

Role of Parenting Style and Parents' Education in Positive Youth Development of Adolescents

Kiadarbandsari, A.^{1*}, Madon, Z.¹, Hamsan, H. H.² and Mehdihezad Nouri, K.¹

¹Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

²Department of Social and Development Sciences, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this research is to determine the role of parenting style and educational level of parents in Positive Youth Development (PYD). Data were obtained using a questionnaire method involving 496 adolescent students of national secondary schools in Selangor. The findings indicate that there is a significant difference between the means for different races in PYD. This study also revealed that authoritative parenting styles, uninvolved parenting styles, and fathers' level of education are significantly correlated to PYD. The authoritative parenting style was found to be the most significant predictor of higher PYD. These findings suggest that adolescents with authoritative parents in Malaysia show higher PYD and accordingly, they contribute to self, others and community.

Keywords: Positive Youth Development (PYD), educational level of parents, parenting style, adolescents, Malaysia

INTRODUCTION

Children and youths are important investment for national development goals and to achieve Vision 2020 of Malaysia,

namely to become a developed country by 2020. Hence, youths are considered as one of the significant assets to achieve sustainable and ongoing growth (Mohamad, Mohammad, & Mat Ali, 2014). Positive Youth Development (PYD) includes all the hopes and ambitions of the entire community to produce strong, happy and experienced adolescents on their way to becoming successful and competent adults (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003). Malaysia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 7 September 2015

Accepted: 15 June 2016

E-mail addresses:

kia_atefeh@yahoo.com (Kiadarbandsari, A.),

zainalm@upm.edu.my (Madon, Z.),

hanina.hamsan@gmail.com (Hamsan, H. H.),

mkataioon@yahoo.com (Mehdihezad Nouri, K.)

* Corresponding author

as one of the fastest growing countries in the world is an exceptional setting for investigation of behavioural and social sciences due to the differences among the ethnic groups economically, socially, politically, and with cultural variety within a small geographic area (Smith & Thomas, 1998). Likewise, developmental asset-based research is significantly novel and few researchers have given their attention to positive youth development in Malaysia (Abdul Kadir et al., 2012).

Adolescence is a period of biological, psychological, social and economic transitions (Steinberg, 2010), but the negative standardisation of the adolescence period is exaggerated (Damon, 2003). Prevention science considers adolescence as a time of risk-taking, conflicts and troubles (Schwartz, Pantin, Coatsworth, & Szapocznik, 2007). In contrast, the PYD perspective concentrates on the strengths of youths and their capability for promoting a thriving generation through coordinating their strengths with contextual sources (see for example, Benson, Scales, Hamilton, & Sempa, 2006; Lerner, von Eye, Lerner, Lewin- Bizan, & Bowers, 2010).

Positive Youth Development

Lerner's "Five C's" model asserts that a constellation of factors such as Competence (Skills and abilities in social, academic, cognitive, and vocational domains), Confidence (Positive self-worth and self-efficacy), Caring (A sense of sympathy and empathy for others), Connection (Positive and mutual relationships with individuals

and institutions), and Character (Respect for and observation of cultural norms; Personal integrity) will be developed. In sequence, the youth can show a sixth C as Contributions to the context (e.g., self, family, community and also as an active citizen). The Five Cs Model of PYD is the most experimentally supported framework to date (Heck & Subramaniam, 2009). According to various studies concerning PYD, Lerner and colleagues (Lerner et al., 2005; Jelacic et al., 2007; Phelps et al., 2009) discovered "contribution" as a positive and powerful construction (e.g., volunteering, community service) and problem or risk behaviours as the negative construction (for instance, crime and substance abuse) that are extracted from the "Five Cs" of PYD. Accordingly, PYD is connected positively to contribution and negatively to risk and problem behaviours (Lerner et al., 2010). The PYD has emerged to consider youths as a potential to be developed, not as difficulties that should be managed (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003; Lerner, 2005). According to a recent study by Hershberg, DeSousa, Warren, Lerner, and Lerner (2014), adolescents considered "connection" as one of the most important characteristics of their current lives and also as a considerable feature of their idealised future.

Theokas and Lerner (2006) have identified four forms in the ecology of youth that can create main developmental assets for improving PYD. The first one refers to the people in the youth context, the second asset mentions the institutions existing

in the community, the third discusses opportunities for young people and adults to work together in valued community activities and the last one focuses on access to these individuals and institutions. These assets can be identified in any situation concerning families, schools and communities. While schools and community settings as ecological assets are the initial key for contextual sources for the adaption of youths and their development adjustments (Benson et al., 2006), individuals are one of the ecological assets, specifically parents, that are considered as the most significant asset for the development of PYD in youths (Theokas & Lerner, 2006). Therefore, the current study is designed with a focus on parents which renders each family as a unique unit within the context of Malaysia by different ratios of culture, economy, education, and religion.

Parenting Style

Parenting style as proposed by Darling and Steinberg (1993) refers to the emotional climate within which parents bring up their child. Parents have different tasks during the development of youths and these differences are especially noticeable among middle children and adolescence when youths go through physical changes, behavioural changes and social changes (Collins & Russell, 1991). Darling and Steinberg (1993) held that parenting style and parenting practices are different, in that, parenting practices are focused in the direction of specific goals such as reinforcing the academic success of a child

but the parenting style refers to the whole emotional climate in which particular parent and child communications take place.

According to Maccoby and Martin (1983), based on factor analyses of parental behaviours, normally there are two dimensions that parents manifest through responsiveness and demandingness. They had also revised the conceptual structure of the various parenting styles of Baumrind (1971) and considered four styles: authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent/permissive, and neglectful/uninvolved. Parents with an authoritative style show a responsive and strict manner. They display warmth, support, and encouraging behaviours while at the same time they are firm and set strong rules for their children. In addition, they focus on explaining their opinions to their children and tend to encourage their children to behave in the same way. Parents with an authoritarian style are strict and monitor their children's behaviour. However, they do not show responsive or warm behaviour. Parents of this type specify strong guidelines but their children do not have any right to query or question them. Permissive parents reveal a responsive and warm behaviour, but they have few demands. Uninvolved parents do not control or guide their children and they do not show any responsive or demanding style (Adalbjarnardottir & Hafsteinsson, 2001).

Kaufmann et al. (2000) reported that both authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles had positive outcomes with healthy adjustments in children. However,

the prediction of youth development based on their parenting style irrespective of the cultural differences is an inconsideration. For decades, educational and psychology researchers have discussed the need to understand racial/ethnic culture as an asset in child and adolescent development (Spencer, 1995). While the authoritative parenting style is known as the most beneficial in terms of psychological and educational outcomes in Western societies (Baumrind, 1991; Boon, 2007), this cannot be claimed as suitable in other cultures where authoritarian parenting has been found to be linked to positive outcomes (Park & Bauer, 2002). For instance, in Western societies, an authoritarian parenting style usually makes children more aggressive and delinquent while the Westernised children cannot tolerate being monitored firmly by their parents (Baumrind, 1971). On the other hand, in the Asian context, children with authoritarian parents show greater academic achievement and positive psychosocial competence (Ang, 2006). For example, research into the effects of parenting style in Singapore discovered that Malay adolescents with authoritarian mothers had better attitudes toward education and school than adolescents who reported their mothers to be authoritative (Rebecca, 2006). More specifically, children in Malaysia as a collectivist society are raised to follow the directions of the group, show a satisfactory manner socially and behaviourally, curtail their personal needs and show a caring approach to other people within the group. Thus, they must obey their parents

completely (Keshavarz & Baharudin, 2009). Sorkhabi (2005) suggested adolescents consider the authoritarian parenting style as a necessity and required greater homogeneity in collective societies. Further, Keshavarz and Baharudin (2009) identified Malaysian parents as applying an authoritarian parenting style as it is found agreeable in that context. Although Asians perceive the authoritarian approach as a positive parenting style in their collective societies, cultural and economic transitions have changed the parenting styles and childrearing perceptions to Western standards in many different cultures (Chao, 2006).

According to Theokas and Lerner (2006), individuals are known as the most significant development assets which are related to a higher level of PYD and a lower level of risk behaviours (e.g., bullying or substance abuse). Researchers have stated that collective activity in the family setting, such as having meals together, is a main predictor of PYD (Larson, 2006). More recently, Bowers, Geldhof, Johnson, Lerner, and Lerner (2014) conducted a study to determine the features of relationships among youths and their parents and also non-parental adults who had a role in affecting PYD indicators such as the Five Cs during the middle to late adolescence. The findings showed highly involved and authoritative parenting styles can predict a higher level of PYD and a higher possibility of showing more connection to a significant non-parental adult as well. The results for participants who reported they received lower levels of warmth from their parents

(authoritarian, uninvolved) showed they felt lower connection to others in the family, peer groups and the community. Parents who showed warmth to their children and were engaged in their lives could motivate and provide skills for the youths in wider contexts than the home. As there are insufficient studies on parenting style and PYD, this study is designed to address this gap.

Parental Education Level

Recently, a growing number of studies looking at the relationship between the level of education of parents and their involvement in their children's education have conducted which are based on the theory that states a higher parental education level leads to their better involvement in their children's education (Vellymalay, 2011). Likewise, higher educated parents show a more authoritative parenting style in comparison to the authoritarian and permissive parenting styles (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987). Teti and Candelaria (2002) suggested that parents with higher education showed a positive authoritative style because the perceived self-efficacy was expected to positively influence their parenting. Further, Theokas and Lerner (2006) stated that within the ecological development assets, the strongest predictor of PYD was found to be connected with individuals in all contexts and also they suggested the family as the most significant predictor of PYD. At the same time, they considered the mother's level of education as a feature of the human

assets inside the family but this did not show any significant effect. In a study by Schmid, et al. (2011), the authors found that respondents who had mothers with a higher level of education were more likely to be in the appropriate PYD, contribution, and depressive symptoms groups when compared with the respondents from families with mothers who had a lower level of education. Although those researchers considered the maternal education as a proxy for socioeconomic status (SES) in their study, in the current study the level of education of the Malaysian parents was studied to clarify the relationship between educational level achieved by both parents and adolescents' PYD.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The aims of the current study were to:

1. Estimate the differences in PYD based on adolescent's race, age, gender, and school location (urban/rural) among adolescent students of national secondary schools.
2. Estimate the relationships between parenting style and parents' level of education with PYD among adolescent students of national secondary schools.
3. Estimate whether parenting style and parents' level of education are predictors of PYD among adolescent students of national secondary schools.

HYPOTHESES

H01. There is no significant difference in PYD by race, age, gender, and school

location (urban/rural) among adolescent students of national secondary schools in Selangor.

H02. There is no significant relationship between parenting style and PYD among adolescent students of national secondary schools in Selangor.

H03. There is no significant relationship between parents' level of education and PYD among adolescent students of national secondary schools in Selangor.

H04. Parenting style and parents' level of education do not significantly predict PYD among adolescent students of national secondary schools in Selangor.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

The purpose of this study is to determine the role of parenting style and the parents' level of education on PYD among adolescents from national secondary schools in Selangor. A total of 496 students from national secondary schools of Selangor aged between 14 and 16 in urban and rural areas participated in the research. These students came from four different schools located in urban and rural areas to increase the generalisability of the findings.

Measures

The questionnaire employed in the current research was translated to Malay Language. The first part was related to the demographic variables of the respondents such as race, age, gender, and school location either as

urban or rural areas, and the educational level of the parents. The second part included ten items of PSI-II (The Parenting Style Inventory II; Darling & Toyokawa, 1997). Based on the Brislin back-translation method (Brislin, 1970), three bilingual (in English and Malay language for translation) experts panel was organised to validate the questionnaire. The PSI-II contains 15 items in three different dimensions of parenting style as demandingness (the degree to which parents have expectations and standards they expect their child to fulfil), emotional responsiveness (degree of emotional sensitivity and responsiveness), and psychological autonomy-granting (degree to which parents permit and encourage their children to improve their own ideas, beliefs, and points of view; Carlo, McGinley, Hayes, Batenhorst, & Wilkinson, 2007) on a five-point Likert scale. Nevertheless, in the present research 10 questions were posed: five items of demandingness and five items for emotional responsiveness subscales, and the subscale psychological autonomy was left out as the four parenting styles from Baumrind's model used only responsiveness and demandingness as dimensions of parenting style (Nijhof & Engels, 2007). The last part was associated with PYD-VSF (very short form version) (Geldhof et al., 2014) and in this research the questionnaire for middle/late adolescents included 17 items in a two-choice response format and also a five-point Likert scale. The results of the study revealed ideal reliability values by the level of Cronbach's alpha for PSI-II =0.66, and PYD-VSF=0.81.

Procedure

Letter of approval to conduct this research among secondary school students in national-type schools were obtained from the Malaysian Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Selangor State Education Department. Two schools from the urban areas and two schools from the rural areas were chosen randomly. The sample was selected randomly through the lists of classes. Trained study staff were in charge of data collection. Testing session began with reading the instructions of the questionnaire to the participants in addition to providing consent forms to the participants.

Research Ethics

The approval of the Ethics Committee of Universiti Putra Malaysia (JKEUPM) was sought before the researchers began the data collection process. All ethical procedures were adhered to strictly, including anonymity, confidentiality of information given by respondents as well as the voluntary nature of participation in the study.

RESULTS

The first goal of the current study was to investigate the role of parenting style and parents' education in encouraging positive youth development of adolescents. Data were subjected to a normality test. A descriptive statistics test was used to determine the frequency, standard deviation, and mean for each scale. Independent sample t-test and Point-biserial correlation analysis

were applied to clarify the differences and associations between parenting styles, educational level of the parents and PYD. Additionally, a multiple regression analysis was used to explain the most significant predictor of the studied variables in the PYD of the adolescents.

Table 1 shows the independent sample t-test conducted to compare the race, age, gender, and school location (urban/rural) of participants on the PYD score. The race distribution showed majority of the participants were Malays accounting for 61.3% ($n=304$) of the study population followed by 37.5% ($n=186$) non-Malays (19.8% Chinese, 15.5% Indians, and the others with the lowest percentage at 2.2%). Among participants with different races ($N=490$), there was a statistically significant difference between the Malay students ($M=8.25$, $SD=0.88$) and the non-Malay students ($M=8.03$, $SD=1.04$), $t(488)=0.01$, $p<.05$. Among participants of different ages, there was no statistically significant difference between 14-year-old ($M=8.09$, $SD=0.96$) and 16-year-old students ($M=8.23$, $SD=0.94$), $t(494)=0.81$, $p>.05$. In terms of gender differences, there was no statistically significant difference between male students ($M=8.11$, $SD=0.81$) and the female ones ($M=8.20$, $SD=0.82$), $t(493)=0.51$, $p>.05$. With respect to differences in PYD based on the school location, the results showed there was no statistically significant difference between students from schools in urban areas ($M=8.15$, $SD=0.89$) and rural areas ($M=8.17$, $SD=1.01$), $t(494)=0.11$, $p>.05$. Therefore, the first hypothesis is

rejected as there is a significant difference between Malay and Non-Malay students in terms of their PYD.

The parenting style scale comprised two subscales, namely demandingness and responsiveness. In categorising the four expected parenting styles, a high score on demandingness and a low score on responsiveness referred to the authoritarian parenting style. A high score in both dimensions of demandingness and responsiveness implied the authoritative parenting style. The next classification is on the permissive parenting style with a low score in demandingness and a high score in responsiveness, and the last cluster presents the uninvolved parenting style where both subscales of demandingness and responsiveness included the lowest scores among all classifications. In relation to the parenting style classifications of this study, a k-means cluster analysis was applied and the four parenting styles were

realised. The results have shown that most of the respondents perceived their parenting style as authoritative at 28.4% (n=141), the next highest percentage was achieved by the authoritarian parenting style at 27% (n=134), the permissive parenting style was reported at 23.8% (n=118) of respondents while 20.8% (n=103) of the participants considered their parenting style as uninvolved. In summary, the authoritative parenting style was reported to be the highest among the participants of this study.

Educational level of the parents revealed that 74.6 % (n=370) of mothers had lower level of education (primary school and secondary school leavers), while 24.2 % (n=120) of the mothers had received higher level of education (including those with undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications, namely Master’s and PhD with 1.2 % considered as missing data. In terms of the fathers’ level of education, 66.1 % (n=328) of the fathers were reported had

Table 1
Independent Sample t-test to determine Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	N	M	SD	t	Df	p
Race						
Malay	304	8.25	0.88	2.54	488	0.00
Non-Malay	186	8.03	1.04			
Age						
14 y/o	239	8.09	0.96	-1.66	494	0.81
16 y/o	257	8.23	0.94			
Gender						
Male	208	8.11	8.11	-1.08	493	0.51
Female	287	8.2	8.2			
School Location						
Urban	249	8.15	0.89	-0.3	494	0.11
Rural	247	8.17	1.01			

lower level qualifications , though 32.3 % (n=160) of the fathers were reported as possessing higher level education, along with 1.6 % considered as missing data. Concerning the educational level of the parents and the parenting style, variables were considered as dummy variables or dichotomous nominal scale variables and the PYD as an interval (or ratio) scale. A Point-biserial Correlation analysis was conducted to explain the correlation between these variables.

According to Table 2, the findings show that the authoritative parenting style was significantly correlated with PYD ($r=0.39$,

$p<0.05$) and also the uninvolved parenting style was significantly and negatively correlated with PYD ($r= -0.44$, $p<0.05$). It also reveals a negative significant correlation between the fathers' lower educational level and PYD ($r= -0.09$, $p<0.05$), and a positive significant correlation between the fathers' higher level of education and PYD ($r= 0.09$, $p<0.05$). Based on the results, we reject the second and third hypotheses.

Based on the regression results, Table 3 shows that the authoritative and uninvolved parenting style explain a statistically significant amount of the variance in the PYD ($F(3, 484) = 58.56$, $p < 0.05$,

Table 2
Correlations between PYD Scores and Parenting Styles, Participants' and Parents' Level of Education

Variable	r	P
Parenting styles		
Authoritarian	-0.02	0.54
Authoritative	.390**	0.00
Permissive	0.03	0.42
Uninvolved	-.441**	0.00
Mothers' level of education		
Lower educational level	-0.08	0.07
Higher educational level	0.08	0.07
Fathers' level of education		
Lower educational level	-.091*	0.04
Higher educational level	.091*	0.04

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3
Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting PYD

Variables	β	SE	B	T	p
Constant		0.05	8.16	111.80	0.00
Authoritative Style	0.27	0.08	0.58	6.39	0.00
Uninvolved Style	-0.35	0.09	-0.83	-8.38	0.00
Higher Educated Father	0.01	0.08	0.02	0.19	0.71

Note: Significant level= * $p < .05$, $F= 58.56$, $R=0.51$, $R^2=0.26$, Adjusted $R^2=0.26$

$R^2=0.26$, $R^2_{Adjusted}=0.26$). The authoritative parenting style (Beta=0.27, $t= 6.39$, $p < 0.05$), uninvolved parenting style (Beta=-0.35, $t= -8.38$, $p < 0.05$) made significant contributions to the prediction of PYD. Hence, the most significant predictor of a higher PYD refers to the authoritative parenting style. According to these findings, we reject the last hypothesis of this study.

DISCUSSION

The PYD perspective focuses on mutually influential relationships between youths and contexts in the way that the youths' strength and their capability for promoting a thriving lifestyle through coordinating their strengths with contextual sources lead to contribution as the positive construct and risk behaviours as the negative outcome (Lerner et al., 2010).

According to Lerner et al. (2005), with regard to revealing the strengths and the power of variations of individuals in the data set, measures are essential to be sensitive to the different personal variables (e.g., race or ethnicity, religious viewpoint, sexual priority, physical skills, and development situations), as well as different contextual status (e.g., family style, neighbourhood, community, culture and historical moments and physical ecology). Previous investigations have shown racial differences among the Five Cs as the indices of PYD (Lerner et al., 2005). Lerner stated that race/ethnicity was the only significant predictor for risk behaviours. With respect to the different ethnic groups in Malaysia, the findings of the current study showed that

there are statistically significant differences in PYD among the races in Malaysia. The source of this variation may be related to the different economic, cultural, educational, religious beliefs and values among the Malaysian races, as well as the individuals from the minority ethnic groups who are classified in the others category. In terms of age, a discrepancy was found when the survey data was compared with previous findings. The results of this study were inconsistent with the findings of a past study (Bowers et al., 2010) that stated older adolescents indicated higher scores in PYD by participants from Grades 8-10 (mean age 14.19 in Grade 8, mean age 15.04 in Grade 9, and mean age 16.05 in Grade 10). These researchers found that adolescents in Grade 9 had lower scores for overall PYD scores in comparison to those in Grade 8. Likewise, the findings based on gender difference were inconsistent with previous studies by Lerner et al. (2005), Schmid et al. (2011), Shek and Wu (2014) in which the girls showed higher levels of PYD. Previous investigations have demonstrated the gender differences of PYD (Lerner et al., 2005) in which girls received higher scores than boys. Boys are generally more involved in risk behaviours than girls (Johnston et al., 2011a), and protecting them from such behaviours can be more difficult. Caldwell and Smith (2006) asserted that the youths in rural areas are probably more prone to boredom, which may increase their at-risk behaviours such as delinquency. These adolescents have less accessibility to youth development programmes, have fewer programmes to select from, and enjoy

less accessible transportation compared with youths in urban areas (Moore et al., 2010). However, During the Malaysian New Economic Policy (NEP), the government of Malaysia took active steps, particularly during the era of the New Economic Policy (1971–1990), to improve rural areas by introducing several development programmes. For instance, the resettlement programme was designed to provide rural communities with better facilities and infrastructure, hence encouraging them to involve in modern sector activities. These rural development programmes improved rural productivity and in the end helped reduce the gap between rural and urban areas. Most of the resettlement programmes were located in less developed states. The Malaysian government introduced numerous strategies and programmes to reduce ethnic income inequality, remove poverty, and also to increase higher living standards in the rural areas. Rural areas were developed as new centres of economic activity. Special plans for rural development were considered such as considerable allocations for rural schools, electricity, roads, health, and the supply of credit (Abdullah, Doucouliagos, & Manning, 2015).

This research has demonstrated that there are significant differences between different parenting styles and PYD. It has also shown how different parenting styles influence the PYD of Malaysian adolescents. Authoritative parenting style has shown the highest mean score among the various parenting styles. Furthermore, the findings suggest that the authoritative parenting

style is positively correlated to PYD and the uninvolved parenting style is negatively associated with PYD. On the other hand, the permissive and authoritarian parenting styles were found not to be correlated to PYD among adolescents in Malaysia. The result of the study, however, demonstrated that the authoritative and uninvolved parenting styles account for variance in the PYD, and the authoritative parenting style was found to be a significant predictor of a higher PYD. The findings of the current study are consistent with a previous study (Bowers et al. 2014) which showed that the authoritative parenting style as a predictor of higher level of PYD. However, according to the past studies in Malaysia which were noted earlier, the authoritarian parenting style is accepted by Malaysian parents. Furthermore, the descriptive findings of the current study have also shown that authoritarian parenting style (27 %) is very close to authoritative parenting style (28.4 %). Irrespective of which is to be recognised as the best parenting style, it cannot lessen the significant value of the authoritative parenting style for PYD among adolescents in Malaysia.

The educational level of the parents plays an important role in the authoritative parenting style, yet, the parents' higher or academic educational level has not shown to be a predictor of PYD while it was positively correlated. This finding is consistent with a past study (Schmid et al., 2011) which found higher levels of the educational level of the parents as a promoter of PYD. It is possible that parents with a higher level of education

may foster their children's or adolescents' academic competence but not necessarily the other indicators of PYD (Five Cs). Still, this finding clarifies the influence of family in the PYD of adolescents once again.

The findings from this study suggest that the authoritative parenting style, uninvolved parenting style, and fathers' level of education are significantly correlated to PYD. However, the authoritative parenting style was found to be predictors of higher PYD. Given the evidence that individuals are the most critical asset in the context of youths (e.g., Theokas & Lerner, 2006), the findings of this study have highlighted the role of parenting style in Malaysia as consistent with findings from Western societies in which the authoritative parenting style was found to be the most significant predictor of a higher PYD.

The findings of this study can support educators, policy makers, parents and practitioners to improve PYD among adolescents. The outcome of the present research may help families, especially parents, to utilise the authoritative parenting style to foster healthy youths and cultivate them towards thriving life trajectories. One clear implication of the study for parents is that higher parental responsiveness and demandingness which leads to an authoritative parenting style may increase PYD among their children, specifically their adolescents. Therefore, it may guide family policy makers to develop and increase the well-being of family and youths. Hence, it is necessary to increase the knowledge of parents of the various

parenting style strategies. Additional research may provide knowledge of how non-Malaysian adolescents perceive their family or context which result in a lower PYD when compared with their Malaysian peers. Another relevant contribution of this study is that valuable information with regard to improving the wellbeing of adolescents is given to the governmental sources of Malaysia, including the Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ministry of Rural and Regional Development, and Ministry of Education Malaysia.

Although the present study has demonstrated valuable findings specifically in an Asian context, the interpretation of these findings should be undertaken with caution as the sample studied was chosen solely from the state of Selangor.

CONCLUSION

The present study has provided new information about the role of parenting style and parents' education in positive youth development of adolescents in Malaysia. It is highly recommended that future such studies in the Malaysian context to address the current research gap by considering the background difference of the other racial groups through their past and current situations as non-Malaysians or immigrants (such as the available facilities or resources in both circumstances in their own country and Malaysia), their family (such as their parenting style, parents' involvement, family functioning, connections with other people), or many other related aspects in comparison to the races in Malaysia. A future study may

explore the effects of these relationships and functions in depth, so more variables related to family characteristics should be taken into consideration. In addition, this study recommends sourcing a vast sample from all the states in Malaysia for future research due to the need to increase the applicability of the generalisation. Finally, despite the limitations, the present study has demonstrated valuable findings specifically in an Asian context and it can also be used as a benchmark study for a suitable parenting for adolescents and to encourage PYD in Malaysia.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Kadir, N. B., Rahim, S. A., Mustapha, Z., Abdul Mutalib, M. H., Kee, C. P., & Mohamed, R. M. (2012). External Assets as Predictors of Positive Emotions Among At-Risk Youth in Malaysia. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review*, 6(3), 203–217.
- Abdullah, A. J., Doucouliagos, H. & Manning, E. (2015). Are regional incomes in Malaysia converging? *Papers in Regional Science*, 94(S1), S69-S94.
- Adalbjarnardottir, S., & Hafsteinsson, L. G. (2001). Adolescents' Perceived Parenting Styles and Their Substance Use: Concurrent and Longitudinal Analyses. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11(4), 401–423.
- Ang, R. P. (2006). Effects of parenting style on personal and social variables for Asian adolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 76(4): 503–511.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monograph*, 4(1p2), 1–103.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In J. Gunn, R. Lerner, & A. Peterson, *The Encyclopedia of Adolescence* (pp. 746–758). New York: Garland.
- Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F., & Sems, A., Jr. (2006). Positive youth Development: Theory, research, and applications. In R. M. Lerner, *Theoretical models of human development. Volume 1 of Handbook of Child Psychology (6th ed.)* Editors-in-chief: W. Damon & R. M. Lerner. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Boon, H. J. (2007). Low- and high-achieving Australian secondary school students: Their parenting, motivations and academic achievement. *Australian Psychologist*, 42(3) 212–225.
- Bowers, E. P., Geldhof, J. G., Johnson, S. K., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2014). Special Issue Introduction: Thriving Across the Adolescent Years: A View of the Issues. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43(6), 859–868.
- Bowers, E. P., Li, Y., Kiely, M. K., Brittan, A., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2010). The Five Cs model of positive youth development: A longitudinal analysis of confirmatory factor structure and measurement invariance. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(7), 720-735.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-Translation for Cross-Cultural Research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*.
- Caldwell, L. L., & Smith, E. A. (2006). Leisure as a context for youth development and delinquency prevention. *Pathways and Crime Prevention: Theory, Policy and Practice*. New York: Routledge. pp.271-297.
- Carlo, G., McGinley, M., Hayesa, R., Batenhorsta, C., & Wilkinson, J. (2007). Parenting Styles or Practices? Parenting, Sympathy, and Prosocial Behaviors Among Adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 168(2), 147-176.

- Chao, R. K. (2006). The prevalence and consequences of adolescents' language brokering for their immigrant parents. In M. H. Bornstein, & L. R. Cote, *Acculturation and parent-child relationships: Measurement and development*, eds (pp. 271–296). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Collins, W. A., & Russell, G. (1991). Mother-child and father-child relationships in middle childhood and adolescence: a developmental analysis. *Developmental Review*, 11(2), 99-136.
- Damon, W. (2003). *Noble purpose: The joy of living a meaningful life*. West Randor, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487.
- Darling, N., & Toyokawa, T. (1997). Construction and validation of the Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II). *Unpublished manuscript*, the Pennsylvania State University.
- Dornbusch, S., Ritter, P., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D., & Fraleigh, M. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Geldhof, G. J., Bowers, E. P., Boyd, M. J., Mueller, M. K., Napolitano, C. M., Schmid, K. L., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2014). The creation and validation of short and very short measures of PYD. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24(1), 163-176.
- Heck, K. E. (2009). *Youth development Frameworks*. CA: University of California.
- Hershberg, R., DeSousa, L., Warren, A. E. A., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2014). Illuminating trajectories of adolescent thriving and contribution through the words of youth: Qualitative findings from the 4-h study of positive youth development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43(5), 50-68.
- Jelicic, H., Bobek, D. L., Phelps, E., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2007). Using positive youth development to predict contribution and risk behaviors in early adolescence: Findings from the first two waves of The 4-H Study of Positive Youth Development. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31(3), 263-273.
- Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2011a). *Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975–2010 Volume I: Secondary school students*. Michigan: The University of Michigan.
- Kaufmann, D., Gesten, E., Lucia, R. C. S., Salcedo, O., Rendina-Gobioff, G., & Gadd, R. (2000). The relationship between parenting style and children's adjustment: The parents' perspective. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 231–245.
- Keshavarz, S., & Baharudin, R. (2009). Parenting style in a collectivist culture of Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 66–73.
- Larson, R. (2006). Positive youth development, willful adolescents, and mentoring. *Journal of community psychology*, 677-689.
- Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdóttir, S., Naudeau, S., Jelicic, H., Alberts, A. E., Ma, L., Smith, L. M., Bobek, D. L., Richman-Raphael, D., Simpson, I., Christiansen, E. D., & von Eye, A. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth Grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H Study of Positive Youth Development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 17-71.
- Lerner, R. M., von Eye, A., Lerner, J. V., Lewin-Bizan, S., & Bowers, E. P. (2010). Special issue introduction: The meaning and measurement of thriving: A view of the issues. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 707-719.
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization

- in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), & P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 1–101). New York: Wiley.
- Mohamad, M., & Mohammad, M. (2014). Measuring Positive Youth Development in Malaysia. *The 1st International Conference on Creative Management 2014 (MIS-ICCM 2014)*, 17-19.
- Mohamad, M., Mohammad, M., Mamat, I., & Mamat, M. (2014). Modelling Positive Development, Life Satisfaction and Problem Behaviour among Youths in Malaysia. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 32 (2): 231-238.
- Mohamad, M., Mohammad, M., & Mat Ali, N.A. (2014). Positive Youth Development and Life Satisfaction among Youths. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 14, 2782-2792.
- Moore, J. B., Jilcott, S. B., Shores, K. A., Evenson, K. R., Brownson, R. C., & Novick, L. F. (2010). qualitative examination of perceived barriers and facilitators of physical activity for urban and rural youth. *Health Education Research*, 355-367.
- Napolitano, C. M. (2010). Context and adolescent intentional self regulation: testing the positive youth development model. published master's thesis, Tufts University.
- Nijhof, K. S., Engels, R. C. M. E. (2007). Parenting styles, coping strategies, and the expression of homesickness. *Journal of Adolescence*, 709–720.
- Park, H. S., & Bauer, S. (2002). Parenting practices, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and academic achievement in adolescents. *School Psychology International*, 386–396.
- Phelps, E., Zimmerman, S., Warren, A. E. A., Jeličić, H., von Eye, A., & Lerner, R. M. (2009). The structure and developmental course of positive youth development (PYD) in early adolescence: Implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 571–584.
- Rebecca, P. A. (2006). Effects of parenting style on personal and social variables for Asian adolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 503–511.
- Roth, J. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). Youth Development Programs: Risk, Prevention and Policy. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 32:170–182.
- Schmid, K. L., Phelps, E., Kiely, M. K., Napolitano, C. M., Boyd, M. J., & Lerner, R. M. (2011). The role of adolescents' hopeful futures in predicting positive and negative developmental trajectories: Findings from the 4-H Study of Positive Youth Development. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 45–56.
- Schwartz S. J., Pantin, H., Coatsworth, J., & Szapocznik, J. (2007). Addressing the challenges and opportunities for today's youth: Toward an integrative model and its implications for research and intervention. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 28(2), 117-144.
- Smith, J. P., & Thomas, D. (1998). On the road: Marriage and mobility in Malaysia. *Journal of Human Resources*, 805-832.
- Sorkhabi, N. (2005). Applicability of Baumrind's parent typology to collective cultures: Analysis of cultural explanations of parent socialization effects. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 552–563.
- Spencer, M. B. (1995). Old issues and new theorizing about African American youth: A phenomenological variant of ecological systems theory. In R. L. Taylor (Ed.), *Black youth: Perspectives on their status in the United States* (pp. 37–69). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Steinberg, L. (2010). *Adolescence (9th ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Susman, E. J., & Dorn, L. D. (2009). Puberty: Its Role

- in Development. In R. M. Lerner , & L. Steinberg (Eds), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology* (pp. 116-151). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Teti, D. M., & Candelaria, M. (2002). Parenting competence. In M. Bornstein, *Handbook of parenting, Vol. 4, Applied Parenting* (pp. 149–180). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Theokas, C., & Lerner, R. M. (2006). Observed Ecological Assets in Families, Schools, and Neighborhoods: Conceptualization, Measurement and Relations with Positive and Negative Developmental Outcomes. *Applied Developmental Science*, 61-74.
- Vellynalay, S. K. (2011). A study of the relationship between Indian parents' education level and their involvement in their children's education. *Kajian Malaysia: Journal of Malaysian studies*, 47-65.