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Abstract
The present study focuses on the current scientific knowledge and literature available relating to perceived parenting styles and decision making as well as the influence of perceived parenting styles on decision making. A literature review will be done over the past decade that is from 2007 to 2017 and the articles published within those years will be systematically analyzed reviewing their emphasis, methodology, limitations and their suggestions for future research. In a broad-spectrum, it has to be noted that every individual’s behavior ability to make decisions are influenced by several factors depending on the decision types. One among those many factors is the perceived parenting style. In order to explore more into this notion it is necessary to go through the existing literatures in the field of study to wrap up the issue related to the cause and effect relationship.
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INTRODUCTION
The essence of understanding lies in narrowing down the factors that influence decision making in individuals that affects their life style and other aspects of behavior. The first and foremost behaviors are learnt from immediate family members that include parents and siblings. Parents play a significant role in influencing a child’s cognitive functions and abilities. Therefore, it is of significance to realize the role of parenting and parenting styles as well as to analyze their influence on the decision making patterns or coping patterns of individuals.

METHOD
Objectives
Through this systematic review, the studies that focused on the importance of parenting styles, decision making and the influence of parenting styles on decision making are reviewed.
Inclusion Criteria
All the studies related to parenting and decision making were collected using the electronic databases out of which only relevant studies were manually selected and sorted for the review.

Electronic Searches
The following electronic databases such as JSTOR, ProQuest (Research), EBSCO (Psychology) and significant others were used to collect the relevant studies. Only published studies were reviewed.

PERCEIVED PARENTAL AUTONOMY
Autonomy is defined as “the sense of choice and willingness one experiences when one behaves in a way that is congruent with self-endorsed values and interests” (Deci et al. 2006; Williams et al. 2006) and therefore autonomy is differentiated from independence and responsibility.

Autonomy support focuses on behaviors that involves “inquiring and acknowledging others’ feelings and perspectives, giving a meaningful rationale for a request, and maximizing people’s sense of self-initiation and choice” (Moreau & Mageau, 2011)

Moreau. E & Mageau. G (2011) studied the “importance of perceived autonomy support for the psychological health and work satisfaction of health professionals” where self-determination theory was used as the framework to study the perceived support of autonomy among supervisors and colleagues. The data collected using the Perceived Autonomy Support Scale for employees showed “that both perceived supervisors’ autonomy support and perceived colleagues’ autonomy support predict health professionals’ psychological health and work-related outcomes confirming the importance of colleagues’ perceived autonomy support as an independent predictor of health professionals’ outcomes”. (Moreau & Mageau, 2011)

Mageau et al. (2015) validated the Perceived Parental Autonomy Support Scale where they discussed about the Autonomy supportive parenting and Control parenting components. Their research stated that Control parenting was operationalized using three types of controlling behaviors towards late adolescents and young adults: (i) threats to punish (ii) guilt-inducing criticisms and (iii) performance pressures whereas the opposite pole of control parenting is autonomy supportive parenting that is operationalized as (i) acknowledging the child’s feelings (ii) giving a rationale for their own set of values (iii) giving the opportunities of choice for taking initiatives. (Mageau et al., 2015)

DECISION MAKING
L. Mann et al. (1997) conducted a study to spot the factorial validity of Flinders Decision Making Questionnaire that was used “to measure three major coping...
patterns mentioned in the conflict theory of decision making: vigilance, hypervigilance, and defensive avoidance” that consisted of “five different substantive models represented different structural relationships between the decision-coping patterns resulting in an unsatisfactory fit to the data which was not validated and further a 22- item questionnaire that comprised of for identifiable factors- vigilance, hypervigilance, buck-passing, and procrastination named the Melbourne DMQ was validated and replaced the Flinders DMQ for the measurement of decision-coping patterns”. (Mann, Burnett, Radford, & Ford, 1997)

G. Northoff et al. (2006) in their research which stated that “since affective judgment requires an interplay between affective and cognitive components, it might be considered a key process in decision making that has been linked to neural activity in ventromedial prefrontal cortex based on Damasio’s Somatic marker theory which proposed that not only cognitive but also affective components are critical for decision making”. They studied 14 healthy subjects “without any psychiatric, neurologic, or medical disease; all were right handed as assessed by the Edinburgh Inventory for Handedness and the behavioral results indicated no significant difference in reaction times between expected judgments and unexpected judgments. The study considered affective judgments to be crucial in decision-making and distinguished between affective judgment without and with preceding expectancy period, i.e., unexpected and expected affective judgment”. (Northoff et al., 2006)

According to Yates and Tschirhart (2006), decisions can be classified into:

“Choices: Where you select a subset from larger set of alternatives (e.g., selecting an automobile to purchase)

Acceptances/ rejections: A binary choice in which only one specific option is accepted or not (admission to graduate school, acceptance to a country club, issuance of automobile driver’s license)

Evaluations: Statements of worth that are backed up with commitments to act (how much are you willing to bid on a house)

Constructions: Attempts to create ideal solutions given available resources (e.g., deciding on a budget for funding a community agency). These are complex problems that entail multiple decisions”. (Yates & Tshirhart, 2006)

Hotaling, J & Busemeyer, J (2012) in their study on DFT-D model of dynamic decision making built the Decision field theory “on the fundamental principle that decisions are based on the accumulation of subjective evaluations of choice alternatives until a threshold criterion is met”. This study has discussed the utility-based models of decision making, sequential sampling approach to decision making, decision field theory, and application of DFT to decision making paradoxes followed by a new application for DFT: planning and multistage decision making. The DFT-D has provided a new investigation into dynamic decision making and planning and serves as a new tool for generating predictions and characterizing behavior across a vast expanse of under- explored decision environments. (Hotaling. & Busemeyer., 2012)
Jonassen. D (2012) considered taking decisions as “the most common kind of problem solving” and also as “important component skill in other more ill-structured and complex kinds of problem solving, including choices, acceptances, evaluations, and constructions”. His paper contrasted “the normative (rational) approaches such as decision matrices, SWOT, force field analyses, scaffold rational decision-making approaches with naturalistic approaches such as constructing stories, mental stimulations, scenarios, and arguments to decision making”. (Jonassen, 2012)

J. Duddy (2015) explored the influence of leadership style and decision making type using “the Full Range Leadership Model as the conceptual framework to determine the best leadership characteristic / style that would identify the optimum decision making type”. He stated that Oliver and Hioco (2012) developed an ethical and critical thinking framework for decision-making at the Community College level and through an analysis of ethical theories and their perspectives, concluded that “ethical theories focus on principles and reasoning, not conclusions and outcomes”. Fisher’s (2001) states:

“…six-step model for decision making: (a) know why a decision is being made, (b) consider alternative actions, (c) consider potential consequences of the alternatives, (d) consider the likelihood and value (or undesirability) of potential consequences, (e) consider alternatives and consequences in light of one’s ethical commitments, and (f) weigh the alternatives based on analysis of the consequences to make the decision”

The Fisher’s model was further expanded by Oliver and Hioco who later proposed the “nine sequential questions that guide”. (Duddy, 2015)

**CONFLICT THEORY OF DECISION MAKING**

Janis and Mann (1977) proposed the “Conflict theory of decision making”. The basic assumption of the theory was that “stress engendered by decisional conflict is the main cause of failure to achieve high-quality decision making”. There are two main sources, from which this psychological stress might arise; this includes “(i) concern about personal, material and social losses and (ii) concern over loss of reputation and self-esteem if the decision goes wrong”.

The five basic stress coping patterns of threatening decisions include:

“Unconflicted adherence: The decision maker tends to ignore the information about the risk of losses and decides to continue the existing course of action.

Unconflicted change: The decision maker tends to adopt any new course of action that is most salient or most strongly recommended.

Defensive avoidance: The decision maker escapes conflict by procrastinating, shifting responsibility to someone else, or constructing wishful rationalizations to bolster the least objectionable alternative. Each of these expressions of defensive avoidance is associated with incomplete and often biased evaluation of information, leading in turn to faulty decisions. Defensive avoidance is associated with high stress.
Hypervigilance: The decision maker searches frantically for a way out of dilemmas. Due to time pressure, the decision maker impulsively seizes upon hastily contrived solutions that seem to promise immediate relief. The full range of consequences of choices is overlooked because of emotional excitement, perseveration, and limited attention. In its more extreme form, hypervigilance is a ‘panic’-like state in which the decision maker vacillates between unpleasant alternatives. Hypervigilance is associated with severe emotional stress.

Vigilance: The decision maker clarifies objectives to be achieved by the decision, canvases an array of alternatives, searches painstakingly for relevant information, assimilates information in an unbiased manner, and evaluates alternatives carefully before making a choice. Vigilance is associated with a moderate level of psychological stress”. (Mann et al., 1997)

“According to conflict model, vigilance is the only coping pattern that allows sound and rational decision making”. (Mann et al., 1997)

CONCLUSION
Immediate family is the first form of relationships that almost all human beings experience and Parenting Styles plays a huge role in every aspect of life. One of important processes that individuals go through includes their role as decision makers by taking decisions. Through this we could understand the gap that researches are yet to fill in terms of parenting styles and decision making patterns and thus improve the scope of future research with respect to the integrations of two core principles that influence each other.
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