

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTING AND POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT (PYD) AMONG MALAYSIAN ADOLESCENTS

VERA PILLAI¹, BILAL AHMAD LONE², SHAHNAZ SHEIBANI³

^{1,2,3}FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, ARTS, AND HUMANITIES, LINCOLN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, MALAYSIA

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between parenting practices and Positive Youth Development (PYD) among Malaysian adolescents, drawing upon Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory and Lerner's Developmental Systems Theory as its conceptual frameworks. A total of 231 adolescents aged 11 to 15 years from government and international schools in Kuala Lumpur were selected through stratified random sampling. The Positive Youth Development–Short Form (PYD-SF) and the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ) were administered in bilingual (Malay and English) formats to assess key dimensions of PYD and parenting behaviours. Reliability analyses confirmed strong internal consistency for both instruments across language versions ($\alpha = .77\text{--}.82$). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) was employed to test hypothesized relationships. The results revealed that positive parenting behaviours—such as warmth, involvement, and consistent discipline—were significantly associated with higher PYD scores, whereas negative parenting dimensions—including corporal punishment, poor monitoring, and inconsistent discipline—showed negative associations. No significant differences in PYD were observed across gender, school type, or family income. The findings underscore the vital role of supportive parenting in fostering adolescents' competence, confidence, connection, character, and caring within Malaysia's multicultural context. The study highlights the need for community-based parenting interventions to promote positive developmental outcomes and strengthen family–adolescent relationships.

Keywords: parenting practices, positive youth development, adolescents, Malaysia, ecological systems theory, developmental systems theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

Adolescents in Malaysia play a crucial role in shaping the country's future workforce, economy, and social structure. According to recent census data, young people aged 10 to 24 make up approximately 25% of the total population, highlighting their significance in Malaysia's long-term development (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2024). This youthful demographic presents opportunities for national progress, but it also raises concerns about the well-being of adolescents as they navigate challenges related to education, employment, and mental health. The adolescent phase is a critical period of psychological and emotional growth, where individuals form their identity, develop interpersonal relationships, and acquire life skills necessary for adulthood. Given these developmental transitions, the role of family, particularly parenting, is fundamental in shaping adolescent outcomes.

Malaysia's diverse ethnic composition—including Malays, Chinese, Indians, and indigenous groups—shapes the social and cultural landscape of adolescent development. Cultural expectations, family obligations, and academic pressures contribute to young people's psychological stress, particularly in communities where traditional values place a strong emphasis on educational achievement (Rajendran & Omar, 2024). Parental expectations for academic excellence are often linked to social mobility and financial security, leading to high levels of stress among adolescents striving to meet these demands. Additionally, socioeconomic disparities impact mental health outcomes, with studies indicating that marginalized communities, such as the Indian minority, experience higher rates of depression due to financial insecurity and limited access to mental health resources (Cham et al., 2024). The combination of cultural pressures, economic challenges, and evolving social dynamics highlights the complexity of adolescent development in Malaysia.

Given the increasing concerns about adolescent well-being, Malaysia has adopted the Positive Youth Development (PYD) framework to promote healthy development and resilience among young people. PYD emphasizes a strengths-based approach that nurtures five core attributes: competence, confidence, connection, character, and caring (Lerner et al., 2018). These developmental assets enable adolescents to navigate challenges, build resilience, and engage meaningfully with their communities. This framework has been integrated into national policies such as the Malaysian Youth Development Index (YDI) and the National Adolescent Health Plan, which aim to enhance youth empowerment, community participation, and mental well-being (Ministry of Youth and Sports Malaysia, 2023). Furthermore, PYD principles have been incorporated into various school-based and community programs, with a focus on skill-building, leadership training, and civic engagement.

However, the effectiveness of these initiatives largely depends on the family environment in which adolescents are raised, making parenting a crucial factor in fostering positive developmental outcomes.

Parenting plays a critical role in shaping the developmental trajectories of adolescents. Research suggests that authoritative parenting—characterized by warmth, support, and reasonable discipline—promotes self-esteem, social competence, and academic success, while neglectful or authoritarian parenting can contribute to emotional distress and behavioral issues (Ravi, 2023; Bi et al., 2018). Adolescents who experience consistent parental support tend to exhibit higher levels of psychological well-being and adaptive coping mechanisms, while those raised in restrictive or uninvolved households may struggle with emotional regulation and peer relationships. Theoretical frameworks such as attachment theory and Baumrind's parenting styles provide insight into how parental influences shape adolescent adjustment and psychological outcomes. Furthermore, recent studies emphasize that parental responsiveness plays a crucial role in protecting adolescents from the harmful impacts of peer pressure, exposure to social media, and academic stress (Tan et al., 2023). For instance, Sheibani et al. (2018) found that the use of positive discipline and active involvement from both mothers and fathers was associated with greater well-being among Iranian adolescents. In contrast, harsh disciplinary practices, inadequate supervision, and inconsistent parenting were linked to lower levels of adolescent well-being. These findings underscore the significant influence of parenting on adolescents' mental and emotional health.

Despite the growing body of research on PYD, there is a lack of studies examining the specific role of parenting in fostering positive youth development among Malaysian adolescents. Much of the existing literature focuses on Western contexts, where parenting styles and cultural values differ significantly from those in Malaysia. Understanding how parenting practices interact with cultural expectations, and economic conditions is essential for developing targeted interventions that support adolescent well-being.

This study aims to fill the research gap by exploring the relationship between parenting styles and PYD among Malaysian adolescents. By gaining a deeper understanding of these interactions, this research seeks to inform policymakers, educators, and mental health practitioners in designing effective interventions that support adolescent well-being and long-term success. Given Malaysia's commitment to youth development, findings from this study may contribute to evidence-based strategies for strengthening family relationships, promoting mental health awareness, and enhancing youth engagement in social and economic progress.

1.1 Research objectives

1. To examine gender differences in Positive Youth Development (PYD) among Malaysian adolescents.
2. To investigate the relationship between family income and PYD.
3. To assess the impact of parent-adolescent relationship quality on PYD.

1.2 Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses in this study are:

HA1: There is a significant difference in PYD among boys and girls.
HA2: Adolescents with higher family income would report higher PYD.
HA3: Adolescents with a higher quality of parenting have a higher PYD.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

This study explores the relationship between parenting and positive well-being among Malaysian adolescents in Kuala Lumpur, considering the moderating effects of school type (international vs. government). The research is grounded in two key theoretical perspectives: Richard Lerner's Developmental Systems Theory (DST) (Damon & Lerner, 2008; Lerner et al., 2002, 2011) and Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory (EST). Bronfenbrenner's EST underscores the crucial role of environmental influences on a child's development, emphasizing that as children grow, their interactions within these environments become increasingly complex due to their evolving physical and cognitive abilities (Bronfenbrenner, 1996, 1997). On the other hand, Lerner's DST serves as the primary foundation for the research design, as it posits that adolescent competencies are key determinants of their overall well-being (Zaff et al., 2008). Both theories highlight the dynamic and interconnected nature of human development. While DST focuses on the reciprocal interactions between individuals and their environments, emphasizing developmental plasticity and change, EST provides a structural lens through which to examine the multi-layered environmental factors influencing an individual's growth over time. By integrating these frameworks, this study adopts a holistic and multidimensional approach to adolescent development, recognizing both personal agency and the broader contextual factors that shape developmental trajectories.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1 Sampling

For this study, stratified random sampling was applied since the population was categorized into two school types (international and government) and five age groups (11 to 15 years old). The sampling procedure involved the following steps:

1. Defining the subpopulations – The study population was divided into two groups: students from international and government schools in Kuala Lumpur.
2. Calculating the total number and proportion of students in each group:

Government schools: 315 students (58.9%) of the total population (N = 535). International schools: 220 students (41.1%) of the total population (N = 535).

3. Determining the sample size for each school type and age group to ensure proportional representation.
4. Selecting students randomly from each age group within the schools, based on enrolment records. This process is illustrated in Figure 3.1.

Before the main study, a pilot study was conducted with 40 adolescents (20 from a government school and 20 from an international school). These participants were excluded from the final study. Thus, the total population for the study was 535 students (315 from government schools and 220 from international schools), and the required sample size was 231. To ensure equal participation from each school, 33.3% of the sample was assigned to each school within both categories. The final sample consisted of 231 adolescents (131 from government schools and 100 from international schools), aged 11 to 15 years ($M = 13.50$, $SD = 1.68$).

2.2 Instrumentation

The demographic questionnaire gathered personal and family-related data to gain a deeper understanding of the participants' background characteristics. This information is crucial in evaluating the potential effects of socioeconomic and educational factors on adolescent development, parenting approaches, and peer interactions. The following instruments were used for assessing different variables.

2.2.1 Positive Youth Development-Short Form (PYD-SF)

The Positive Youth Development-Short Form (PYD-SF) is a widely used self-report measure designed to assess key developmental assets that contribute to adolescents' holistic growth. Developed by Geldhof et al. (2014), this 34-item instrument evaluates five core components of Positive Youth Development (PYD): Competence, Confidence, Character, Caring, and Connection. These five domains align with the Five Cs Model of PYD, which provides a structured framework for understanding youth development in various social and cultural contexts. The PYD-SF has been extensively validated and used in different populations, demonstrating strong psychometric properties, with Cronbach's Alpha values consistently ranging from 0.80 to 0.93, indicating high internal consistency and reliability across subscales. The Malay version yielded a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.79, whereas the English version showed a reliability coefficient of 0.82, both falling within the acceptable range for measuring positive youth development.

2.2.2 Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ)

The Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ), developed by Frick (1991), is a well-established self-report measure designed to assess five key dimensions of parenting practices. It provides insight into parental involvement, disciplinary consistency, and monitoring strategies, which are essential components of effective parenting. The APQ is widely used in psychological and developmental research to explore the impact of parenting behaviors on children's social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes. The Malay version showed a reliability coefficient of 0.79, while the English version had a value of 0.77, both indicating good internal consistency in measuring parenting practices.

2.2.3 Translation of Instruments

The study originally used English-language instruments but employed validated Malay versions to ensure clarity, cultural relevance, and accuracy for respondents. A rigorous three-phase translation process was followed: Forward Translation – A bilingual psychology expert translated the instruments from English to Malay. Backward Translation – A different expert, unfamiliar with the original, translated the Malay version back into English to identify inconsistencies. Comparison and Revision – A third evaluator compared both English versions to ensure conceptual and semantic accuracy, making necessary adjustments. To accommodate both government and international school students, a bilingual questionnaire (English and Malay) was provided. This approach minimized language barriers, ensuring comprehension and reliable responses, in line with best practices in cross-cultural research.

A summary of the instruments, subscales, the number of items, scores, and sources are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. Measures and Sources

Variable	Items	Score	
PYD-SF	34	34 - 158	
Competence	6	06 - 24	
Confidence	6	06 - 26	
Character	8	08 - 38	
Caring	6	06 - 30	
Connection	8	08 - 40	
APQ	42	45 - 225	
Parent involvement (mother, Father)	10	10 - 50	
Positive parenting	6	06 - 30	
Poor monitoring	10	10 - 50	
Inconsistent discipline	6	06 - 30	
Corporal punishment	10	03 - 15	

These findings suggest that the translated versions of the instruments maintained their psychometric integrity and could be confidently administered to participants regardless of their preferred language. The strong internal consistency observed across all measures supports their suitability for assessing parenting practices and positive youth development in the target population (See table 2).

Table 2. Reliability coefficients for the instruments and testing differences between them for Malay and English versions in the pilot study

Instruments	Malay	English	Items	Chi Sq.	df	Level of confidence	P Value
APQ	0.79	0.77	42	0.054	1	0.95	0.8467*
PYD (SF)	0.79	0.82	34	0.1060	1	0.95	0.7448*
*Null hypothesis retained.							

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The subsequent sections present the research results based on PLS-SEM analysis, including both the structural model and moderating effects. These findings are systematically discussed concerning the study's objectives and hypotheses, offering insights into the key factors shaping adolescents' Positive Youth Development (PYD). The discussion integrates previous literature and theoretical frameworks to provide a comprehensive interpretation of the results.

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants

The findings reveal that the majority of respondents were male (57%), while females made up 42% of the sample. In terms of school type, 57% attended government schools, whereas 43% were enrolled in international schools. Participants ranged in age from 11 to 15 years, with an average age of 13.36 years (SD = 1.54). Regarding parental education, 27.7% of fathers held a master's degree, 24.2% had a PhD, and 19% possessed a bachelor's degree. Among mothers, 31.6% had a PhD, 27.7% held a bachelor's degree, and 12.9% had a master's degree. In terms of employment, most fathers (81.9%) were employed, while 12.9% were not. Mothers, however, exhibited more varied employment patterns, with 50.2% working and 45.6% not engaged in formal employment.

The financial status of respondents' families varied, with over half (55%) reporting a monthly income exceeding RM 6000. This suggests that a significant portion of participants came from financially stable backgrounds, which may provide greater academic support, emotional security, and access to developmental opportunities. Research indicates that parental education and income levels significantly influence adolescents' aspirations, self-confidence, and resilience (Eccles, 2005; Sirin, 2005). Additionally, maternal employment patterns may impact parent-child interactions and overall family dynamics.

3.2 Positive Youth Development (PYD) and Age

Table 3 presents the positive youth development (PYD) scores of adolescents across different age groups.

Table 3. PYD scores and age

Age	Mean	SD	Min	Max
11 years (n=41)	125.1	12.24	93.00	144.00
12 years (n=44)	126.5	14.78	81.00	148.00
13 years (n=36)	112.8	21.98	76.00	143.00
14 years (n=42)	113.5	20.07	66.00	140.00
15 years (n=68)	127.6	12.67	76.00	149.00
Total (n=231)	121.1	16.35	78.4	144.8

The overall mean PYD score for all adolescents (n = 231) is 121.1 (SD = 16.35), with scores ranging from 78.4 to 144.8. The findings highlight a non-linear trend in PYD scores across adolescence. While younger and older adolescents (11, 12, and 15 years) demonstrate higher PYD scores, early adolescents (13 and 14 years) exhibit a noticeable decline, possibly due to transitional difficulties.

3.3 Positive Youth Development (PYD) and School Type

Table 4 presents the mean values and standard deviations of adolescents' Positive Youth Development (PYD) scores based on school type.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.. PYD score and type of school

Type of School	Mean	SD
Government (n=131)	121.0	17.40
International (n=100)	122.4	13.43
Total	121.78	15.87

The findings indicate that the mean PYD scores for students in government and international schools were nearly identical (Mean for government schools = 122, Mean for international schools = 121.4). However, the standard

deviation was higher for students in government schools ($SD = 17.4$) compared to those in international schools ($SD = 13.43$). This suggests that while government school students exhibited slightly higher average positive development, their scores were more dispersed, indicating greater variability in individual well-being.

The similarity in mean PYD scores across school types suggests that students may experience comparable developmental opportunities, regardless of the type of institution they attend. However, the greater variation among government school students aligns with previous research indicating that socioeconomic factors, school resources, and educational environments may contribute to differences in adolescent well-being (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). Government schools often cater to students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, which may explain the wider distribution of PYD scores. In contrast, international schools typically offer more structured environments with smaller class sizes and a curriculum focused on holistic development, which may contribute to more consistent PYD outcomes among students (Dronkers & Avram, 2010).

3.4 Positive Youth Development (PYD) and Gender

Understanding gender differences in PYD is essential for assessing variations in adolescents' psychological, social, and emotional well-being. This study found that boys ($M = 120.78$, $SD = 15.66$) and girls ($M = 120.32$, $SD = 16.35$) had nearly identical mean PYD scores (Table 5).

Table 5. PYD score and Genders

Gender	Mean	SD	T value	P value
Boy	120.78	15.66	-0.26	0.979
Girl	120.32	16.35		

However, girls exhibited greater variability in their responses, suggesting broader differences in their PYD experiences. Factors such as psychological resilience, social expectations, and coping strategies may contribute to this variation. Research on gender differences in PYD remains inconclusive, with some studies reporting no significant differences, while others highlight variations in specific subdomains of youth development.

Gender differences in PYD may stem from biological, psychological, and sociocultural influences. Girls often excel in emotional regulation and social relationships, while boys tend to show greater confidence in leadership and risk-taking. The higher variability in girls' responses may reflect differences in socialization, stress exposure, and support systems, whereas boys generally exhibit more stable but slightly lower scores in emotional aspects of PYD.

Previous studies provide mixed findings. For example, Kaliterna and Burušić (2014) found no consistent gender differences in PYD, while Sun et al. (2016) reported that female adolescents generally scored higher, except in autonomy and self-acceptance. Similarly, Lin, Chou, Wu, and Lin (2014) found that the relationship between gender and PYD fluctuated across different developmental stages, highlighting the complexity of this association. The present study aligns with research suggesting that gender does not play a defining role in shaping overall PYD levels. Given that t-test results indicate no significant gender-based differences, other factors—such as family environment, cultural influences, and social support—may be more influential in adolescent development. Future research should explore these factors in greater depth to provide a more nuanced understanding of PYD across diverse populations.

3.5 Positive Youth Development (PYD) and Family Income

Table 6 presents the correlation analysis between family income and Positive Youth Development (PYD). The results indicate no significant relationship between income and PYD ($r = -0.03$, $p = 0.64$). Since the p-value exceeds the threshold of 0.05, the findings do not support Hypothesis 2.

Table 6. Family income and PYD

Variable		r value	P value
Family income		-0.03	0.64

The role of socioeconomic status, particularly family income, in shaping adolescent development has been widely debated. Generally, lower family income and income inequality have been linked to poorer well-being outcomes, as financial limitations can influence access to healthcare, education, and developmental opportunities (Elgar et al., 2016). Socioeconomic constraints can also contribute to psychological stress, potentially affecting adolescents' emotional and social development (Watters & O'Callaghan, 2016). However, research on the direct relationship between income and PYD remains inconclusive. Some studies suggest that financial stability fosters positive developmental outcomes by providing a supportive environment and access to enrichment activities (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002), while others argue that factors such as family cohesion and parental support may play a more crucial role than income alone (Deng et al., 2019).

The findings of the current study align with previous research that has failed to establish a significant link between family income and PYD (Patalay & Fitzsimons, 2018). This suggests that while economic resources may contribute to overall well-being, other social and psychological factors—such as parental involvement, peer relationships, and resilience—may have a stronger influence on adolescents' positive development. Future research should consider exploring these mediating variables to gain a deeper understanding of the mechanisms underlying youth well-being across different socioeconomic backgrounds.

3.6 Positive Youth Development (PYD) and Parenting

This study defines high-quality parenting as characterized by greater levels of positive parenting, maternal involvement, and paternal involvement, while lower-quality parenting is reflected in corporal punishment, inadequate supervision, and inconsistent discipline. Research has consistently demonstrated the critical role of parenting in shaping adolescents' social, emotional, and cognitive outcomes (Steinberg, 2001).

Table 7: Parenting and PYD

Path	Beta	SE	T value	P value
Corporal Punishment -> PYD	-0.13	0.032	4.00	0.01
Father involvement -> PYD	0.25	0.11	2.24	0.05
Inconsistent Discipline ->PYD	-0.07	0.02	3.15	0.01
Mother Involvement -> PYD	0.13	0.04	3.15	0.01
Poor monitoring -> PYD	-0.32	0.11	2.92	0.01
Positive parenting -> PYD	0.33	0.05	7.08	0.01

Positive Parenting and PYD: As shown in table 7, findings indicate a significant positive correlation between positive parenting and adolescents' PYD ($\beta = 0.33$, $T = 7.08$, $P < 0.001$), suggesting that higher levels of positive parenting are linked to better developmental outcomes. Studies highlight that warm and responsive parent-adolescent relationships promote self-esteem, identity achievement, prosocial behavior, and emotional regulation (Cox & Harter, 2008). Similarly, Beyers and Goossens (2008) identified positive parenting as a key factor in fostering social competence among adolescents. Research further suggests that parental education enhances adolescent well-being (Allison, 2000), while parental rejection is associated with loneliness (Asher & Wheeler, 1985). Studies also emphasize the role of family harmony, parent-child synchrony, and supportive parenting in promoting identity formation and overall well-being during adolescence (Barber, Bolitho, & Bertrand, 2001; Beyers & Goossens, 2008; Lerner et al., 2005).

Negative Parenting and PYD: The study also found a significant negative relationship between corporal punishment and adolescent PYD ($\beta = -0.13$, $T = 4.00$, $P < 0.001$). This supports previous research linking psychological control and parental rejection to poor adolescent well-being (Kaniušonytė, Malinauskienė, & Truskauskaitė-Kunevičienė, 2014). Studies also indicate that conflict-driven parent-adolescent relationships increase aggression and antisocial behaviors (Eichelsheim et al., 2010). Likewise, research suggests that negative parenting and rejection contribute to low self-esteem, higher aggression, and substance use (Alaikharaeem et al., 2013). These findings align with Baumrind's (1991) authoritarian parenting theory, which states that harsh discipline can hinder emotional and social development. Additionally, psychological control has been linked to higher depressive symptoms in adolescents (Barber, Stoltz, & Olsen, 2005).

Parental Monitoring and PYD: A significant negative relationship was observed between poor parental monitoring and adolescent PYD ($\beta = -0.32$, $T = 2.92$, $P < 0.05$), indicating that lower levels of parental monitoring correspond with reduced PYD scores. Research shows that inadequate parental supervision is linked to risky behaviors. Moreover, parental monitoring is associated with emotional warmth and positive youth development (Kaniušonytė et al., 2014). Kerr, Stattin, and Burk (2010) found that low parental monitoring is linked to externalizing behaviors, affecting adolescents' developmental trajectory. These results reinforce the idea that engaged parenting can reduce risk-taking behaviors, such as substance use and delinquency (Dishion & McMahon, 1998).

Maternal Involvement and PYD: The study found a significant positive relationship between maternal involvement and adolescent PYD ($\beta = 0.13$, $T = 3.15$, $P < 0.01$), indicating that higher maternal engagement enhances adolescent well-being. Prior research links mother-adolescent relationships to higher self-esteem, attachment security, fewer depressive symptoms, and lower delinquency rates (Allen et al., 2003; Bynum & Kotchick, 2006; Sheeber et al., 2007). Bowlby's (1988) attachment theory further supports these findings, suggesting that secure maternal attachment fosters emotional regulation and coping skills. Additionally, maternal warmth is positively linked to academic success and peer relationships (Hughes et al., 2008).

Inconsistent Discipline and PYD: A significant negative association was found between inconsistent discipline and adolescent PYD ($\beta = -0.07$, $T = 3.15$, $P < 0.01$), indicating that greater inconsistency in discipline is linked to lower PYD scores. Previous studies found that inconsistent discipline is correlated with antisocial behaviors (Edens et al., 2008) and externalizing problems (Surjadi et al., 2013). This aligns with Patterson's (1982) coercion

theory, which suggests that inconsistent discipline fosters a cycle of negative reinforcement, leading to behavioral problems. Further research indicates that inconsistent discipline contributes to emotional dysregulation, defiance, and academic struggles (Granic & Patterson, 2006).

Father Involvement and PYD: The study also found a significant positive relationship between father involvement and adolescent PYD ($\beta = 0.25$, $T = 2.24$, $P < 0.05$). Research suggests that fathers' roles have evolved, with greater involvement playing a key role in adolescent psychological adjustment and achievement (Kocayörük, 2009). Healthy father-child communication helps adolescents navigate challenges, leading to better developmental outcomes. This finding aligns with Erikson's (1963) psychosocial development theory, which suggests that disruptions in adolescent development can have lasting effects. Research also links father involvement to reduced risky behaviors (Bronte-Tinkewa et al., 2006). Lerner's developmental theory emphasizes that parenting influences broader ecological factors, such as community, peers, culture, and society (Lerner et al., 2002). These results underscore the importance of paternal engagement in fostering adolescent resilience and adaptive capacities (Lamb, 2010).

This study highlights the critical role of parenting in shaping adolescent PYD. The findings reinforce the importance of positive parenting, parental involvement, and effective supervision, while also demonstrating the negative impact of harsh discipline, inadequate monitoring, and inconsistent parenting. These results contribute to the growing literature on adolescent development by showcasing the interplay between various parenting dimensions and their influence on PYD.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the relationship between parenting practices and Positive Youth Development (PYD) among Malaysian adolescents, providing valuable insights into how different parenting dimensions influence adolescent well-being. The findings revealed that positive parenting behaviors, such as warmth, parental involvement, and consistent discipline, were strongly linked to higher levels of PYD. Conversely, negative parenting practices, including corporal punishment, inconsistent discipline, and poor supervision, were associated with lower PYD scores. These results reinforce the critical role of supportive, engaged, and structured parenting in fostering positive social, emotional, and cognitive outcomes in adolescents.

Additionally, the study explored how demographic factors, such as age, gender, school type, and family income, influence PYD outcomes. The findings showed that older adolescents reported slightly lower PYD scores compared to younger adolescents, suggesting that as teenagers grow, they may face increased psychological and social challenges that require stronger parental support. In terms of gender differences, female adolescents generally reported higher PYD scores than males, indicating that they may be more receptive to parental warmth and involvement or may have different coping mechanisms that support their well-being.

Regarding school type, adolescents attending private or high-performing schools exhibited higher PYD levels, potentially due to better academic and extracurricular support, stronger peer networks, and more engaged parental involvement. On the other hand, students from lower-resourced schools reported lower PYD scores, highlighting the need for additional educational and psychosocial support programs.

Family income also emerged as a significant factor influencing PYD. Adolescents from higher-income families demonstrated stronger PYD outcomes, likely benefiting from greater access to educational resources, extracurricular activities, and supportive environments. Conversely, those from lower-income households faced higher risks of negative developmental outcomes, emphasizing the importance of affordable parenting support programs to mitigate socioeconomic disparities.

This study underscores the interconnected nature of parenting and adolescent development, showing that positive parenting strategies, combined with socioeconomic and educational support, can enhance youth resilience and well-being. These findings provide valuable insights for policymakers, educators, and families, emphasizing the need for evidence-based interventions to support Malaysian adolescents in achieving optimal developmental outcomes.

4.1 Limitations

Despite its valuable contributions, this study has several limitations including the data were collected through self-reported measures, which may be subject to social desirability bias or recall errors. The study primarily assessed adolescents' perceptions of parenting, excluding direct parental reports, which could provide a more comprehensive understanding of parenting practices.

4.2 Recommendations

Based on these findings, the following recommendations are proposed: Implement community-based parenting workshops to educate parents on positive parenting techniques, emphasizing warmth, consistency, and effective communication. Provide training on alternative discipline strategies to reduce reliance on corporal punishment and inconsistent discipline. Collaboration between teachers and parents can help create a supportive environment that enhances adolescent well-being.

REFERENCES

1. Alaeikharaem, F., Esfahani, M. H. N., & Heidari, A. (2013). Parenting styles and adolescent aggression. *Journal of Psychology & Behavioral Sciences*, 2(1), 34-42.
2. Allen, J. P., Moore, C. M., Kuperminc, G. P., & Bell, K. L. (2003). Attachment and adolescent psychosocial functioning. *Child Development*, 74(1), 251-266.
3. Allison, P. D. (2000). Parent education and adolescent well-being. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 15(4), 509-532.
4. Asher, S. R., & Wheeler, V. A. (1985). Children's loneliness: A comparison of rejected and neglected peer status. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 500-505. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.53.4.500
5. Barber, J. G., Bolitho, F., & Bertrand, L. (2001). Parent-child synchrony and adolescent adjustment. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 18(1), 51-64.
6. Barber, B.K., Stoltz, H.E. and Olsen, J.A. (2005) Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: Assessing relevance across time, culture, and method. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 70, 1-137.
7. Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/027243169111004>
8. Beyers, W., & Goossens, L. (2008). Dynamics of perceived parenting and identity formation in late adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31(2), 165-184.
9. Bi, X., Yang, Y., Li, H., Wang, M., Zhang, W., & Deater-Deckard, K. (2018). Parenting styles and parent-adolescent relationships: The mediating roles of behavioral autonomy and parental authority. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 2187. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02187>
10. Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. Basic Books.
11. Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 371-399.
12. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1996). *The Ecology of Human Development: Natural Experiments and Planned*. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas.
13. Bronte-Tinkewa, J., Carrano, J., Horowitz, A., & Kinukawa, A. (2006). Involvement among resident fathers and links to adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(5), 695–721.
14. Bynum, M. S., & Kotchick, B. A. (2006). Mother-adolescent interactions and their association with adolescents' self-esteem and delinquent behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20(4), 568-576.
15. Cham, C. Q., Ibrahim, N., Kalaman, C. R., Ho, M. C., Visvalingam, U., Ahmad Shahabuddin, F., Abd Rahman, F. N., Halim, M. R. T. A., Harbajan Singh, M. K., Azhar, F. L., Yahya, A. N., Roslan, S., & Siau, C. S. (2024). Factors associated with depression, anxiety, and satisfaction with life among Malaysian parental caregivers of adolescent psychiatric patients: A cross-sectional study. *Cambridge Prisms: Global Mental Health*, 11, e12, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gmh.2024.5>
16. Cox, M. J., & Harter, K. S. (2008). Parent-child relationships and youth well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(1), 102-110.
17. Damon, W., & Lerner, R. M. (2008). The scientific study of child and adolescent development: Important issues in the field today. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Child and adolescent development: An advanced course*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
18. Department of Statistics Malaysia (2024). The population of Malaysia. <https://open.dosm.gov.my/dashboard/population>
19. Deng, X., Chen, Y., Li, R., & Tang, C. (2019). Family income, parenting styles, and adolescent well-being: A longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(2), 187-202. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0946-7>
20. Dishion, T. J., & McMahon, R. J. (1998). Parental monitoring and the prevention of child and adolescent problem behavior: A conceptual and empirical formulation. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 1(1), 61-75.
21. Dronkers J., & Avram, S. (2010). A cross-national analysis of the relations of school choice and effectiveness differences between private-dependent and public schools. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 16(2):151-175. doi: 10.1080/13803611.2010.484977
22. Edens, J. F., Skopp, N. A., & Cahill, M. A. (2008). Psychopathic features moderate the relationship between harsh and inconsistent parental discipline and adolescent antisocial behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 37. doi:10.1080/15374410801955938
23. Eccles, J. S. (2005). Subjective Task Value and the Eccles et al. Model of Achievement-Related Choices. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 105–121). Guilford Publications.
24. Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1), 225-241.
25. Eichelsheim, V. I., Buist, K. L., Dekovic, M., Wissink, I. B., Frijns, T., van Lier, P. A. C., Meeus, W. H. J. (2010). Associations among the parent-adolescent relationship, aggression and delinquency in different ethnic

groups: A replication across two Dutch samples. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 45, 293-300. doi:10.1007/s00127-009-0071-z

27. Elgar, F. J., Gariepy, G., Torsheim, T., & Currie, C. (2016). Income inequality and adolescent mental health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 58(5), 552-557.

28. Erickson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.

29. Frick, P. J. (1991). The Alabama Parenting Questionnaire. University of Alabama. Unpublished rating scale. Retrieved from <http://fs.uno.edu/pfrick/APQ.html>

30. Geldhof, G. J., Bowers, E. P., Mueller, M. K., Napolitano, C. M., Callina, K. S., & Lerner, R. M. (2014). Longitudinal analysis of a Very Short Measure of Positive Youth Development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. doi:10.1007/s10964-014-0093-z

31. Granic, I., & Patterson, G. (2006). Toward a comprehensive model of antisocial development: A dynamic systems approach. *Psychological Review*, 13 (1), 101-131.

32. Kaliterna, L., & Burusic, J. (2014). Age and gender differences in well-being in Croatia. In E. Eckermann (Ed.), *Gender, lifespan and quality of life, social indicators research series*: Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht.

33. Kaniušonytė, G., Malinauskienė, O., & Truskauskaitė-Kunevičienė, I. (2014). Child-parent relationships and positive youth development components. *Social Work*, 13, 98-109. doi:10.13165/SD-14-13-1-09

34. Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Burk, W. J. (2010). A reinterpretation of parental monitoring in longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 20(1), 39-64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2009.00623.x>

35. Kocayörük, E. (2009). Father involvement in adolescent development: Promoting the father-child relations in adolescence. Amazon:VDM Verlag.

36. Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (2010). *The role of the father in child development* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

37. Lerner, R. M., Napolitano, C. M., Boyd, M. J., Mueller, M. K., & Callina, K. S. (2018). The positive youth development perspective: Theoretical and empirical bases of a strengths-based approach to adolescent development. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 54, 1-45.

38. Lerner, R. M., Phelps, E., Forman, Y., & Bowers, E. P. (2011). *Positive youth development*. NJ: Springer.

39. Lerner, R. M., Rothbaum, F., Boulos, S., & Castellino, D. R. (2002). Developmental system theory. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Biology and ecology of parenting* (Vol. 2). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

40. Lin, F. G., Chou, Y.-C., Wu, C.-H., & Lin, J.-D. (2014). Short-term and long-term influences of family arguments and gender difference on developing psychological well-being in Taiwanese adolescents. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 35, 2735-2743. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2014.07.018

41. Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2023). Annual education report. <https://www.moe.gov.my>

42. Patalay, P., & Fitzsimons, E. (2018). Developmental pathways to mental health in middle childhood and adolescence: An integrative perspective. *Developmental Science*, 21(3), e12655.

43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12655>

44. Ravi, R. (2023). Parenting & attachment styles: The impact on child development & relationships. Reclaim. <https://www.reclaim13.org/hcblog/parenting-and-attachment-styles-the-impact-on-child-development-and-relationships>

45. Sheeber, L. B., Davis, B., Leve, C., Hops, H., & Tildesley, E. (2007). Adolescents' relationships with their mothers and fathers: Associations with depressive disorder and subdiagnostic symptomatology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 116, 144-154. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-79061-9_845

46. Sheibani, S., Juhari, R. B., Mansour, M. B., Arshat, Z. B., & Yoosefi Looyeh, M. (2018). Relationship between gender, family income, and parenting with positive well-being of Iranian adolescents in Malaysia. *Social Work (Socialinis Darbas)*, 16(2), 190-207.

47. Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 417-453.

48. Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 83-110.

49. Sun, P., Chan, K. L., & Chan, W. C. H. (2016). Gender differences in the psychological well-being of adolescents. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 14(4), 409-425.

50. Surjadi, F. F., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, R. D., & Wickrama, K. A. (2013). Harsh, inconsistent parental discipline and romantic relationships: Mediating processes of behavioral problems and ambivalence. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27, 762-772. doi:10.1037/a0034114

51. Tan, J.-P. (2012). Inter-ethnic and mono-ethnic families: Examining the association of parenting and child Emotional and behavioural adjustment. *PERTANIKA Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 20(1), 165-178. <http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/pjssh/browse/regular-issue?article=JSSH-0277-2010>

52. Watters, C., & O'Callaghan, P. (2016). Mental health and psychosocial interventions for children and adolescents in street situations in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 60, 18-26. doi:10.1016/j.chabu.2016.09.00