



Relationship between Parenting Styles and Socio-Emotional and Character Development among School Students

Dr. Mussarat Jabeen Khan¹, Kainat Zia², Dr. Sumaira Naz³,
Ayesha Jahangir⁴, Awwabah Rufarakh⁵

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between parental styles and students' socio-emotional and character development in schools. The study also examines gender and school system effects on parenting styles and socio-emotional and character development in students. The correlational study focused on school children in Islamabad/Rawalpindi, Pakistan. The Social-emotional and character development scale (*SECDS*) and Parenting style Scale by Ghafoor and Kurukkan (2014) were used to assess social-emotional and character development and parenting styles. The study included 400 schoolchildren, 200 of whom were male and 200 females. Data was analyzed using *SPSS 20*. Results indicated that parents' attentiveness is positively correlated with pro-social conduct, honesty, self-control, self-development, school respect, and home respect. These qualities are negatively correlated with parental control. Female participants had more parental attentiveness, pro-social behavior, honesty, self-control, self-development, and respect in school and at home than male participants. Males scored higher on parental control. The study found that private school students had higher levels of parental responsiveness, pro-social conduct, honesty, self-control, self-development, school respect, and home respect than government school students. However, government school students had more parental control.

Parenting methods affect children's behavior. School-aged children benefit from parental attention in socio-emotional and character development. Parental control, however, hinders such development. Female participants reported more parental attention, socio-emotional, and character development. Private school students develop socio-emotionally and character more than government school students.

Keywords: Parenting styles, Socio-emotional development, Character development, School students

1. Introduction

Parenting techniques have acquired ample attention and consideration from assorted scientific fields. Many psychological studies emphasize the impact of parenting styles on children's socio-emotional and character development. The primary interactions of children with their parents influence their behavior and are likely to shape parenting styles. Parenting style is how parents communicate with their kids. During a lifetime, parenting styles, dimensions, and practices are pivotal for child's development. Parents guide the child's behavior from being dependent on them to become autonomous personality. These control and responsive behavior patterns of the parents provide lasting effects on the children's social, emotional, and character development (Bornstein & Bornstein, 2007).

Theoretical frameworks emphasize the role of parenting styles in children's overall development and have provided rich literature in this field (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). Internalizing and externalizing behavior of children and adolescents have been studied in the light of parenting styles and the role they play in them (Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003). According to Baumrind (1991), there are two dimensions of parenting dimensions: parental control and parental responsiveness. These dimensions have had a direct control on the child's adjustment and the characteristics of the parenting styles are influential in child's development (Steinberg, 2001).

Both parents exhibit controlling and responsive parenting approaches. Controlling behavior is used to limit children's actions, feelings, and thoughts. (Assor, Kaplan, Kanat-Maymon, & Roth, 2005). Controlling behavior involves giving the child instructions and demands to change their conduct, attitude, and opinion, as well as imposing one's own preferences on the child and not letting them speak. Parental control includes only conditional favorable respect for the child to encourage compliance with the parents' ideas. (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004).

According to Smetana (2017), Parents guide, manage, and control children's conduct by setting clear, consistent expectations. This includes giving the youngster a configuration to help them behave responsibly. Kakihara and Tilton-Weaver (2009) say these activities can harm children through behavioral or psychological control. In another facet of parenting, parents show warmth through responding to and accepting their children (Baumrind, 1991). Parents respond to children's actions and thinking. The youngster is allowed to act independently and centered (Bamurind, 1991). The child's ability to respond to situations and emotions shows psychological flexibility. Kashdan and Rottenberg (2010) call it self-control, self-regulation, and emotional regulation.

Parenting is one of the most important factors in personality development, according to Belsky and Barrendz (2002). In contrast, parenting style affects child adjustment and achievement (Kordi & Baharudin, 2010). Learners adjust to the world through socialization. Parental responsiveness and socialization are key to children's cognitive and social development. Parental caregivers are important for children's emotional development, according to several research studies (Kochanska, 2001). In many ways, connections help emotional growth, and it involves

¹ Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan, mussarat.jabeen@iiu.edu.pk

² Corresponding Authors, Department of Psychology, University of Malakand, Pakistan, universalpsyche@gmail.com

³ Hazara University-Mansehra, Pakistan, sumaira_naz_awan@yahoo.com

⁴ Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan, Ayesha.jahangir2023@gmail.com

⁵ Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan, awwabah.rufarakh@gmail.com

understanding, recognizing, expressing, and regulating emotions. Social and emotional development is higher in responsive parents' children (Berg, 2011).

Different approaches have been developed to analyze child character development (Berkowitz & Grych, 2000). Lamb and Feeny (1995) define character development as prosocial behavior, empathy, and standard awareness. Awan, and Zia (2015) define standards awareness as the precursor of conscience, indicating morality and honesty in infants. Other than honesty, moral reasoning, and conscience, Berkowitz and Grych (1998) say self-control, development, and orientation are crucial to character formation. Landy and Ofsky (2009) say children act as their parents train them, whether intentionally or not. Psychoanalytical theory states that children internalize environmental “dos” and “don’ts” and manage and create relationships and feelings. In social and emotional development, they internalize cooperativeness, honesty, and norms (Hay, 1994).

Former Pakistani studies examined psychopathologies connected with parenting methods in children's internalizing and externalizing difficulties. Psychological flexibility promotes adaptive psychological functioning and emotional growth, according to Bond & Bunce (2003). Psychopathologies reduce psychological flexibility (Tull, Gratz, Salterz & Roemer, 2004). Parenting styles and practices affect all aspects of child development (Thergaonkar & Wadkar, 2007). Fathers are authoritarian, controlling, and colder toward their children, while moms are authoritative, controlling, and warmer. Asian moms are also more responsive to their children (Barnhart, Raval, Jansari & Rawal, 2013). Even if the above parenting approaches are still used, fathers are now more receptive to their children (Bhattacharyya & Pradhan, 2015). This study examines and predicts how parenting styles and practices affect middle school students in Pakistan's social, emotional, and cultural development.

1.1. Objectives

- i. To assess the impact of parenting methods on pupils' socio-emotional and character development.
- ii. To examine gender disparities in parenting approaches, socio-emotional, and character development among schoolchildren.
- iii. To compare parenting approaches and socio-emotional and character development in government and private school students.

1.2. Hypotheses

- i. Mother and father responsiveness is positively associated with socio-emotional and character development in school pupils, including Pro-Social Behavior, Honesty, Self-Control, Self-Development, Respect at School, and Respect at Home.
- ii. Negative correlation between mother and father control and socio-emotional and character development (Pro-Social Behavior, Honesty, Self-Control, Self-Development, Respect at School and Home) in school pupils.
- iii. Female students outperform male students in socio-emotional and character development (Pro-Social Behavior, Honesty, Self-Control, Self-Development, Respect at School, and Respect at Home).
- iv. Private school students outperform government school children in socio-emotional and character development, including Pro-Social Behavior, Honesty, Self-Control, Self-Development, Respect at School, and Respect at Home.

2. Research Design

The present study is based on a correlational design that examines the correlation and prediction between parenting styles and social, emotional, and character development among early adolescents. The relation between these exercised variables is explored and their correlations were statistically measured without manipulation.

2.1. Sample

A purposive sampling method was used. Participants ($N=400$) were selected with equal ratio of male ($n=200$) and female ($n=200$) with age between 10 to 15 years. Data was collected using questionnaires from government and private schools in Rawalpindi and Islamabad.

2.2. Social-Emotional and Character Development Scale (SECDS)

Social-emotional and character development scale measures social-emotional skills and character traits including prosocial behavior, honesty, and self-control for elementary school children. The scale consists of 28 items. The scale consists of 6 sub-scales which include prosocial behavior (6 items), honesty (6 items), self-control (5 items), self-development (4 items), respect at school (5 items), and respect at home (4 items). Responses were measured with a Likert-type scale which is 1=none of them, 2= some of them, 3 = most of the time, and 4= all of the time. Cronbach Alpha reliability is 0.83.

2.3. Parenting style Scale

This scale was originally assembled by Ghafoor and Kurukkan (2014). The scale was constructed based on the explanation stated by Baumrind (1991), Maccoby and Martin (1983) for the evaluation of low and high levels of parental responsiveness and parental control. All the items were devised equally for the collaboration of both parents. The scale consists of 38 items, equally divided to measure both sub-scales i.e., parental responsiveness and parental control. Responses were measured with a 5-point scale as, 5=Very right, 4= Mostly right, 3=Sometimes right, sometimes wrong, 2=Mostly wrong, 1=Very wrong. There were no reverse-scored items in the scale. Scores for each parent were taken separately and the sum of scores of both parents was taken for the

overall score of an item, namely the mother's responsiveness, father's responsiveness, mother's control, and father's control. Cronbach Alpha reliability is 0.87.

3. Procedure

Participants were selected from different schools in Rawalpindi and Islamabad. Data was collected using purposive sampling after developing ample cooperation with the participants. Participants were assured of confidentiality of the collected data and true responses were requested from them. Informed consent was taken from each participant and a brief description of the research was given to them. After these participants were presented with questionnaires of parenting styles and social emotional and character development.

4. Results

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (N=400)

Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	Min-Max	Skew	Kurt
Mother Responsiveness	19	.71	55.97(6.14)	29.00-74.00	.15	.02
Mother Control	19	.79	62.97(3.98)	20.00-83.00	.15	.06
Father Responsiveness	19	.77	57.40(7.93)	19.00-90.00	.03	.72
Father Control	19	.72	59.04(5.79)	21.00-89.00	-.04	-.64
Pro-Social Behavior	6	.72	14.60(2.86)	6.00-22.00	-.28	-.66
Honesty	6	.77	15.47(2.74)	8.00-24.00	-.17	-.67
Self Control	5	.74	11.87(2.98)	6.00-18.00	.15	.03
Self Development	4	.80	10.97(2.79)	6.00-16.00	.18	.31
Respect at School	5	.79	13.75(1.89)	7.00-18.00	.17	.29
Respect at Home	4	.83	10.98(3.21)	5.00-15.00	.19	.37

Table 1 shows good reliability estimates, which indicates that all the instruments are internally consistent. Results also specify that the values of skewness and kurtosis are falling within acceptable range i.e., -1 to +1.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix of Study Variables (N=400)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Mother responsiveness	-	-	.71*	-.59*	.65*	.62*	.61*	.73*	.74*	.69*
2 Mother control	-	-	-	.61*	-	-.67*	-.59*	-.60*	-.74*	-
3 Father responsiveness	-	-	-	-.60*	.67*	.71*	.73*	.68*	.74*	.69*
4 Father control	-	-	-	-	-.60*	-.57*	-.71*	-.64*	-.72*	-
5 Pro-social behavior	-	-	-	-	-	.56*	.62*	.68*	.64*	.61*
6 Honesty	-	-	-	-	-	-	.70*	.64*	.68*	.61*
7 Self control	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.58*	.64*	.60*
8 Self development	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.67*	.66*
9 Respect at school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.67*
10 Respect at home	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* $p < .05$

Table 2 shows relationship among studied variables. Mother responsiveness and father responsiveness are positively correlated with pro-social behavior, honesty, self control, self development, respect at school and respect at home. Whereas mother control and father control are negatively correlated with pro-social behavior, honesty, self control, self development, respect at school and respect at home. The magnitude of correlation ranges from .56 to .74.

Table 3: Mean, Standard Deviation, and t-values of Boys and Girls on study variables (N=400)

Variables	Girls (n=200)	Boys (n=200)	<i>t</i> (398)	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i>		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
Mother Responsiveness	55.97(6.14)	49.24(6.06)	.13	.01	1.00	2.28	2.99
Mother Control	57.27(4.21)	62.97(3.98)	2.54	.00	.39	2.02	.97
Father Responsiveness	57.40(7.33)	51.37(7.73)	.40	.00	.31	1.53	.07
Father Control	50.29(5.63)	59.04(5.79)	1.90	.01	.11	2.04	.33
Pro-Social Behavior	14.60(2.86)	11.46(2.07)	2.70	.01	.24	1.65	.46
Honesty	15.47(2.74)	10.73(2.54)	1.75	.01	.74	1.32	.86
Self Control	11.87(2.98)	9.27(2.54)	1.29	.01	.69	1.67	1.02
Self Development	10.97(2.79)	8.11(2.29)	2.31	.01	.80	1.08	1.34
Respect at School	13.75(1.89)	10.05(2.01)	1.98	.01	.72	1.98	1.27
Respect at Home	10.98(3.21)	7.99(3.24)	2.37	.01	.68	2.08	1.09

Table 3 shows difference between girls and boys on different parenting styles and socio-emotional and character development. Girls reported higher at mother responsiveness, father responsiveness, pro-social behavior, honesty, self control, self development, respect at school and respect at home than boys. Whereas boys scored higher at mother control and father control than girls.

Table 4: Mean, Standard Deviation, and t-values of Students Studying in Government and Private Schools on Study Variables (N=400)

Variables	Private (n=200)	Government (n=200)	<i>t</i> (398)	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i>		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
Mother Responsiveness	54.47(6.14)	49.34(6.06)	2.79	.00	1.98	3.78	2.01
Father Responsiveness	56.47(4.32)	63.27(3.92)	5.37	.00	2.00	2.28	2.99
Mother Control	58.49(7.30)	51.57(7.13)	4.98	.02	1.53	2.31	.07
Father Control	51.24(5.60)	59.39(5.71)	3.76	.04	1.04	2.21	.33
Pro-Social Behavior	14.69(2.80)	11.76(2.17)	5.79	.00	1.24	4.65	.46
Honesty	16.07(2.84)	11.03(2.84)	5.25	.01	.75	2.47	.89
Self Control	12.97(2.91)	9.31(2.39)	4.13	.01	1.01	5.79	1.02
Self Development	11.07(2.69)	8.71(2.59)	3.40	.01	.92	3.87	.92
Respect at School	14.25(2.09)	10.65(2.17)	1.9	.01	.69	4.31	1.39
Respect at Home	11.58(3.15)	7.65(3.31)	2.7	.00	.82	4.25	.96

Table 4 shows the difference between students studying in private and government schools. Students studying in private school system reported higher mother responsiveness, father responsiveness, pro-social behavior, honesty, self-control, self-development, respect at school, and respect at home than students studying in the government school system. Whereas students studying in the government school system scored higher at mother control and father control than students studying in the private school system.

5. Discussion

The current study examined and predicted the relationship between parenting methods and early adolescents' social, emotional, and character development. Mother and father responsiveness was expected to positively correlate with pro-social conduct, honesty, self-control, self-development, school respect, and home respect. The idea that mother and father responsiveness promotes pro-social conduct, honesty, self-control, self-development, respect at school, and respect at home was supported. Lorca, Richaud, and Malonda (2017) found that adolescents with higher parental responsiveness exhibit higher pro-social behavior, supporting the present study's findings. Another study found that parental responsiveness predicts prosocial behavior (Malonda et al., 2019).

A study also found that stronger parental response enhances adolescent honesty and candor, supporting the concept (Bureau & Mageau, 2014). A further study found that parental responsiveness was positively connected with self-control. The results also demonstrated that adolescents with higher parental responsiveness have higher self-control (Ng-Knight et al., 2016). Another study found that adolescents with higher parental attentiveness scored higher on all developmental outcomes psychological, behavioral, and academic (Gracia et al., 2012). Sarwar (2016) found that responsive authoritative parents prevent teenage misbehavior. This shows that adolescents with responsive parents are respected in natural and social settings, supporting the favorable association between parental responsiveness and respect at home and school.

The study hypothesized that mother and father control negatively affect socio-emotional and character development (Pro-Social Behavior, Honesty, Self-Control, Self-Development, Respect at School, and Respect at Home) in schoolchildren. The present study confirmed that mother and father control negatively affects pro-social behavior, honesty, self-control, self-development, school respect, and home respect. This supports prior research indicating parental control negatively affects prosocial conduct (Carlo et al., 2011). Mother and father control also negatively correlates with adolescent honesty (Bureau & Mageau, 2014). Another study found that parental control was adversely connected with self-control in teenagers and that stronger parental control reduced self-control (Ng-Knight et al., 2016). This study supports Shek, Zhu, and Ma (2018), who found a negative association between parental control and teenage development. The findings confirmed that parental control hinders teenage development.

Another study found that parental supervision increases psychological maladjustment, which slows adolescent development (Nucci, Hasebe & Lins-Dyer, 2005). A study also showed that authoritarian parents' regulating behavior causes problematic behavior and lowers teenagers' home respect (Sarwar, 2016). This study found that girls reported higher mother and father responsiveness, pro-social behavior, honesty, self-control, self-development, respect at school, and respect at home than boys. Girls scored worse on mother and father control than boys. Another study found that girls report more indulgent parents than boys because they are more family-oriented. The study also hypothesized that females are more sensitive and aware of social relationships than boys since parenting practices focus on the psychological environment (Bi et al., 2018). Another study found girls scored higher on prosocial behavior than boys (Van der Graaff et al., 2018). Girls reported higher levels of prosocial behavior and honesty than males, and adolescents with higher prosocial behavior are more likely to be honest (Grosch & Rau, 2017). Girls also rated higher on self-control than guys. Boys were also more likely to demonstrate aggressive and troublesome behavior, a visible trait of weak self-control (Tau, Wang, Fan & Gao, 2014). Another study found that boys reported stronger parental control than girls, supporting our findings. The study found that parents used controlling tactics to distinguish between males and girls. Girls were more prosocial than boys in another study (Van der Graaff et al., 2018). Girls reported greater prosocial conduct and honesty than boys, and honest adolescents are more prosocial (Grosch & Rau, 2017). Self-control was higher in girls than boys. Boys were also more likely to act aggressively and misbehave, indicating poor self-control (Tau, Wang, Fan & Gao, 2014). Another study found that boys reported more parental control than girls, corroborating our findings. The study indicated that parents-controlled boys and girls (Endendijk et al., 2016).

5.1. Limitations and Implications

While the current study illustrated enough evidence for the hypotheses of the study, a couple of limitations were faced. Namely, data was collected using the purposive sampling technique, which deprives generalizability. It is suggested to use a random sampling technique and to draw upon a more demographically diverse sample to improve generalizability.

There is a need to further investigate the causal effect of parenting styles and the socioemotional and character development of adolescents. Correspondingly, the present study suggested that the collective impact of parental control and responsiveness hinders parent-child relationships which can be further explored.

Despite limitations, the results of the study emphasized the importance and development of parenting interventions. To explore the course of parental responsiveness and control following study provides the ground for the theoretical model of parenting styles and their long-term effects on different stages of child development. Factors underlying the basis of parental responsiveness and control can comprehend the cause of action in regard to prosocial behavior and self-development. These factors can help reveal various paths whereby parents can enhance children's wellbeing by adopting different strategies i.e., by being responsive and thoughtful in a variety of manners.

6. Conclusion

This study correlated and predicted parenting approaches with early adolescent social, emotional, and character development. According to statistical analyses and literature reviews, mother and father responsiveness was positively correlated, and control was negatively correlated with socio-emotional and character development (Pro-Social Behavior, Honesty, Self-Control, Self-Development, Respect at School, and Respect at Home) in schoolchildren. Girls scored higher than boys in mother responsiveness, father responsiveness, pro-social conduct, honesty, self-control, self-development, school respect, and home respect. Additionally, private school pupils develop socio-emotional and character skills better than government school children.

References

- Assor, A., Kaplan, H., Kanat-Maymon, Y., & Roth, G. (2005). Directly controlling teacher behaviors as predictors of poor motivation and engagement in girls and boys: The role of anger and anxiety. *Learning and Instruction, 15*(5), 397-413.
- Assor, A., Roth, G., & Deci, E. L. (2004). The emotional costs of parents' conditional regard: A Self-Determination Theory analysis. *Journal of personality, 72*(1), 47-88.
- Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behavior. *Child development, 76*(6), 1144-1159.
- Awan, A. G., & Zia, A. (2015). Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Educational Institutions: A case study of District Vehari-Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(16), 122-130.
- Barnhart, C. M., Raval, V. V., Jansari, A., & Raval, P. H. (2013). Perceptions of parenting style among college students in India and the United States. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 22*(5), 684-693.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The journal of early adolescence, 11*(1), 56-95.
- Belsky, J. & Barends, N., (2002) Personality and parenting. In: Bornstein MH (Ed.), Handbook of Parenting (2nd ed). Bening & Becoming a Parent. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 3, 415-438.
- Berg, B. (2011). The effects of parenting styles on a preschool aged child's social emotional development.
- Berkowitz, M. W., & Grych, J. H. (1998). Fostering goodness: Teaching parents to facilitate children's moral development. *Journal of moral Education, 27*(3), 371-391.
- Berkowitz, M. W., & Grych, J. H. (2000). Early character development and education. *Early Education and Development, 11*(1), 55-72.
- Bhattacharyya, P., & Pradhan, R. K. (2015). Perceived paternal parenting style and proactive coping strategies of Indian adolescents. *International Journal of Psychological Studies, 7*(2), 180.
- 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.
- Bond, F. W., & Bunce, D. (2003). The role of acceptance and job control in mental health, job satisfaction, and work performance. *Journal of applied psychology, 88*(6), 1057.
- Bornstein, L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2007). Parenting styles and child social development. Encyclopedia on early childhood development. Montreal: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development and Strategic Knowledge Cluster on Early Child Development.
- Bureau, J. S., & Mageau, G. A. (2014). Parental autonomy support and honesty: The mediating role of identification with the honesty value and perceived costs and benefits of honesty. *Journal of Adolescence, 37*(3), 225-236.
- Carlo, G., Mestre, M. V., Samper, P., Tur, A., & Armenta, B. E. (2011). The longitudinal relations among dimensions of parenting styles, sympathy, prosocial moral reasoning, and prosocial behaviors. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 35*(2), 116-124.
- Endendijk, J. J., Groeneveld, M. G., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Mesman, J. (2016). Gender-differentiated parenting revisited: Meta-analysis reveals very few differences in parental control of boys and girls. *PLoS one, 11*(7), e0159193.
- Gracia, E., Fuentes, M. C., Garcia, F., & Lila, M. (2012). Perceived neighborhood violence, parenting styles, and developmental outcomes among Spanish adolescents. *Journal of Community Psychology, 40*(8), 1004-1021.
- Grosch, K., & Rau, H. A. (2017). Gender differences in honesty: The role of social value orientation. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 62*, 258-267.
- Hart, C. H., Newell, L. D., & Olsen, S. F. (2003). Parenting skills and social-communicative competence in childhood.
- Hay, D. F. (1994). Prosocial development. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 35*(1), 29-71.
- Kakihara, F., & Tilton-Weaver, L. (2009). Adolescents' interpretations of parental control: Differentiated by domain and types of control. *Child development, 80*(6), 1722-1738.
- Kashdan, T. B., & Rottenberg, J. (2010). Psychological flexibility as a fundamental aspect of health. *Clinical psychology review, 30*(7), 865-878.

- Kochanska, G. (2001). Emotional development in children with different attachment histories: The first three years. *Child development, 72*(2), 474-490.
- Kordi, A., & Baharudin, R. (2010). Parenting attitude and style and its effect on children's school achievements. *International journal of psychological studies, 2*(2), 217.
- Lambs., & Feeny, N.C. (1995). Early Moral Sense and socialization. In W.M. Kurtines and 3. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction* (pp. 497-510). Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- Landy S, Osofsky JD. (2009). *Pathways to Competence: Encouraging Healthy Social and Emotional Development in Young Children*. Second Edition. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes;
- Llorca, A., Richaud, M. C., & Malonda, E. (2017). Parenting styles, prosocial, and aggressive behavior: The role of emotions in offender and non-offender adolescents. *Frontiers in psychology, 8*, 1246.
- Malonda, E., Llorca, A., Mesurado, B., Samper, P., & Mestre, M. V. (2019). Parents or peers? Predictors of prosocial behavior and aggression: a longitudinal study. *Frontiers in psychology, 10*, 2379.
- Ng-Knight, T., Shelton, K. H., Riglin, L., McManus, I. C., Frederickson, N., & Rice, F. (2016). A longitudinal study of self-control at the transition to secondary school: Considering the role of pubertal status and parenting. *Journal of Adolescence, 50*, 44-55.
- Nucci, L., Hasebe, Y., & Lins, D. M. T. (2005). Adolescent psychological well-being and parental control of the personal. *New directions for child and adolescent development, 2005*(108), 17-30.
- Sarwar, S. (2016). Influence of parenting style on children's behaviour. *Journal of Education and Educational Development, 3*(2).
- Shek, D. T., Zhu, X., & Ma, C. (2018). The influence of parental control and parent-child relational qualities on adolescent internet addiction: A 3-year longitudinal study in Hong Kong. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 642.
- Smetana, J. G. (2017). Current research on parenting styles, dimensions, and beliefs. *Current opinion in psychology, 15*, 19-25.
- Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of research on adolescence, 11*(1), 1-19.
- Thergaonkar, N. R., & Wadkar, A. J. (2007). Relationship between Test Anxiety and Parenting Style. *Journal of Indian Association for Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 3*(1), 10-12.
- Tull, M. T., Gratz, K. L., Salters, K., & Roemer, L. (2004). The role of experiential avoidance in posttraumatic stress symptoms and symptoms of depression, anxiety, and somatization. *The Journal of nervous and mental disease, 192*(11), 754-761.
- Van der Graaff, J., Carlo, G., Crocetti, E., Koot, H. M., & Branje, S. (2018). Prosocial behavior in adolescence: gender differences in development and links with empathy. *Journal of youth and adolescence, 47*(5), 1086-1099.