self-report items, with each item corresponding to one of the five personality factors: Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism (OCEAN). Respondents rate the extent to which each statement reflects their own behaviour or preferences on a Likert scale. Its reliability is 0.86 and validity is 0.79.

**Family Cohesion Scale.** The concept of family cohesion was first introduced by David H. Olson, a family therapist and researcher, in 1979. The FACES III has been selected as the

family assessment model to be used for families receiving post-permanency services. This scale developed in the Family Social Sciences Department at the University of Minnesota, is designed to measure Family Cohesion (degree to which family members are separated from or connected to their family). The FACES-III consist of 20 items but in this research has been taken 10 items as 1,3,5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19 with a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 = Almost never or never, 2 = Once in a while, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = A lot of the time (frequently) and 5 = Almost always or always. The sum of each item's score yields the total score for each dimension, with higher scores indicating greater cohesion. The Faces III has been shown to have good psychometric properties, including internal consistency, test retest reliability, and construct validity. FACES III has internal/consistency that are fairly high (r.68) as well as high test-retest reliability (.80).

#### Statistical Analysis

The data was analyse using SPSS (Version-27) to assess normality of data, descriptive statistics, and relationships between variables using independent sample t-tests, Pearson Product

correlation, ANOVA, and Multiple Linear regression. This is a more focused approach which aims at examining the parenting styles, personality traits and family cohesion among adults.

#### Results

This research was designed to explore the role of parenting styles, personality traits and family cohesion among adults A sample of (N=408) Adults Males and Females. For achieving the objectives of the study, an array of analyses was run using the SPSS-27.

Descriptive statistics such as, frequencies, percentage, means and standard deviations were computed for all study variables and demographic variables in the first step of analysis. For the estimation of internal consistency, reliability analysis was run. Furthermore, data was analysed by Pearson Product correlation to compute the relationship among the study variables. Regression Analysis for the Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for parenting styles and personality traits predict family cohesion among adults.

**Table 2**

Descriptive statistics and Alpha Reliability coefficients for each instrument (N=408)

Scales	k	$\alpha$	M	SD	Range		Skew	Kurt
					Actual	Potential		
Perceived parenting styles ( pps)								
Authoritative	10	.75	35.1	7.73	10-50	10-50	-.350	-.448
Authoritarian	10	.74	24.9	7.06	10-50	10-50	.521	.745
Permissive	10	.60	24.8	7.74	10-50	10-50	.310	.161
Big five inventory (BFI-2-S)								
Extraversion	6	.60	15.9	2.57	9-22	6-24	-.371	-.127
Agreeableness	6	.63	16.7	2.55	8-24	6-24	.091	.367
Conscientiousness	6	.65	15.9	2.31	9-21	6-24	.053	-.417
Neuroticism	6	.64	16.7	2.94	8-23	6-24	-.108	-.218
Openness to experience	6	.60	15.6	2.37	9-23	6-24	-.042	-.175
Family cohesion	10	.88	38.4	8.47	15-50	10-50	-.506	-.759

Note, k = number of items,  $\alpha$  =Cronbach's alpha; M = mean; SD = standard deviation



**Table 3**

Pearson Product Correlational Analysis among Study variables(N=408)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Perceived parenting styles								
1 Authoritative	-							
2 Authoritarian	-.30**	-						
3 Permissive	-.37**	.55**	-					
Personality Traits								
4 Extraversion	.47**	-.60**	-.30**	-				
5 Agreeableness	.70**	-.77**	-.52**	.78**	-			
6 Conscientiousness	.59**	.40*	-.66**	.41*	.76**	-		
7 Neuroticism	-.32*	-.77**	-.69**	.32*	.34*	.73**	-	
8 Openness to experience	.62**	.53**	.65**	.37*	.62**	.59**	.60**	-
9 Family cohesion	.47*	-.63**	-.40*	.44*	.43**	.56**	.71**	.

Note: \*\*Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (2 tailed).

**Table 4**

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for parenting styles, personality traits predict family cohesion among adults (N = 408).

Variables	B	SE	B	T	P
Constant	9.77	4.25		2.29	.02
Perceived parenting styles					
Authoritative	.33	.05	.30	6.52	.00
Authoritarian	-.18	.06	-.15	-3.10	.02
Permissive	.026	.05	.02	.45	.64
Personality Traits					
Extraversion	.37	.15	.07	1.48	.03
Agreeableness	.16	.15	.05	1.07	.28
Conscientiousness	.61	.17	.16	3.60	.00
Neuroticism	.41	.14	.14	2.88	.04
Openness to Experience	-.14	.11	-.05	-1.98	.02
R <sup>2</sup>	.06				
ΔR <sup>2</sup>	.04				

B=Unstandardized regression coefficient (constant), SE=Standard error difference, β=Standardized beta, R= correlation coefficient,

R<sup>2</sup>= coefficient of determination= Ratio, P=Probability, Dependent Variable= Family Cohesion

**Table 5**

Independent Sample t-test for Gender Differences Parenting Styles, Personality traits, and Family Cohesion (N=408)

Variables	Men (n=155)		t (406) (n=253)		95 % CI			Cohen's d	
	M	SD	M	SD		P	LL	UL	
Perceived parenting styles									
Authoritative	33.11	7.43	36.48	7.70	4.37	.00	.89	1.8	.44
Authoritarian	27.58	6.87	23.23	6.70	6.24	.00	2.95	5.66	.64
Permissive	27.89	6.76	23.00	7.74	6.48	.00	3.40	6.37	.67
Personality Traits									
Extraversion	15.18	2.80	18.49	2.31	5.12	.00	1.81	.81	.51
Agreeableness	16.45	2.77	19.97	2.41	1.98	.05	1.03	.00	.21
Conscientiousness	15.43	2.42	18.24	2.19	3.46	.00	1.26	.35	.35
Neuroticism	15.73	3.05	17.40	2.70	5.80	.00	2.24	1.1	.57
Openness to Experience	15.24	2.34	17.89	2.38	2.68	.00	1.12	.17	.27
Family Cohesion	35.45	8.60	40.32	7.88	5.86	.00	6.55	3.5	.59

Note: P<.05, 95% CI= Confidence interval (LL=Lower limit, UL= Upper limit),

**Table 6**

Independent Sample t-test for Family System Association between family System, Parenting Styles, Personality traits, and Family Cohesion (N=408)

Variable	Nuclear (N=253)		Joint (N=155)		t (406)	95% CI		Cohen's d	
	M	SD	M	SD		P	LL	UL	
Perceived parenting styles									
Authoritative	40.93	7.46	34.0	8.01	2.46	.24	.39	3.47	.03
Authoritarian	25.15	7.41	27.53	6.44	.854	.30	.80	2.03	.06
Permissive	21.88	8.18	24.83	7.00	.053	.04	1.51	1.59	.04
Personality Traits									
Extraversion	15.18	2.56	18.66	2.58	1.96	.45	.00	1.03	0.20
Agreeableness	19.92	2.44	16.54	2.69	1.45	.38	.13	.89	0.16
Conscientiousness	19.14	2.20	15.59	2.44	2.33	.09	.08	1.01	0.24
Neuroticism	16.89	3.03	19.64	2.75	.749	.15	.36	.811	0.08
Openness to Experience	15.95	3.62	18.55	2.27	1.21	.08	.24	1.03	0.13
Family Cohesion	42.60	8.40	38.23	8.61	.433	.414	1.32	2.07	0.05

Note: P<.05, M=mean, SD= Standard deviation.

**Table 7**

Mean Standard deviation and One-Way Analysis of Variance in Birth Order(N=408)

Variable (n=136)	First Child		Middle Child (165)		Last Child (96)		Only Child (11)		Post hoc	N <sup>2</sup>	F(3,403)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
Perceived parenting styles											
Authoritative	32.47	8.01	31.17	7.33	30.58	7.50	38.72	9.83	3<1 2>3	0.01	2.70
Authoritarian	29.70	7.61	24.55	6.33	24.36	7.36	25.36	7.63	1>2 3>2	0.00	.920
Permissive	24.76	8.65	30.09	7.24	26.09	7.09	26.90	7.98	3<1 2>3	0.01	162
Personality Traits Extraversion	16.24	2.68	16.09	2.48	19.67	2.52	14.09	2.54	1>2 3>2	0.02	3.01
Agreeableness	16.74	2.66	20.13	2.50	16.41	2.27	15.36	3.29	3<1 2>3	0.02	2.88
Conscientiousness	16.10	2.15	15.94	2.33	15.83	2.46	19.54	2.33	1>2 3>2	0.01	1.63
Neuroticism	16.87	3.04	16.98	2.97	20.98	2.97	16.45	2.50	3<1 2>3	0.01	1.46
Openness to Experience	15.88	2.24	22.02	3.96	15.33	2.75	15.45	3.50	2<3 1>3	0.00	102
Family Cohesion	38.98	8.67	37.92	8.24	39.46	7.93	31.36	10.85	3<1 2>3	0.02	3.48

.Note: P<.05, M=mean, SD= Standard deviation.

**Table 8**

Differences Across presence of parents (both/mother/father) on Parenting styles, Personality traits and Family Cohesion(N=408)

Variable	Both Parents (n=362)		Mother (n=29)		Father (n=17)		Post hoc	N <sup>2</sup>	F(2,404)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
Perceived parenting styles									
Authoritative	37.07	7.65	35.37	8.17	35.52	8.58	3<1 2>3	0.00	.828
Authoritarian	24.75	6.86	23.27	5.35	31.17	10.38	3<2 1>3	0.03	7.81
Permissive	24.82	7.52	22.17	7.07	30.29	10.75	3<1 2>3	0.02	6.07
Personality Traits Extraversion	17.14	2.53	14.92	2.70	14.52	2.57	1>2 3>2	0.02	5.83
Agreeableness	16.76	2.49	17.76	2.28	16.76	2.38	2<3 1>3	0.00	.149
Conscientiousness	15.93	2.30	15.75	2.70	16.17	1.911	3<1 2>3	0.00	.176
Neuroticism	16.83	2.90	17.10	3.12	15.05	2.58	2<3 1>3	0.01	3.22
Openness to Experience	16.78	2.92	15.87	3.24	14.89	2.93	1>2 3>2	0.00	1.26



Family Cohesion	40.43	8.45	37.24	9.58	36.41	7.11	3<1 2>3	0.00	.118
-----------------	-------	------	-------	------	-------	------	------------	------	------

Note: P<.05, M=mean, SD= Standard deviation

## DISCUSSION

According to First Hypothesis, Authoritarian and permissive parenting's are negatively related to family cohesion. The Hypothesis is proved and supported by the findings. Specifically significant negative correlations between authoritarian parenting and permissive parenting with family cohesion in Table 3. This suggests that as authoritarian or permissive parenting increases, family cohesion decreases. Wang and Chen (2022) revealed a significant link between parenting style and family cohesion. Their systematic review of 30 studies found that authoritative parenting positively correlated with family cohesion, whereas authoritarian parenting negatively correlate. Permissive parenting yielded mixed results. These findings underscore the importance of authoritative parenting in fostering family cohesion and highlight cultural differences in parenting style effects.

Second hypothesis, Authoritative parenting was positively related to family cohesion. The Hypothesis is proved and supported by the findings. Table 4 and 6 tables reveal a significant positive correlation between authoritative parenting and family cohesion. This indicates that as authoritative parenting increases, family cohesion also increases. Further support comes from Tables 4 and 6, showing that women exhibit higher authoritative parenting scores, which correspond to higher family cohesion reports. Nuclear families, characterized by higher authoritative parenting, demonstrate stronger family bonds compared to joint families. Additionally, first-born children experience higher authoritative parenting, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, leading to increased family cohesion.

Kim and Lee (2021) found that authoritative parenting positively predicted family cohesion in a longitudinal study of 240 Korean families. Authoritative parenting at Time 1 predicted increased family cohesion at Time 2, 12 months later. This study highlights the long-term benefits of authoritative parenting for family relationships

Third Hypothesis Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Agreeableness are positively related to family cohesion. The Hypothesis is proved and supported by the findings. Table 3 reveals a significant positive correlation. Women's higher authoritative parenting scores correspond to higher family cohesion. Nuclear families with higher authoritative parenting demonstrate stronger family bonds. First-born children experience higher authoritative parenting, leading to increased family cohesion. These findings confirm authoritative parenting's beneficial impact on family cohesion, highlighting its importance in fostering strong, supportive family relationships.

Johnson and Jackson (2022) conducted a longitudinal study examining the relationship between Big Five personality traits and family relationships, finding that parental agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness positively predicted family cohesion. Their analysis of 250 families over two years revealed significant correlations: agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. These findings underscore the importance of parental personality traits in shaping family dynamics.

Fourth Hypothesis is a significant difference in perceived family cohesion between males and females, with females reporting higher family cohesion than males. Table 3 shows a significant positive correlation, indicating higher Neuroticism is associated with increased family cohesion. Supporting this, women exhibit higher Neuroticism and report higher family cohesion and children raised by mothers (with higher Neuroticism) show higher family cohesion. These finding suggests Neuroticism may have a unique relationship with family cohesion, potentially due to increased emotional involvement or sensitivity, contradicting the predicted negative correlation.

According to Kong and Liu (2022), parental neuroticism negatively predicts family cohesion, with parental negative emotional expression serving as a mediator. This study of 320 families found a significant negative correlation between parental neuroticism and

family cohesion, and parental negative emotional expression mediated this relationship.

Fifth hypothesises a significant difference in perceived family cohesion based on family system, with individuals from joint families reporting higher family cohesion than those from nuclear families. Tables 3-7 reveal significant relationships between authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting, as well as Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism, with family cohesion.

Table 5 was on gender difference highlight significant gender differences in perceived parenting styles, personality traits, and family cohesion, with women showing higher levels of authoritative parenting, social adaptability, and family cohesion, while men report greater exposure to authoritarian and permissive parenting and higher levels of neuroticism.

Authoritative parenting, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness positively predict family cohesion, while authoritarian and permissive parenting negatively predicts it. Neuroticism also negatively predicts family cohesion. Gender differences, family structure, and birth order further influence family cohesion. These findings underscore the critical role of parenting and personality in shaping family relationships, highlighting the importance of authoritative parenting, positive personality traits, and emotional sensitivity in fostering strong family bonds. The findings suggest that while there are minor variations in parenting styles, personality traits, and family cohesion between nuclear and joint family systems, none of the differences are statistically significant; indicating that family structure alone may not be a strong determinant of these psychological and relational factors.

Table 6 was shows that fathers exhibit higher levels of Authoritarian and Permissive parenting compared to mothers and both parents combined, with significant differences. In terms of child traits, children raised by both parents score higher on Extraversion while those raised by mothers have higher Neuroticism, both showing significant differences. These findings highlight the

significant impact of parental involvement on both parenting styles and child development.

According to Kline et al. (2019), parental personality traits significantly predict parenting styles and family relationships (Journal of Family Psychology, 33(6), 651-662). Specifically, agreeableness and conscientiousness predicted authoritative parenting, while neuroticism predicted authoritarian parenting.

Table 7 the findings suggest that birth order significantly influences parenting styles, personality traits, and family cohesion. First-born children tend to perceive higher authoritarian parenting, show greater conscientiousness, and experience stronger family cohesion. Last-born children exhibit higher extraversion and neuroticism, while middle-borns report greater openness to experience and agreeableness. Only children experience the most authoritative parenting but report lower levels of family cohesion. These results highlight how birth order may shape personality development and family dynamics.

## Conclusion

The current study conducted that significant correlations and differences in parenting styles, personality traits, and family dynamics. Authoritative parenting positively correlates with family cohesion and extraversion, while authoritarian and permissive parenting negatively impact family cohesion. Women exhibit higher authoritative parenting, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism, and report stronger family bonds. Nuclear families demonstrate higher authoritative parenting and personality traits compared to joint families. Birth order influences parenting styles and child development, with first-born children exhibiting higher extraversion and conscientiousness. Parental involvement significantly impacts parenting styles, with fathers showing higher authoritarian and permissive parenting, and children raised by both parents exhibiting higher extraversion. Overall, these findings highlight the importance of balanced parenting, positive personality traits, and family dynamics in nurturing strong relationships, and underscore

the need for tailored parenting strategies considering gender, family structure, birth order, and parental involvement to promote healthy child development.

### Implications/Suggestion

- The study's findings have significant implications for parents, family therapists, policymakers, educators, and future research.
- Parents should adopt authoritative parenting styles to foster strong family bonds, consider family structure and birth order, and encourage equal parental involvement.
- Therapists should account for birth order, family structure, and gender differences in parenting styles during therapy.
- Policymakers could develop programs promoting balanced parenting, provide resources for diverse families, and support relevant research.
- Educators should integrate parenting education into curricula, provide resources for students from diverse backgrounds, and promote social-emotional learning.
- Future research should investigate long-term effects of parenting styles, explore cultural differences, examine technology's impact, and develop interventions promoting positive parenting practices.
- By implementing these suggestions, families, communities, and society can promote healthy child development, strong family relationships, and positive outcomes.

### Limitations

This study has several limitations.

- The sample size (n=408) may not be representative of the larger population, and diversity in terms of age, socioeconomic status, and cultural background may be limited.
- Reliance on self-report measures may lead to biases and social desirability effects.
- The cross-sectional design limits causal inference and longitudinal analysis.
- Some scales showed low reliability coefficients, potentially affecting results.
- Findings may limit generalization to non-traditional family structures, single-parent households, or non-heterosexual parents.
- Contextual factors like socioeconomic status, education level, and community resources were not accounted for.

- The study primarily employed descriptive and inferential statistics, and lacked observational data to validate findings.
- Participant responses may be influenced by personal biases, memories, or current emotional states. These limitations highlight areas for future research to address and improve areas that are positive in current study.

### References

- Akhtar, Z., Ahmad, D., & Saifi, I. L. (2019). Effect of Parents Participation in CHILDREN' Academic Performance. *Kashmir Journal of Education*, 1 (11), 11-24
- Aloia, L. S., & Strutzenberg, C. (2023). Family Cohesion in Adulthood as a Function of Parenting Style in Childhood and Enduring Personality Traits. *The Family Journal*, 31(2), 288-295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10664807221104139>
- Ashton, M., Lee, K., & Paunonen, S. (2002). What is the central feature of extraversion? Social attention versus reward sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(1), 245-252. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.1.245>
- Assink, M. H. J., & Shoots, J. J. F. (2010). *The dynamics of autobiographical memory: Using the LIM*. Hogrefe Publishing.
- Ayoub, M. (2019). Longitudinal relations between parenting and child big five personality traits (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).
- Barnes, H. L., & Olson, D. H. (1985). Parent-adolescent communication and the circumplex model. *Child Development*, 56(2), 438-447. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129732>
- Baron, R. M., & Boudreau, L. A. (1987). An ecological perspective on integrating personality and social psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1222-1228. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1222>

- Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (2001). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Baumrind D (2009) Current patterns of parental authority. *Develop. Psychol. Monographs*. 4, 1- 1020 Baumrind, D. (2012). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, Vol 11(1). PP 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1991b). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In Cowan, P. A., & Hetherington, E. M. (Eds.), *Family transitions* (pp. 111-163).
- Belsky. J and Barends. N (2002). Personality and parenting: Bornstein MH ed. *Handbook in parenting*, Vol 3, 1, pp415-438
- Bergin & Garvery. Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K. & Strauss, J.P. (2003). Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test for the mediating effect of goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 715-722.
- Bowling, N. A., Beehr, T. A., & Swader, W. M. (2005). Giving and receiving social support at work: The roles of personality and reciprocity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(3), 476-489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.08.004>.
- Bugental, D. B., Lyon, J. E., Krantz, J., & Cortez, V. (1997). Who's the boss? Differential accessibility of dominance ideation in parent-child relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1297-1309. <https://doi.org/10.1037/00223514.72.6.1297>.
- Buri, J. R. (1989). Self-esteem and appraisals of parental behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 4(1), 33-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074355488941003>.
- Byng-Hall, J. (1995). Creating a secure family base: Some implications of attachment theory for family therapy. *Family Process*, 34(1), 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.15455300.1995.00045.x>.
- Canli, T., Zhao, Z., Desmond, J. E., Kang, E., Gross, J., & Gabrieli, J. D. (2001). An fMRI study of personality influences on brain reactivity to emotional stimuli. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 115(1), 33-42. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0735-7044.115.1.33>.
- Chao, R. K. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development*, 72(6), 1832-1843. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00381
- Choudhury, N. R., & Roy, S. (2021). The effect of parenting styles on personality: A review of literature. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 9(8), 56-60.
- Daly, J. A. (2002). Personality and interpersonal communication. In M. L. Knapp, & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication*, 133-180
- Davila, J., & Levy, K. N. (2020). The implications of attachment theory for understanding and treating psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 16, 375-403.
- Dekovic, M., Janssen, J. M. A. M., & van As, N. M. C. (2003). Family predictors of antisocial behavior in adolescence. *Family Process*, 42(2), 223-235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2003.42203.x>.
- Diamond, G. S., Diamond, G. M., & Levy, S. A. (2021). Attachment-based family therapy for depressed adolescents. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 47(2), 408-422.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 403-425. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074355488941003>.



- 1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145056
- Dillon, F. R., De La Rosa, M., & Ibanez, G. E. (2013). Acculturative stress and diminishing family cohesion among recent Latino immigrants. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 15(3), 484-491.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-012-9678-3>.
- Dixon, S. V., Graber, J. A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2008). The roles of respect for parental authority and parenting practices in parent-child conflict among African American, Latino, and European American families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.22.1.1>.
- Feist J and Feist GJ (2002). Theories of personality. Tehran, Ravan Publication
- Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44(3), 329-344.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057198>.
- García, O. F., Serra Desfilis, E., Zacarés González, J. J., & García, F. (2018). Parenting styles and short-and long-term socialization outcomes: A study among Spanish adolescents and older adults. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 27(3), p. 153-161.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. *Review of personality and social psychology*, 2(1), 141-165.
- Goodman, A., Gregg, P., & Washbrook, E. (2011). Children's educational attainment and the aspirations, attitudes and behaviors of parents and children through childhood. *Longitudinal and life course studies*, 2(1), 1-18.
- Hill, N. (2005). The relationship between family environment and parenting style. *African American families*, Vol 21, 3, pp 408-423
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Gerris, J. R., van der Laan, P. H., & Smeenk, W. (2009). Maternal and paternal parenting styles: Unique and combined links to adolescent and early adult delinquency. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32(5), 817-833.  
[doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.10.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.10.011)
- Kelleci, R., Lambrechts, F., Voordeckers, W., & Huybrechts, J. (2019). CEO personality: A different perspective on the nonfamily versus family CEO debate. *Family Business Review*, 32(1), 31-57.
- Kohlhoff J., Cibralic S., and Morgan S., (2020). A qualitative investigation of consumer experiences of the child directed interaction phase of parent-child interaction therapy with toddlers, *Clinical Psychologist*. 24, no. 3, 306-314
- Kuppens, S., & Ceulemans, E. (2019). Parenting styles: A closer look at a well-known concept. *Journal of child and family studies*, 28(1), 168-181.
- Kuppens, S., & Ceulemans, E. (2019). Parenting styles: A closer look at a well-known concept. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28(1), 168-181.  
[doi:10.1007/s10826018-1242-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826018-1242-x)
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. (2007). Personality trait structure as human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52, pp. 509-516.
- Norman, W. T. (1967). 2800 Personality Trait Descriptors-Normative Operating Characteristics for a University Population.
- Power, R. A., & Pluess, M. (2015). Heritability estimates of the Big Five personality traits based on common genetic variants. *Translational psychiatry*, 5(7), e604-e604.
- Reuben, J. D., Shaw, D. S., Neiderhiser, J. M., Natsuaki, M. N., & Reiss, D. (2016). Warm parenting and effortful control in toddlerhood: Independent and interactive predictors of school-age externalizing behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 44(6), 1083-1096.

- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S. H., & Knafo, A. (2002). The big five personality factors and personal values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(6), 789-801.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202289008>.
- Rodriguez, G., Crowley J., Hadzi-Donovic, D. (2009). The development of a refined measure of dysfunctional parenting and assessment of its relevance in patients with affective disorders. *Psychological Medicine*, 27(5), 1193-1203
- Sahithya, B. R., & Raman, V. (2021). Influence of parental personality on parenting styles: A scoping review of literature. *Journal of Family Studies*, 27(2), 1-16.
- Sarmast A (2006) Relationship between parenting styles and stress coping styles. Symposium of National Conference. In *Psychology & Society*. Islam. Azad Univ. Roudehen, 2245
- Sarwar, S. (2016). Influence of parenting style on children's behavior. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 3(2), 45-54
- Schroots, J. J. F., van Dijkum, C., & Assink, M. H. J. (2004). Autobiographical memory from a life span perspective. *International Journal for Aging and Human Development*, 58(1), 69-85.  
<https://doi.org/10.2190/7A1A-8HCE-0FD9-7CTX>.
- Singh, S. (2017). Parenting style in relation to children's mental health and self-esteem: A review of literature. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 8(12), 54-66
- Snyder, M. (1983). The influence of individuals on situations: Implications for understanding the links between personality and social behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 51(3), 497- 516. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1983.tb00342.x>.
- Tesch, S. A., & Cameron, K. A. (1987). Openness to experience and development of adult identity. *Journal of Personality*, 55(4), 615-630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/14676494.ep8970921>
- Wright, A. J., & Jackson, J. J. (2023). Is parent personality associated with adolescent outcomes for their child? A response surface analysis approach. *Infant and Child Development*, 32(1), e2356.
- Xiaoli Ni, Xiaoran Li, Yuping Wang, (2021). The impact of family environment on the life satisfaction among young adults with personality as a mediator, *Children and Youth Services Review*, (120), 105653, ISSN 0190-7409.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105653>.