



RESEARCH PAPER

Empowering Growth: Unveiling Maternal and Paternal Roles in Adolescent Development Within an Autonomy-Supportive Framework

¹ Syeda Asma Gillani*, ²Palwasha Nasir Abbasi and ³Zoya Manzoor

1. Lecturer, University of Azad Jumma and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad, AJ&K, Pakistan

2. Student, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, AJ&K, Pakistan

3. Student, University of Azad Jumma and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad, Pakistan, AJ&K, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author: asmagillani2011@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the effects of maternal and paternal inducement on teenage personal development, with emphasis on autonomy-supportive parenting. It seeks to establish how parents' different behaviors like facilitation, encouragement, modeling, and rewarding affect adolescent development. Autonomy-supportive parenting is very important in building intrinsic motivation and self-actualization, according to Self-Determination Theory. While maternal participation has been found to be essential in adolescent growth, paternal inducement remains poorly understood. The current research explores whether paternal and maternal inducement both make unique contributions to adolescent personal growth and to what extent demographic variables influence such outcomes. Regression analysis was used to evaluate the association between parental behaviors and adolescent development. Parental facilitation, encouragement, modeling, and rewarding were some of the predictors that were evaluated. Demographic variables like gender, maternal education, family structure, and socioeconomic status were also evaluated. Findings show that maternal inducement plays a considerable role in personal growth, specifically through facilitation and encouragement, while paternal inducement plays no significant role. Notably, maternal and paternal rewarding behavior were negatively correlated with personal growth, indicating that overdependence on external rewards might inhibit self-directed growth. Autonomy, self-acceptance, and emotion regulation also were identified as predictors of adolescent personal development. Gender differences were also noted, with females showing more personal growth than males. Furthermore, greater maternal education was negatively correlated with personal growth, perhaps because higher academic expectations restricted autonomy. Parenting interventions need to encourage autonomy-supportive practices among both parents. Schools and policymakers need to promote increased paternal involvement to counterbalance parental influence. Cultural and socioeconomic influences on parenting and adolescent development need to be studied in future research.

KEYWORDS

Adolescent Personal Development, Parental Influence, Autonomy-Supportive Parenting, Emotional Regulation

Introduction

Personal growth and self-actualization entail finding and living in conformity with one's true self, authenticity, inner strength, and presence. Personal growth and self-actualization are a relentless pursuit of an effort to be more than oneself. As O'Connell and O'Connell (1974) explain, self-actualization is an on-going, conscious process of becoming all one can be as a human being. Jones and Crandall (1986) advocate that

personal growth is optimally attained through five basic dimensions, namely autonomy, self-acceptance and self-esteem, freedom of expression and emotional acceptance, trust and accountability in relationships, and coping with life's issues. There are several theories that try to account for the process of personal growth, describing how a person evolves from a dependent, disorganized infant into a mature adult with emotional, social, and intellectual abilities. Three major theoretical models offer important information about this process.

Sigmund Freud's personal development theory focuses on the influence of early childhood experiences on a person's personality.

Freud (1960) assumed that by age six or seven, individual development was all but complete. He described three stages of development in early childhood as crucial: the oral stage (birth to 18 months), the anal stage (1.5 to 3 years), and the phallic stage (3 to 7 years). Freud asserted that what occurs between the child and caregivers during these stages leaves indelible marks on adult personality. For example, the degree of love and concern in the oral stage profoundly determines the ability to trust and feel secure as an adult. In a similar vein, the anal stage is about independence and control, whereas the phallic stage has an immense role to play in defining gender identity. Freud further implied that while these childhood events may be repressed, they continue to have an effect on adult behavior (Khalid, 2004). Drawing on the work of Freud, Erik Erikson developed the theory of personality development into a more comprehensive, lifelong process. Erikson (1963) suggested that human development proceeds along a fixed sequence, termed the epigenetic principle, that is, personality develops in stages in accord with a set plan.

While Freud did not stress that growth occurs throughout life, Erikson did. Erikson saw each stage as a specific psychological problem. He thought that overcoming these problems successfully prepares one for further phases of development (Khalid, 2004). Behaviorist psychologists, on the other hand, see personal development as a product of acquired behaviors due to reinforcement and punishment. From a behaviorist point of view, development entails acquiring self-regulation and ability by learning how to change behaviors in accordance with rewards and sanctions. Behaviorists contend that people learn by identifying patterns around them—learning what behaviors get them positive results and what ones to avoid (Jourard, 1974). Skinner (1968), one of the most prominent behaviorists, posited that personal growth is all about avoiding negative experiences and maximizing environmental factors to favor good behavior. According to him, self-awareness results from learning that behavior is not arbitrary but follows consistent patterns based on outside influences. Each of these theories presents a unique way of looking at personal growth. Whether determined by unconscious early experiences, systematic developmental phases, or acquired behavior, the journey of self-actualization continues to be a vital part of human existence.

Humanistic Perspective

Humanistic psychologists have done most of the research on personal growth. They focus on the fact that people are born with a natural ability to self-regulate, self-actualize, and become independent, functioning individuals—given the right environment to grow in. Rogers (1989) felt that everyone has the ability for self-awareness and personal development. But if this potential is not realized, it does not vanish but lies dormant. He believed that in a psychologically nurturing setting, people will become more self-directed, social, creative, and mature by nature. Likewise, Maslow

(1970) discussed personal growth and proposed that individuals always move towards self-actualization, if their surroundings support and foster this process. He emphasized the necessity of meeting basic physiological; safety, love, and self-esteem need as fundamental aspects of building motivation for development and empowering people to achieve their potential (Khalid, 2004).

Self-Regulation

Self-regulation is a systematic process that is involved in the development of judgment, thinking patterns, and decision-making and, consequently, leads people towards the attainment of certain objectives. Zimmerman (2000) underscored the need for psychological and educational research into self-regulation. It has been frequently applied to denote learners' capacity to understand and learn in varying modes (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1994; Winner, 1990). A number of theories surrounding self-regulation emphasize its relation to goal-setting. Clarity on purpose, quality, and performance is brought by goals (Latham & Locke, 1990). Goal-setting entails setting a specific standard and working towards achieving it. Self-regulation functions in various stages, such as planning (selection of goals and strategy development), monitoring performance (evaluation of progress and making adjustments), and taking regulatory processes like the evaluation of progress and realignment of strategies (Zimmerman, 1988).

At the most fundamental level, self-regulation involves one's capability to suppress and rebuild their response so as not to engage in undesired actions through the exertion of control on initial urges. Regulation in this sense is seen to entail an intentional transformation which steers conduct towards realizing a specific goal. Zeidner, Boekaerts, and Pintrich (2000) have portrayed self-regulation as a cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral integration process. These aspects allow individuals to modify their behaviors, meet their requirements, and efficiently cope with fluctuating environmental conditions. According to Polivy (1998), adjusting one's response based on the environment does not necessarily mean resisting the situation but accepting it. Self-restraint constitutes a subset of self-regulation, where it entails suppression or control of the responses, generally through dominance or suppression (Bryant, 2006). Moreover, self-regulation can also be understood as the capability to set, put into practice, and maintain behavior that is congruent with one's goals (Brown, Miller, & Lawendowski, 1999). Self-regulation is a function of various factors that make it work or fail. It is an important factor in cognitive processes such as thinking, learning, problem-solving, and decision-making. Capacity for organizing, guiding, and thinking about one's behavior is a necessity to react to change appropriately (Brown, 1998). Self-regulation helps in the direction towards specific goals with avoidance or deferral of inappropriate behavior. Further, it constitutes an organized mechanism of goal setting and self-guiding toward achieving goals (Vancouver, 2000).

Components of Self-Regulation

At first, self-regulation was characterized by three main components (Baumeister et al., 1994), but afterwards motivation emerged as a fourth crucial element.

Monitoring

Monitoring is the core function of self-regulation. Zimmerman (2000) defines self-regulation as a continuous process in which past knowledge is utilized to enhance actual performance. As environmental, personal, and behavioral factors alter with time,

constant monitoring is required. Baumeister and Vohs (2007) define that self-regulation is done by comparing the current state with a standard one. If one fails to reach the standard, changes are instituted, and this cycle continues until the alignment. But one also has the freedom to stop regulating oneself for behaviors.

Willpower

Willpower is another essential part of self-regulation. Effort is involved in changing one's behavior, and hence willpower is very important. This process briefly drains the energy of an individual, resulting in the phenomenon of ego depletion. Evidence shows that blood glucose, which serves as the brain's primary source of energy, is important in self-regulation. When people use self-control, the glucose runs out, and this can affect their capacity to maintain self-regulatory activities (Gailliot & Baumeister, 2007).

Motivation

Motivation is the engine of self-regulation. It sets one's capability to work towards goals and keep up with desired standards. The more motivated one is, the greater the chances of successfully reaching self-regulatory goals. Without motivation, self-regulation fails even if one has specific goals, a functional monitoring system, and adequate resources (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). For self-regulation to work, all four components need to work together. Yet to some degree, one component may substitute for another. For example, if one is not self-regulatory, motivation can replace it (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). Brown (1998) contends that the lack of any of these components can contribute to behavioral dysregulation and hence to such disorders as addiction. Though very important, this model of self-regulation is not without faults.

Types of Regulation

Four types of regulation were identified by Deci and Ryan (1985), namely external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integrated regulation. These types of regulation explain how behaviors are shaped by various motivational processes, from external pressures to full internalization.

Internalization

Internalization is a process in which individuals incorporate external influences into their internal framework, shaping their thoughts and behaviors accordingly (Schafer, 1968). For example, a student who initially lacks interest in learning mathematical principles cannot be forced to do so. However, encouragement through positive reinforcement, such as praise and admiration from teachers and parents, can facilitate internal motivation. Internalization, as per self-determination theory, is a motivational process through which people take up behaviors as their own.

External Regulation

If an action is performed as a result of external pressures, rewards, or punishments, it is termed as external regulation. For example, if a student does homework just because they are afraid of being punished or hope for a reward, then their behavior is externally regulated. Here, the motivation is not based on individual interest but is driven by external pressures or incentives.

Introjected Regulation

Introjected regulation-influenced behavior is not regarded as self-determined, since it is done under internal tension or pressure. This regulation is characterized by internalized obligations and expectations, which are usually followed by guilt, shame, or the need to gain approval (Deci & Ryan, 1991). The behavior is regulated by internalized standards, yet it is not voluntary, since people feel they must do something to escape negative feelings or gain approval.

Identified Regulation

Identified regulation happens when a person voluntarily performs a behavior, acknowledging its personal worth and meaning. In contrast to the behavior of an externally regulated individual, actions based on identified regulation are self-directed. Yet, external factors like rewards or punishments can still be involved. For instance, a student who spends additional time learning science because they truly believe it will lead to academic success is using identified regulation. Although their motivation is still extrinsic, they willingly commit to the behavior since they perceive it as useful to their objectives.

Integrated Regulation

Integrated regulation is the highest form of self-regulation, where behaviors are completely in accordance with a person's values and identity. Integrated regulation usually emerges during adulthood, as people become more aware of their behaviors and their meaning. During this process, individuals give high importance to activities that lead to significant consequences. As an example, a student who views herself as both an avid scholar and a good athlete might find herself in internal conflict when these roles conflict. To resolve this, she makes a deliberate, rational choice to prioritize the identity most closely aligned with her long-term goals. Each of these forms of regulation illustrates how motivation develops from control outside of oneself to full internalization, influencing people's behaviors and decision-making.

Parental Inducement

Parental engagement plays a crucial role in fostering a strong connection between home and school, significantly influencing various aspects of a child's educational journey. Research has consistently shown a positive correlation between parental involvement and students' academic performance, behavior, and social development. This relationship is of great interest to educators, policymakers, parents, and students alike, prompting extensive research on the impact of parental participation in education (Rowley & Schulenberg, 2007).

Parental involvement has been defined in various ways in academic literature. Although it is a complex process that goes beyond geographical location, researchers commonly define it in two broad categories: home-based involvement and school-based involvement. Home-based involvement describes parental activity outside the school environment, such as helping children with homework, supervising study habits, and tracking academic achievement. It also includes influencing children's attitudes and behaviors to enhance learning. Conversely, school-based engagement involves direct participation in school activities, including attending parent-teacher conferences, volunteering in school programs, and sponsoring extracurricular activities such as summer programs and school-organized field trips (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005).

- Educational professionals all concur that students do better when their parents are actively involved in their education. The form of this participation is varied, from going to school meetings and volunteering to helping with homework, all of which help towards greater academic achievement. There are many studies that point to the advantages of parental involvement, such as higher motivation, better school retention rates, and fewer dropouts.
- Among various types of parental involvement, offering homework support to children is one of the most immediate and significant ways parents can help their child learn. Such involvement generates emotional support, encouragement, and security, leading to a child's overall well-being. Research by Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005) indicates that, over the last few years, schools have worked diligently to enhance parental involvement in student learning. Numerous research has established that parental involvement and children's success at school have an extremely strong connection, and this also involves personality traits contributing to success.

Parental Inducement and Socioeconomic Status

Studies have shown a high relationship between socioeconomic status, academic achievement of students, and parental involvement. Research indicates that children belonging to lower socioeconomic status families and with fewer economic resources tend to experience developmental issues. Parents who earn higher incomes, on the other hand, work fewer hours to maintain their living, and as a result, they can spend more time with their children's education. Mead (1992, 1997) had forecasted that children whose parents are dependent on welfare would suffer from adverse psychological and cultural consequences. As per Mead (1992), these children can develop negative attitudes toward work, which will impact their drive to achieve academic success. While parental investment of time in education for children is priceless, welfare dependency can, at times, lower children's ambitions.

In working-class families, parents who feel they are actively engaged in their children's schooling are more likely to offer greater resources, including access to computers, training, and scholastic support. These parents, however, view their participation as an informal aspect of a broad regimen rather than as a planned design. Their participation in day-to-day academic activities, including helping with homework and parent-teacher meetings, is relatively lower, although they are actively involved in seeing that their children's educational requirements are fulfilled. Parents with less education, however, might not be concerned with overseeing their child's academic progress and might be more concerned with financial assistance or welfare benefits (Lareau, 1987). Alldred and Edwards (2000) highlighted that increased parental participation has a significant influence on the capabilities of children in learning. Independent of socioeconomic status or racial divisions, they determined a direct connection between parental involvement and academic success among students. Likewise, Okpala et al. (2001) determined that academically, children from well-off families score higher than their counterparts from lower-income families with some exceptions.

Literature Review

Personal development and self-actualization are integral parts of human growth, incorporating autonomy, acceptance of oneself, emotional sensitivity, and the capability

to cope with life's trials (Jones & Crandall, 1986). Theories of psychology try to decipher the processes in personal development and each has something different to propose.

Freud's (1960) theory of psychosexual development focuses on early childhood and its role in laying the cornerstone of personality growth. He suggested that critical incidents that take place during the oral, anal, and phallic stages influence adult behavior, indicating that unconscious conflicts in these stages may appear as personality in adulthood (Khalid, 2004). Erikson (1963) built on Freud's theory and developed a psychosocial model of development. His epigenetic principle is that personality develops through a series of eight stages, each characterized by a distinctive psychological challenge (Khalid, 2004). Unlike Freud, Erikson stressed that development goes on throughout life and that successfully overcoming developmental crises allows one to become mature emotionally and socially.

Behavioral theories, however, perceive individual development as an outcome of conditioned behavior influenced by reward and penalty. Skinner (1968) contended that behavior is the product of the environment and self-regulation results from individuals becoming able to adapt their behavior on the basis of reward and sanction. According to this theory, self-awareness is not an inherent quality but a conditioned response to external forces (Jourard, 1974).

Humanistic psychology, most notably that of Maslow (1970) and Rogers (1989), has also had a notable contribution to theories on personal growth. Maslow's hierarchy of needs describes the move from physical survival to self-actualization and states that meeting lower-order needs allows one to reach full potential (Khalid, 2004). Rogers (1989) reinforced the roles of self-understanding and care-giving conditions in promoting personal development, noting that people move naturally toward becoming better versions of themselves when subjected to healthy psychological conditions.

Self-regulation is a fundamental process in personal development, entailing goal-setting, monitoring, willpower, and motivation (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). Zimmerman (2000) emphasizes the function of self-regulation in learning, positing that individuals with high self-regulatory capacity are able to plan effectively, track progress, and modify their behavior in order to attain desired results. Motivation takes center stage in this process since it indicates how much persistence and effort an individual would exhibit towards goal realization (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). Based on Deci and Ryan's (1985) Self-Determination Theory, self-regulation is on a continuum from external regulation (behavior controlled by external rewards and punishments) to integrated regulation (behavior completely in line with personal values and identity).

Baumeister et al. (1994) originally conceptualized three main elements of self-regulation—monitoring, willpower, and goal-setting—expanding the model subsequently to add motivation as a fourth essential factor. Evidence indicates that self-regulatory failures, such as impulsivity and goal-persistence failure, can contribute to behavioral dysregulation and psychopathology (Brown, 1998). In addition, self-regulation is cognitively and emotionally determined, with individuals having to weigh short-term impulses against long-term goals (Zeidner, Boekaerts, & Pintrich, 2000).

Parental involvement is well established as a key predictor of a child's academic success, emotional health, and personal development (Rowley & Schulenberg, 2007). Studies differentiate between home-based (e.g., helping with homework, developing learning habits) and school-based (e.g., parent-teacher conferences, volunteering in

school programs) involvement (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005). Research has repeatedly shown a positive relationship between parental involvement and student achievement, such as enhanced motivation, better academic performance, and lower dropout rates.

Yet, socioeconomic status (SES) is key to influencing parental engagement and student performance in turn. SES is typically associated with more education resources available to it, more time to devote to learning, and higher school connection (Lareau, 1987). For lower-income families, though, financial demands will at times constrain participation in school events or the offer of learning assistance in the home environment (Okpala et al., 2001). Mead (1992, 1997) believed that children in welfare-dependent families could be inclined to negative attitudes towards work and education, which would impact their educational ambitions. On the other hand, parents with steady incomes and good educational backgrounds are likely to spend more on the education of their child, providing a well-organized and encouraging environment for self-development (Alldred & Edwards, 2000).

In spite of economic differences, studies indicate that parental support and participation can counteract some of the detrimental consequences of lower SES. Schools that are actively involved with parents of various socioeconomic statuses can help close the gap by offering resources, workshops, and community support programs (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005).

Hypotheses

H1: Both maternal and paternal parental inducement impact adolescents' personal growth together, with maternal inducement exerting a larger effect.

H2: Maternal and paternal parental facilitation is positively linked with personal growth, while both maternal and paternal parental rewarding behavior is negatively linked with personal growth.

H3: Psychological elements like autonomy, self-acceptance, and acceptance of feelings are positively linked with personal growth.

H4: Socio-demographic variables such as gender, mother's work and education, family structure, and socioeconomic status impact personal growth, with female respondents showing higher personal growth compared to male respondents, and with extended family systems and lower socioeconomic status having a negative correlation with personal growth.

Material and Methods

Instruments

Parental Inducement

Parental participation in the study was assessed with the Parental Inducement of Academic Self-Regulation Scale, initially created by Martinez-Pons. The scale is based on a five-point Likert scale, from 1 (not involved at all) to 5 (very involved). It measures various dimensions of parental participation, such as modeling, encouragement, facilitation, and rewards. Both the father's and mother's participation were measured separately. The median score on this scale was at the 50th percentile, such that

adolescents with scores above this level had greater parental involvement, while those with scores below it had lower parental engagement.

Self-Regulation

Self-regulation was measured with the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Self-Efficacy, a scale modified by Martinez-Pons in 1996. The scale contains social support and self-regulated learning components with items that directly assess self-efficacy in academic self-regulation. Respondents answered on a seven-point scale, with 1 representing "I never do this" and 7 representing "I always do this." The mean score of the scale was 53, and adolescents who scored above 53.5 were considered high self-regulators, while those who scored below 53 were considered low self-regulators.

Self-Actualization

Self-actualization was assessed through the Index of Personal Growth, which was constructed by Khalid in 2004. This construct is a measure of a person's incremental development towards becoming what they are capable of being. The mean score on this scale was 127.5, and scores of 128 and higher reflected high self-actualization, while scores lower than 127 reflected lower self-actualization.

Sample

Sample has been drawn from various colleges of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Sample comprises 202 students. Sample has been drawn by utilizing convenience sampling technique. Participants have been drawn randomly from public colleges and schools.

Procedure

The information was gathered from students at their respective institutions. The administrations of the schools were contacted and the study purpose was informed to them. The questionnaires were given in the form of a booklet. The questionnaires were retrieved on the spot. Ethical clearance for the research was obtained from the proposal defense committee of National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad.

Results and Discussion

Regression analysis was used to study the impact of parental involvement and its impact on the self-actualization and academic regulation of students. The regression analysis is presented below.

Table 1
Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Father's involvement and Mothers Involvement on personal growth, autonomy, of students (N = 202)

Model for personal growth	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	124.454	4.462		27.892	.00
1 parental inducement of father	.081	.059	.097	1.382	.16
2 (Constant)	117.447	4.907		23.935	.00

	parental inducement of father	.009	.062	.011	.144	.88
	parental inducement of mother	.157	.050	.232	3.131	.00
	(Constant) autonomy	124.454	4.462		27.892	.000
1	parental inducement of father	.081	.059	.097	1.382	.168
	(Constant)	117.447	4.907		23.935	.000
2	parental inducement of father	.009	.062	.011	.144	.886
	parental inducement of mother	.157	.050	.232	3.131	.002

In Model 1, the findings show that father's parental inducement has a small and statistically insignificant impact on personal growth ($B = 0.081$, $p = 0.16$), which implies that the father's influence by itself does not play a significant role in the personal growth of adolescents. In Model 2, when father's and mother's parental inducement were both added, the father's effect was still negligible and non-significant ($B = 0.009$, $p = 0.88$), while the mother's parental inducement had a significant positive impact on personal growth ($B = 0.157$, $p = 0.002$). This indicates that maternal involvement is more important in promoting personal growth among adolescents than paternal involvement.

Table 2
Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Father's involvement and Mothers Involvement, and socio-demographic status of parent's academic self-regulation of students (N = 202)

	B	S. E	β	t	P
(Constant)	7.990	7.799	-	1.024	.30
Fathers' encouragement	.009	.133	.005	.065	.94
Fathers' facilitation	.742	.177	.331	4.181	.00
Fathers Rewarding	-.422	.213	-.171	-1.982	.04
Fathers modeling	.309	.191	.100	1.617	.10
Mother modeling	-.463	.111	-.379	-4.192	.00
Mother facilitation	1.477	.204	.566	7.249	.00
Mother Encouragement	.034	.120	.020	.285	.77
Mother rewarding	-1.174	.206	-.406	-5.689	.00
Personal Growth	-.278	.195	-.314	-1.428	.15
Autonomy	1.087	.313	.335	3.473	.00
Self-acceptance	.918	.300	.394	3.058	.00
Acceptance of emotion	1.100	.306	.343	3.600	.00
Trust responsibility in interpersonal relations	.455	.321	.133	1.417	.15
Age	-.341	1.012	-.018	-.337	.73
Gender	4.799	1.269	.220	3.781	.00
Education	.710	.630	.068	1.126	.26
Mother education	-2.562	.588	-.316	-4.359	.00
Father education	-.962	.750	-.085	-1.282	.20
Mother occupation	4.363	1.441	.196	3.028	.00
Father occupation	-.595	.771	-.045	-.771	.44
Family system	-5.418	1.192	-.243	-4.545	.00
Monthly income	-14.859	4.433	-.996	-3.352	.00
Socio economic status	14.503	4.310	.961	3.365	.00

Note. MODEL: $R^2 = .664$, R^2 change = .620, Adjusted $R^2 = .169$; $p = .000$.

Regression analysis findings show the influence of different parental factors, personal traits, and socioeconomic factors on personal development.

Among the paternal factors, father's facilitation emerged as a strong positive predictor of personal growth ($\beta = .331$, $p < .001$), implying that when fathers actively

facilitate the academic and personal growth of their children, it increases their overall development. On the other hand, father's rewarding had a significant negative correlation with personal growth ($\beta = -.171, p = .04$), suggesting that over-dependence on external rewards can prevent the internal motivation needed for self-growth. Father's modeling and father's encouragement did not predict personal growth significantly. In terms of maternal factors, mother's facilitation was the most significant predictor of individual development ($\beta = .566, p < .001$), indicating the pivotal role of maternal facilitation in promoting an adolescent's autonomy and self-knowledge.

But mother's modeling ($\beta = -.379, p < .001$) and mother's rewarding ($\beta = -.406, p < .001$) were negative predictors of personal growth, such that some types of parental control might stifle the emergence of independence and self-actualization. Mother's encouragement was not found to have an effect. With regard to personal characteristics, autonomy ($\beta = .335, p < .001$), self-acceptance ($\beta = .394, p = .002$), and acceptance of emotions ($\beta = .343, p < .001$) were all positive significant predictors of personal growth. This result is consistent with self-determination theories, which indicate that those who build autonomy and emotional acceptance will experience more personal growth. Trust and responsibility in interpersonal relationships was not a significant predictor of personal growth. Demographic factors were also involved. Gender was a predictor ($\beta = .220, p < .001$), suggesting possible gender differences in personal growth experiences.

Mother's education was inversely related to personal growth ($\beta = -.316, p < .001$), which may imply that greater maternal education is associated with more restrictive parenting practices that may discourage independence. Conversely, mother's occupation contributed to positive personal growth ($\beta = .196, p = .002$), perhaps due to working mothers' instilling of independence and resourcefulness in children. Father's education and occupation was not predictive of personal growth. Socioeconomic and family influences also contributed significantly. Family system was found to have a negative relationship with personal growth ($\beta = -.243, p < .001$), meaning that teenagers who are part of extended family systems may have autonomy and personal development limitations. Monthly income had a negative impact ($\beta = -.996, p = .001$), while socioeconomic status had a positive impact ($\beta = .961, p = .001$), which means that economic stability in general, and not income per se, plays a role in personal growth.

These conclusions underscore the intricate interaction of parental factors, individual traits, and economic circumstances in the development of adolescent personal growth.

Discussion

The results of the regression model support that maternal parental inducement has a strong impact on the prediction of personal growth among adolescents, whereas paternal parental inducement is not significantly associated with the prediction of personal growth among adolescents. The second model containing maternal and paternal inducement supports the above finding as maternal inducement is a consistent predictor with an evident effect ($\beta = .232, p = .002$), while paternal inducement continues to have a non-significant effect ($\beta = .011, p = .886$). These findings are in agreement with existing literature indicating that mothers are more likely to contribute significantly to the emotional and psychological growth of children (Pomerantz et al., 2007; Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009).

The lack of significance of paternal inducement could be due to variations in typical parenting roles. Fathers tend to be more interested in instrumental and problem-solving facets of parenting, taking perhaps less of a direct lead in personal development as maternal involvement encourages (Lamb, 2010). Further, there is evidence that father involvement tends to be linked more with external outcomes such as social competence and behavioral control than with internal ones such as self-awareness and self-actualization (Flouri & Buchanan, 2004). These results concur with research indicating that maternal sensitivity is the critical predictor of psychological development among adolescents (Steinberg, 2001).

In addition, the important role of maternal parental inducement validates Self-Determination Theory, which asserts that autonomy-supportive parenting increases intrinsic motivation and promotes personal development (Ryan & Deci, 2017). Teenagers who experience high levels of maternal encouragement and facilitation are likely to have a high sense of self-efficacy and motivation, resulting in higher self-actualization (Martínez-Pons, 1996). This indicates that mothers' participation in decision-making, emotional support, and academic encouragement is an important factor in adolescents' developmental pathways.

In light of these results, fathers need to be encouraged to become more autonomy-supportive and emotionally supportive parents. School intervention and parenting programs should focus on the value of maternal as well as paternal participation in promoting personal growth. Future studies should investigate possible moderating variables, including socioeconomic status and cultural norms, to determine how various types of parenting affect adolescent development in different settings (Bornstein, 2020).

The results indicate that parental facilitation is significant to adolescent personal growth, specifically father's and mother's facilitation, both of which were found to be positively correlated with personal growth. This is consistent with Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), where autonomy-supportive contexts are expected to promote personal development. Through parents' provision of resources, guidance, and encouragement without being overly controlling, adolescents build more intrinsic motivation and self-awareness (Ryan & Deci, 2017).

Nonetheless, both father's and mother's rewarding behaviors were negatively correlated with personal growth, reflecting the possibility that extrinsic reinforcement tactics may compromise intrinsic motivation. Research indicates that overdependence on rewards can diminish self-motivated learning and exploration and result in lower personal growth (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2016). This supports earlier research which establishes an association between controlling parenting styles and decreased self-actualization among adolescents (Soenens et al., 2012).

The research also discovered that autonomy, self-acceptance, and acceptance of emotions were strong positive predictors of personal growth, supporting psychological models that call for emotional regulation and self-awareness as critical factors in the development of personal growth (Neff & Germer, 2013). Teenagers who are allowed to make their own choices and know their emotions have higher rates of self-actualization (Sheldon & Hilpert, 2012).

Demographic and socioeconomic influences also contributed to personal development. Gender was a contributing factor, with females indicating more personal development than males. This is consistent with earlier findings that adolescent girls tend

to reflect more on themselves and manage their emotions, leading to their overall development (Hyde, 2014). Interestingly, greater maternal education was inversely related to personal growth, which may suggest that mothers who are more educated have greater academic aspirations, perhaps constraining adolescents' independence (Bornstein, 2015). In contrast, maternal work status had a positive relationship with personal growth, perhaps since working mothers demonstrate independence and resilience, leading their offspring to develop the same (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010). In addition, family composition and economic factors also had a strong impact on personal growth. Large family systems were negatively correlated with personal growth, implying that teenagers in large families may have more constraints on autonomy through hierarchical family relationships (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Moreover, monthly income was negatively correlated with personal growth, whereas general socioeconomic status was positively correlated. This implies that economic pressure could hamper adolescents' personal growth, while a stable socioeconomic condition offers opportunities for self-development (Conger et al., 2010).

Conclusion

We can ascertain from the finding of this study that as a whole here there is strong relation between parental involvement, self-regulation and even self-actualization tendencies. But father involvement is not taking major role in self-actualization. While mother involvement and father involvement is taking major role in self-regulation of the student. That means parental involvement are taking important role in improving children and productive in the society. If the students have good parental involvement then they will be better in self knowledge and they will perform well in all areas of their life. They will do better in making friendships with other people and they will perform well in their schools just like that they will be better in problem solving skills and also will be better in personal development.

Implications

Since findings revealed that low parental involvement is one of the significant factors for low level of self-regulation and self-actualization tendencies among adolescents. Therefore findings would be helpful in offering counseling services to the parents. Likewise various awareness program could be organized to make parents aware that how parental involvement contribute significantly towards development of self regulatory tendencies and self-actualization status among their children. Parental trainings must be arranged to enhance the parental participation which would be beneficial in positive growth of adolescents and would be beneficial to make them useful part of society.

Recommendations

A one short coming of this study is the small number of participants accounts for a limited number of Rawalpindi and Islamabad's adolescents. These findings cannot be supported on the basis of generalization on the basis of these findings alone. Another short coming of this study is the restricted age group (15 to 17 years), thus findings only can be generalized on this group. One possible reason is that youth volunteered to take part in the study; it is possible that such youth possess characteristics that differentiate them from others who did not participate recommendations for future studies are expanding the sample and recruiting participants from other studies and parts of Pakistan.

References

- Allred, P., & Edwards, R. (2000). *A typology of parental involvement in education: A brief review*. *Educational Research*, 42(1), 53–67.
- Allred, P., & Edwards, R. (2000). *Children, home and school: Regulation, autonomy or connection?* Routledge.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2007). *Self-regulation, ego depletion, and motivation*. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1(1), 115–128.
- Baumeister, R. F., Heatherton, T. F., & Tice, D. M. (1994). *Losing control: How and why people fail at self-regulation*. Academic Press.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., & Markman, L. B. (2005). *The contribution of parenting to ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness*. *The Future of Children*, 15(1), 139–168. <https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2005.0001>
- Brown, J. D. (1998). *The self*. McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, J. M. (1998). *Self-regulation and the addictive behaviors*. In W. R. Miller & N. Heather (Eds.), *Treating addictive behaviors* (pp. 61–73). Springer.
- Brown, J. M., Miller, W. R., & Lawendowski, L. A. (1999). *The self-regulation questionnaire*. In L. VandeCreek & T. L. Jackson (Eds.), *Innovations in clinical practice: A source book* (Vol. 17, pp. 281–292). Professional Resource Press.
- Cutrona, C. E., & Guerin, D. W. (1994). *Social support and parental involvement as protective factors in the academic achievement of adolescents*. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 14(1), 56–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431694014001004>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). *A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality*. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Vol. 38. Perspectives on motivation* (pp. 237–288). University of Nebraska Press.
- Dominguez, M., & Carton, J. S. (1997). *The relationship between self-actualization and parenting style*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23(1), 35–46. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(97\)00007-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(97)00007-3)
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Freud, S. (1960). *The ego and the id*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Gage, N. L., & Berliner, D. C. (1984). *Educational psychology* (3rd ed.). Houghton Mifflin.
- Gailliot, M. T., & Baumeister, R. F. (2007). *The physiology of willpower: Linking blood glucose to self-control*. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(4), 303–327.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (2005). *Final report: The social context of parental involvement: A path to enhanced achievement*. Institute of Education Sciences.
- Jones, W. H., & Crandall, R. (1986). *Validation of a short index of self-actualization*. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12(1), 63–73.

- Jourard, S. M. (1974). *The transparent self*. Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Khalid, R. (2004). *Human development theories: A comparative analysis*. Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 19(1-2), 1-24.
- Khalid, R. (2004). *Psychology of adolescence and adulthood*. Institute of Education & Research.
- Lareau, A. (1987). *Social class differences in family-school relationships: The importance of cultural capital*. Sociology of Education, 60(2), 73-85.
- Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (1990). *A theory of goal setting & task performance*. Prentice-Hall.
- Martínez-Pons, M. (1996). *Test of a model of parental inducement of academic self-regulation*. The Journal of Experimental Education, 64(3), 213-227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.1996.10806602>
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1988). *Recalled parent-child relations and adult personality*. Journal of Personality, 56(2), 417-434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1988.tb00894.x>
- Mead, L. M. (1992). *The new politics of poverty: The nonworking poor in America*. Basic Books.
- Mead, L. M. (1997). *The new paternalism: Supervisory approaches to poverty*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Nystul, M. S. (1984). *The relationship between self-actualization and parental treatment styles*. Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior, 21(1), 42-48.
- O'Connell, B., & O'Connell, D. (1974). *The self-actualizing process*. Prentice-Hall.
- Okpala, C. O., Okpala, A. O., & Smith, F. E. (2001). *Parental involvement, instructional expenditures, family socioeconomic attributes, and student achievement*. The Journal of Educational Research, 95(2), 110-115.
- Peck, M. S. (1978). *The road less traveled: A new psychology of love, traditional values, and spiritual growth*. Simon & Schuster.
- Polivy, J. (1998). *The effects of behavioral inhibition: Integrating internal cues, external contexts, and self-regulation*. Psychological Inquiry, 9(3), 181-204.
- Pressley, M., & McCormick, C. (1995). *Advanced educational psychology for educators, researchers, and policymakers*. HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Rogers, C. R. (1989). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Rowley, S. J., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2007). *Understanding the impact of parental involvement on student success*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 99(2), 234-245.
- Schafer, R. (1968). *Aspects of internalization*. International Universities Press.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1994). *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications*. Erlbaum.

- Skinner, B. F. (1968). *The technology of teaching*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Sprinthal, N. A., & Sprinthal, R. C. (1990). *Educational psychology: A developmental approach*. McGraw-Hill.
- Ulrich, R., Wolfe, M., & Bluhm, D. (1970). The effect of reinforcement magnitude on the acquisition and extinction of operant behavior. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 14(1), 73-78. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jeab.1970.14-73>
- Vancouver, J. B. (2000). Self-regulation in organizational settings: A tale of two paradigms. *Journal of Management*, 26(6), 1213-1230.
- Winner, E. (1990). *Gifted children: Myths and realities*. Basic Books.
- Zeidner, M., Boekaerts, M., & Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Self-regulation: Directions and challenges for future research. *Applied Psychology*, 49(3), 437-451.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1988). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25(1), 3-17.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). *Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn*. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1), 82-91.