



RESEARCH PAPER

Parenting Dynamics and Adolescent Outcomes: Investigating the Role of Demographic Differences

¹Syeda Asma Gillani*, ²Palwasha Nasir Abbasi and ³Shanza Aman Khan

1. Lecturer, Department of Psychology, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad, AJ&K, Pakistan
2. MPhil Scholar, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan
3. MPhil Scholar, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author:** asmagillani2011@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study was intended to investigate demographic differences in parenting contexts as well as basic psychological needs and behavioral outcomes for adolescents. The research was based on the assumption propounded by Self-determining Theory. That is, gender, family system, mother's occupation and monthly income relate to the perception of adolescents about parenting, the need satisfaction of adolescents and the behavioral indicators. A total of 300 adolescents, aged between 13 and 17 years, were selected as sample units through stratified sampling technique. Data were taken from Parents as Social Context Questionnaire, Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction Scale and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. Data were analyzed within the framework of cross-sectional, comparative research design. The findings showed that differences in mean across demographic groups were significantly different such that nuclear family adolescents were more positively influenced by parental involvement as compared to adolescents from one-parent families, as well as adolescents from high-income households, and mothers are working showed higher psychological need satisfaction and lesser behavioral difficulties. Recommendations incorporate that interventions are culturally specific parenting interventions and policies promoting economic stability and awareness among parents. Longitudinal studies should also look at the future basis of causality direction for interpretation enhancement.

KEYWORDS Parenting Context, Basic Psychological Needs, Adolescent Behavior, Demographic Differences

Introduction

Adolescence serves as a crucial developmental period for identity exploration, autonomy, and social sensitivity. During this phase, a highly influential factor in adolescent development is parenting, concerning the essential aspects of emotional warmth, styles of discipline, and communication (Pinquart, 2023; Nelson et al., 2022; Yaffe, 2018). Recent studies have given high importance to adolescents' perceptions of parenting, including positive and negative perceptions, in relation to emotional well-being and emotion regulation (Wang & Fletcher, 2021; Cabrera et al., 2020; Repetti et al., 2019). Therefore, parenting should not be studied in isolation but understood from the lens of the social and cultural structures that influence the dynamics of families.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and its subtheory, Basic Psychological Needs Theory (BPNT), create a very strong base for explaining adolescent outcomes with respect to parenting behavior (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Vansteenkiste et al., 2022; Cheon et al., 2020). The BPNT states that for optimal psych functioning and well-being, really the

satisfaction of autonomy, competence, and relatedness is essential. Therefore, by supporting these needs, parents would mostly encourage adolescents to internalize values, self-regulate, and carry out prosocial behaviors (Jang et al., 2021; Soenens et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2023). On the other hand, frustration of needs, often tied to harshness or inconsistency in parenting, tends to lead to behavior and emotional problems.

Demographic factors, including gender, family structure, parental employment, and socioeconomic status, have produced significant changes in parenting styles and adolescents' psychological needs (Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2020; Sahithya et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2023). For example, children from nuclear families may view parenting differently than those from joint families, thus contributing to the autonomy and relatedness they perceive (Amoah et al., 2022; Alam et al., 2020; Okeke & Chukwu, 2021). Similarly, whether or not mothers work may provide a basis for different parenting dynamics, influencing children's emotional and behavioral outcomes (Mushtaq et al., 2022; Tokiya & Suzuki, 2021; Farooq et al., 2024).

Research suggests that there are extensive gender differences in perceived parental behavior among adolescents, with boys often exposed to higher negative parenting levels (Katz et al., 2020; Yun & Jang, 2023; Sandhu & Kaur, 2021). These perceptions could have implications for emotional regulation and behavioral problems. Gender socialization may also be associated with parenting styles in relation to different satisfaction degrees regarding psychological needs for boys and girls (Singh & Mahapatra, 2022; Cabello et al., 2021; Latif et al., 2023). All these differences make sense in illuminating an understanding of social as well as psychological variables of possible interactions during adolescence.

Socioeconomic status, particularly parental income, has always been on the basis of being predictors for parenting quality or even then for adolescent outcomes. High SES families usually managed to enrich their lives with such facilities which groomed competence and autonomy in the adolescents (Zhou et al., 2020; Mujtaba et al., 2023; Mazzone et al., 2021). Unmet psychological needs might be greater among these adolescents and, possibly, greater emotional or behavioral problems due to certain stressors associated with the finances (Fegert et al., 2020; Singh et al., 2021; Tsai et al., 2023). Income-related differences underline the need for contextualized analysis of parenting practices across and under income categories.

This article intends to examine how demographic variables-gender, family structure, maternal occupation, and income levels--affect adolescents' perceptions of parenting, satisfaction of basic psychological needs, and behavioral outcomes such as prosocial behavior and emotional problems. The comparative approach adopted by this research would, therefore, help throw light on how such differences exist in parental influences and adolescent well-being against the sociocultural patterned fabric of Pakistani society. The results could provide a foundation for culturally relevant parenting interventions and policy frameworks for improving mental health and development among adolescents (Ali et al., 2023; Khan & Rehman, 2021; Riaz & Shah, 2024).

Literature Review

Parenting is central to adolescent development, where different styles substantially influence emotional, cognitive, and behavioral outcomes. The classical tripartite classification by Baumrind-authoritative, authoritarian, permissive-remains

applicable in many contexts; however, recent studies have begun to draw attention to more nuanced cultural manifestations of these styles (Pinquart, 2023; Nelson et al., 2022). Adolescents raised in supportive, autonomy-granting conditions show greater self-regulation skills and social competence (Cheon et al., 2020; Soenens et al., 2020), while psychologically controlling parenting is associated with anxiety, defiance, and internalizing behaviors (Yun & Jang, 2023; Mushtaq et al., 2022). This interplay is particularly complicated in collectivist cultures that uphold the values of obedience and family interdependence.

According to the Basic Psychological Needs Theory (BPNT), founded upon Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the basic psychological needs, i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness, are paramount for optimal psychological functioning. Parenting that supports these needs promotes the adolescent's well-being, motivation, and identity formation (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Vansteenkiste et al., 2022). When these needs are not met because of too much control or complete neglect, it can result in maladaptive strategies and behavioral difficulties in adolescents (Yu et al., 2023; Jang et al., 2021). The enhancing body of literature found associations of need satisfaction with resilience and positive adjustment across different sociocultural contexts, including the South Asian populace (Latif et al., 2023; Khan & Rehman, 2021).

Parenting is not a universal principle. The child's perception of child-rearing in adolescence is impacted by such demographic factors as sex, family composition, maternal employment, and socioeconomic status. Adolescents in extended families report feeling a greater sense of relatedness and communal support, while nuclear families foster seclusion, according to research (Alam et al., 2020; Amoah et al., 2022). Likewise, children of working mothers are likely to experience more freedom, sometimes with consequent parental neglect (Farooq et al., 2024; Tokiya & Suzuki, 2021). Such differences demonstrate the need to place research on parenting within demographic contexts.

Behavior and emotion outcomes in adolescents like prosocial behaviour, emotional difficulties and aggression are closely related to perceived parenting and psychological need fulfilment. Supporting parenthood increases the ages of regulation of an individual's emotions and decreases risk behaviour involvement, while inconsistent or harsh parenthood correlates with depression, anxiety, and oppositional conduct (Cabello et al., 2021; Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2020; Fegert et al., 2020). Among other factors, prosocial behaviour is modeled through warmth and autonomy support as attachments internalize moral values and empathic responses (Katz et al., 2020; Wang & Fletcher, 2021). One condition that results in emotional difficulties in adolescents is either too strict or emotionally cold parenting, which thwarts the developmental need of this group.

Socioeconomic status (SES) certainly affects the quality of parenting, the quality of avail resources, and adolescent adjustment. Households of higher SES usually provide an enriched environment and nurture for academic competence as well as psychological well-being (Zhou et al., 2020; Mujtaba et al., 2023). On the other hand, economic hardship associates itself with stress-induced parenting and decreased ability to meet children's emotional needs, thus increasing the adolescent's vulnerability to different forms of behavioral and emotional disorders (Tsai et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2021). An intervention planning further on the well-being of the adolescent must consider these disparities in parenting styles and family dynamics for effectiveness (Ali et al., 2023; Riaz & Shah, 2024)."

Actually, socioeconomic status (SES) still touches on such issues as quality of parenting, resource availability, and adolescent adjustment. Households of higher SES usually provide an enriched environment and nurture for academic competence as well as psychological well-being (Zhou et al., 2020; Mujtaba et al., 2023). On the contrary, economic hardship has most often defined itself by the situation of stress awareness and reduced ability to meet such children's emotional needs, increasing such vulnerability in an adolescent to behavioral and emotional disorders (Tsai et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2021). Future plans on intervention towards adolescent well-being, therefore, must incorporate such differences on family dynamics, and parenting, as well as styles for full effectiveness (Ali et al., 2023; Riaz & Shah, 2024).

Hypotheses

- There will be significant gender differences across dimensions of positive and negative parenting, satisfaction of psychological needs and behavioral outcomes of adolescents.
- The employment status of mothers will significantly influence parental actions and the psychological and behavioral outcomes that children attain.
- There will be significant differences in parenting practices, satisfaction of autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and behavioral difficulties across low, middle, and high-income groups.

Material and Methods

Nature of the Study

The present research was based on a quantitative cross-sectional correlational design. This design was appropriate for assessing the relationships among variables on a heterogeneous adolescent population exhibiting the use of standardized self-report instruments. It was also done by comparing analyses against demographic categories to assess the group differences.

Sample and Sampling Technique

In all, there were $N = 300$ adolescent participants from the ages of 13 to 18 years included in the study. The sample was drawn with a stratified random sampling technique to ensure proportional representation across different demographic such as:

- Gender (Male, Female)
- Family system (Nuclear, Joint)
- Age categories (13–15, 16–18)
- Monthly family income (Low, Medium, High)
- Number of siblings (1–2, 3–4, 5 or more)

Table 1
Demographic characteristics of sample variables (N=300)

| Variables | Categories | N | % | M | S.D. |
|-------------|------------|-----|------|-------|------|
| Gender | Male | 100 | 50 | | |
| | Female | 100 | 50 | | |
| Age | | | | 15.35 | 1.44 |
| Education | | | | 9.93 | 1.31 |
| Birth order | First born | 52 | 26.0 | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------|----------|
| | Middle born | 89 | 44.5 |
| | Last Born | 54 | 27.0 |
| | Only child | 5 | 2.5 |
| Father occupation | Government | 139 | 69.5 |
| | Non-Government | 61 | 30.5 |
| | Not employed | 0 | 0 |
| Mother occupation | Government | 57 | 28.5 |
| | Non-Government | 14 | 7.0 |
| | Not employed | 129 | 64.5 |
| Family system | Nuclear | 150 | 75.0 |
| | Joint | 50 | 25.0 |
| Father | Age | 48.33 | 6.23 |
| | Income | 57894.00 | 35829.60 |
| Mother | Age | 43.51 | 6.02 |
| | Income | 14902.84 | 21383.08 |

Instruments

Parents as Social Context Questionnaire (PSCQ)-Mother, Father, and Child Forms

The PSCQ, which is Parents as Social Context Questionnaire, was developed by Skinner, Johnson, and Snyder in 2005 with a view to assessing children's impressions of particular parental behavior and emotional climate. The instrument comprises three versions, that is, for reports by mothers and fathers and child self-reports. Each version consists of 24 items rated on a 4-point Likert scale (from 1 = Not at all true, 4 = Very true). The scale is organized around six subscales: warmth, structure, autonomy support, rejection, chaos, and coercion, which span both positive and negative dimensions of parenting. There are 4 items for each subscale. A strong psychometric property was established with PSCQ with internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) ranging from 0.70 to 0.89 across the subscales. Its construct validity is supported by factor analysis, with the tool being used effectively in cross-cultural studies of parenting from the adolescent perspective (Skinner et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2011).

Basic Psychological Needs Scale (BPNS)

The Basic Psychological Needs Scale (BPNS) was developed by Deci and Ryan (2000) within the Self-Determination Theory framework to assess satisfaction of three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. The version of the scale used in this study is the 21-item version rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (Not at all true) to 5 (Completely true). Subscales include Autonomy (7 items), Competence (6 items), and Relatedness (8 items). BPNS is well validated in various adolescent populations with good internal consistency across the studies with a range of Cronbach's alpha values between 0.78 and 0.91 (Johnston & Finney, 2010; Deci & Ryan, 2000). The factorial structure of the scale has been continuously replicated in diverse cultural contexts proving its cross-cultural validity and theoretical soundness.

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)

The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) was developed by Robert Goodman (1997) as a brief screening tool for behavioral issues in children and adolescents. The current version used in the study includes 25 items and follows a 3-

point Likert scale, with 0 representing "Not true," 1 representing "Somewhat true," and 2 representing "Certainly true." The SDQ has five subscales of which there are five items each: Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity/Inattention, Peer Problems, and Prosocial Behavior. While the first four subscales build up to a Total Difficulties Score, Prosocial Behavior is viewed separately as a measure of strengths. The SDQ has been translated into 60-plus languages, with worldwide validation. Its reliability has been well documented, with internal consistency ranging from 0.73 to 0.83 across subscales, and strong test-retest reliability over 4–6 months (Goodman, 2001). A measure's construct and concurrent validity, among others, were being readily established.

All instruments were adapted for cultural relevance and tested for reliability and validity in the current context through a pilot study (n = 30).

Procedure and Ethical Considerations

The study was approved by the Ethical Committee of the relevant academic institution. Permissions from the school authorities to gather data from students were obtained. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants and their parents/guardians, and written informed consent was obtained. There was a guarantee of anonymity and confidentiality to the adolescents. Participation in the study was strictly voluntary, and participants had the right to withdraw from the study any time they wished. Piloting of the research instruments was carried out with 30 students for clarity and appropriateness. Data collection took place in classrooms under the observation of the researcher, thus achieving a standardized environment. Data obtained were kept safely after the end of the study and analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics were applied, and correlation analyses, t-tests, ANOVA, and mediation/moderation analyses through PROCESS macro were applied to investigate the hypotheses of the study.

Results and Discussion

Gender differences in all variables of the study. In order to explore gender differences in relation to positive mother, father and perceived dimensions, negative mother, father and perceived child dimensions, basic need satisfaction and its subscales autonomy, competence and relatedness and total difficulties and prosocial behaviors t-test were computed.

Table 2
Mean differences across gender on Parent as social context

| Variables | Boys N=(100) | | Girls N=(100) | | t | p | 95% CL | | Cohen' s d |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------|------------------|------|-------|------|--------|------|---------------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | | | LL | UL | |
| Positive Father dimensions | 49.03 | 6.46 | 50.63 | 5.33 | -1.91 | .355 | -3.25 | .052 | .27 |
| Negative Father Dimensions | 34.32 | 9.01 | 32.16 | 8.61 | 1.73 | .632 | -.29 | 4.61 | .25 |
| Positive Mother Dimensions | 49.89 | 6.90 | 50.34 | 7.57 | -.43 | .566 | -2.47 | 1.57 | .06 |
| Negative Mother dimensions | 34.99 | 9.40 | 32.17 | 9.01 | 2.16 | .863 | .25 | 5.38 | .31 |
| Child Positive dimensions | 41.82 | 5.94 | 43.82 | 5.51 | -2.46 | .098 | -3.59 | -.40 | .35 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|------|-------|------|-----|
| Child Negative dimensions | 24.97 | 6.94 | 22.96 | 5.43 | 2.27 | .008 | .27 | 3.74 | .32 |
| Basic Need Satisfaction | 63.14 | 10.75 | 65.03 | 11.01 | -1.22 | .386 | -4.92 | 1.14 | .17 |
| Autonomy | 20.13 | 4.53 | 20.97 | 4.88 | -1.26 | .132 | -2.15 | .47 | .18 |
| Competence | 16.57 | 3.30 | 17.30 | 2.81 | -1.6 | .057 | -1.58 | .12 | .24 |
| Relatedness | 26.44 | 4.22 | 26.76 | 4.48 | -.51 | .235 | -1.53 | .89 | .07 |
| Total Difficulties | 10.39 | 6.91 | 10.25 | 7.27 | .18 | .268 | -1.83 | 2.11 | .02 |
| Prosocial behavior | 7.53 | 1.919 | 7.67 | 2.192 | -.48 | .034 | -.71 | .43 | .07 |

Note. CI= confidence interval. LL= lower limit. UL= upper limit

Table 2 shows gender differences in all variables of the study. It can be observed that there are no significant gender differences in positive mother, father and perceived child dimensions, negative mother and father dimensions, basic need satisfaction and its subscales autonomy, competence and relatedness and total difficulties and prosocial behaviors. However, there is a significant association between perceived negative child dimensions and gender, which indicates that boys are more likely to perceive negative parental dimensions as compare to females.

Differences across family system in all variables of the study. In order to explore the differences across categories of family system in relation to positive mother, father and perceived child dimensions, negative mother, father and perceived child dimensions, basic need satisfaction and its subscales autonomy, competence and relatedness and total difficulties and prosocial behavior, T-test was performed separately for each variable. Results have been summarized in Table 3.

Table 3
Mean differences across family system on Parent as social context

| Variables | Nuclear N=(150) | | Joint N=(50) | | t | p | 95% CL | | Cohen's d |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------|------|-------------|------|--------|-------|-----------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | | | LL | UL | |
| Positive Father dimension | 50.46 | 5.85 | 47.92 | 5.92 | 2.65 | .949 | .65 | 4.43 | .43 |
| Negative Father dimension | 32.21 | 8.75 | 36.32 | 8.51 | -2.89 | .905 | -6.90 | -1.30 | .48 |
| Positive Mother dimension | 50.76 | 7.27 | 48.16 | 6.78 | 2.22 | .370 | .30 | 4.91 | .40 |
| Negative Mother dimension | 32.82 | 9.84 | 35.84 | 7.00 | -2.36 | .000 | -5.54 | -.048 | .35 |
| Perceived Positive dimension | 43.20 | 5.44 | 41.66 | 6.69 | 1.47 | .015 | -.53 | 3.63 | .25 |
| Perceived Negative dimension | 23.32 | 6.51 | 25.90 | 5.21 | -2.83 | .021 | -4.38 | -.77 | .44 |
| Basic Need Satisfaction | 65.95 | 10.75 | 58.48 | 9.40 | 4.38 | .062 | 4.11 | 10.83 | .74 |
| Autonomy | 21.25 | 4.70 | 18.44 | 4.13 | 3.76 | .087 | 1.34 | 4.28 | .63 |
| Competence | 17.46 | 2.96 | 15.36 | 2.91 | 4.35 | .530 | 1.14 | 3.05 | .71 |
| Relatedness | 27.24 | 4.31 | 24.68 | 3.88 | 3.91 | .046 | 1.26 | 3.85 | .62 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-----|
| Total Difficulties | 9.42 | 6.72 | 13.02 | 7.49 | -3.18 | .689 | -5.82 | -1.37 | .51 |
| Prosocial behavior | 7.82 | 2.015 | 6.92 | 2.04 | 2.74 | .772 | .25 | 1.55 | .44 |

Note. CI= confidence interval. LL= lower limit. UL= upper limit

Table 3 shows family system differences in all variables of the study. It can be observed that there are no significant gender differences in positive mother and father dimensions and negative father dimensions, basic need satisfaction and its subscales autonomy, competence and total difficulties and prosocial behavior. However, there is a significant association between Negative Mother Dimension, Perceived Child Positive dimension, Perceived Child Negative dimension and relatedness and family system, which indicates that adolescents from extended family system are more likely to perceive negative parental dimensions as compare to adolescents from nuclear system. Mean of adolescents from Nuclear family system is more as compare to extended family system. Similarly perceived positive parental dimensions mean more in adolescents from nuclear family as compare to extended family system and perceived negative parental dimensions mean is more in adolescents from extended family system as compare to mean of nuclear family system.

Differences across mother occupation in all variables of the study. In order to explore the differences across categories of mother occupation in relation to positive mother, and perceived child dimensions, negative mother and perceived child dimensions, basic need satisfaction and its subscales autonomy, competence and relatedness and total difficulties and prosocial behavior, T-test was performed separately for each variable. Results have been summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
Mean differences across mother occupation on Parent as social context

| Variables | Working mothers N=(71) | | non-working mothers N=(129) | | t | p | 95% CL | | Cohen's d |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|--------------|------|--------|-------|-----------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | | | LL | UL | |
| Positive Mother dimension | 50.29 | 7.53 | 50.0155 | 7.08 | 0.26 | 0.18 | -1.83 | 2.39 | .04 |
| Negative Mother dimensions | 30.69 | 7.66 | 35.1705 | 9.75 | -3.58 | .001 | -6.94 | -2.0 | .51 |
| Child Positive dimensions | 43.45 | 4.85 | 42.4729 | 6.25 | 1.22 | .022 | -.71 | 2.66 | .17 |
| Child Negative dimensions | 21.39 | 5.36 | 25.3798 | 6.35 | -4.47 | .137 | -5.74 | -2.23 | .68 |
| Basic Need Satisfaction | 66.67 | 10.89 | 62.6589 | 10.67 | 2.52 | .536 | .88 | 7.15 | .37 |
| Autonomy | 21.50 | 4.33 | 20.0233 | 4.85 | 2.14 | .432 | .12 | 2.84 | .32 |
| Competence | 17.95 | 2.84 | 16.3721 | 3.07 | 3.58 | .461 | .71 | 2.45 | .53 |
| Relatedness | 27.21 | 4.76 | 26.2636 | 4.08 | 1.47 | .100 | -.31 | 2.21 | .21 |
| Total Difficulties | 8.30 | 5.95 | 11.4264 | 7.42 | -3.23 | .007 | -5.0 | -1.21 | .46 |
| Prosocial behaviour | 7.83 | 2.06 | 7.4729 | 2.05 | 1.17 | .731 | -.24 | .95 | .17 |

Table 4 shows mother occupation differences in all variables of the study. It can be observed that there are no significant difference in positive mother dimensions,

positive father dimensions, negative father dimensions, basic need satisfaction and its subscales autonomy, competence and prosocial behavior and mother occupation.

However, there is a significant association between Negative mother dimensions and total difficulties and mother occupation, which indicates that total difficulties in non-working women mean is more as compare to working women which indicates that socio-emotional health of non-working women is more as compare to working women. Mean difference of non-working mother is high on negative mother dimensions as compare to working women.

Differences across family income in all variables of the study. In order to explore the differences across categories of father monthly income in relation to positive mother, father and perceived child dimensions, negative mother, father and perceived child dimensions, basic need satisfaction and its subscales autonomy, competence and relatedness and total difficulties and prosocial behavior, one way ANOVA was performed separately for each variable. Results have been summarized in Table 5.

Table 5
Comparison of monthly income on Parent as social context

| Variables | Low (n=83) 10,000 to 40,000 | | Middle (n=79) 41,000 to 81,000 | | High (n=38) Above 81,000 | | F | p | η² |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Positive Father Dimension | 48.62 | 5.96 | 49.94 | 6.128 | 52.21 | 4.91 | 4.92 | .008 | 0.86 |
| Negative Father Dimension | 37.28 | 8.00 | 31.21 | 8.98 | 28.60 | 6.51 | 18.78 | .000 | 0.96 |
| Positive Mother Dimension | 47.75 | 6.42 | 50.94 | 7.07 | 53.52 | 7.63 | 9.98 | .000 | 1.36 |
| Negative Mother Dimension | 36.49 | 7.80 | 32.08 | 9.29 | 30.31 | 10.63 | 7.95 | .000 | 1.44 |
| Child Positive Dimension | 41.78 | 6.78 | 43.55 | 5.17 | 43.55 | 4.34 | 2.29 | .104 | 0.48 |
| Child Negative Dimension | 25.83 | 6.32 | 23.13 | 6.42 | 21.60 | 4.79 | 7.43 | .001 | 1.38 |
| Basic Need Satisfaction | 59.75 | 10.24 | 65.91 | 10.69 | 69.73 | 9.12 | 14.47 | .000 | 3.62 |
| Autonomy | 18.75 | 4.53 | 21.15 | 4.63 | 23.21 | 3.70 | 14.33 | .000 | 1.11 |
| Competence | 16.07 | 3.25 | 17.37 | 2.95 | 17.89 | 2.51 | 6.21 | .002 | 0.43 |
| Relatedness | 24.92 | 4.10 | 27.37 | 4.15 | 28.63 | 4.03 | 12.93 | .000 | 1.88 |
| Total Difficulties | 13.20 | 6.55 | 9.31 | 6.76 | 6.10 | 6.22 | 16.69 | .000 | 0.14 |
| Prosocial behaviour | 7.19 | 1.87 | 7.64 | 2.20 | 8.39 | 1.92 | 4.64 | .011 | 0.04 |

Note. η^2 =Eta squared

Table 5 indicates that group differences in perceived positive parental dimension with respect to level of father income are not significant. However, statistically significant differences can be observed in positive father dimensions, negative father dimensions, positive mother dimensions, negative mother dimensions, perceived negative parental dimensions, basic need satisfaction, autonomy, competence,

relatedness, total difficulties and prosocial with respect to level of father income. It has been shown in Table 3.

Table 6 shows pair-wise comparisons for positive father dimensions, negative father dimensions, positive mother dimensions, negative mother dimensions, perceived negative parental dimensions, basic need satisfaction, autonomy, competence, relatedness, total difficulties and prosocial across level of income of father. High father income shows higher level of positive father dimensions as compared to low father income. Low father income shows higher level of negative father dimensions as compared to middle and high income. Middle and high father income show higher level of positive mother dimensions as compared to low father income. Low father income shows higher level of negative mother dimensions as compared to middle and high income. Low income of father shows higher level of perceived negative parental dimensions as compared to middle and high father income. High and middle father income show higher level of basic need satisfaction as compared to low father income. High and middle father income show higher level of autonomy as compared to low father income. High and middle father income show higher level of competence as compared to low father income. High and middle father income show higher level of relatedness as compared to low father income. Adolescents belong to Low father income group show higher level of total difficulties as compared to high and middle father income. High father income shows higher level of prosocial behaviors as compared to low father income.

Table 6
Post-hoc analysis on across categories of father income (N=200)

| Variables | Father income I | Father income J | Mean difference (I-J) | SE | 95% Confidence interval LL | UL |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------|----------------------------|-------|
| Positive father dimension | High | Low | 3.58* | 1.14 | 1.32 | 5.84 |
| Negative Father dimension | Low | Middle | 6.07* | 1.28 | 3.54 | 8.60 |
| | | High | 8.68* | 1.59 | 5.53 | 11.83 |
| Positive mother dimension | Middle | Low | 3.19* | 1.08 | 1.04 | 5.33 |
| | High | Low | 5.76* | 1.35 | 3.09 | 8.44 |
| Negative Mother dimension | Low | Middle | 4.40* | 1.41 | 1.61 | 7.19 |
| | | High | 6.17* | 1.76 | 2.70 | 9.64 |
| Child Negative dimension | Low | Middle | 2.69* | .96 | .79 | 4.58 |
| | | High | 4.22* | 1.19 | 1.86 | 6.58 |
| Basic need satisfaction | Middle | Low | 6.15* | 1.60 | 2.98 | 9.32 |
| | High | Low | 9.97* | 2.00 | 6.02 | 13.92 |
| Autonomy | Middle | Low | 2.39* | .69 | 1.01 | 3.76 |
| | High | Low | 4.45* | .86 | 2.73 | 6.16 |
| Competence | Low | High | -1.82* | .58 | -2.98 | -.66 |
| | Middle | Low | 1.30* | .47 | .37 | 2.23 |
| Relatedness | Low | Middle | -2.45* | .64 | -3.72 | -1.17 |
| | | High | -3.70* | .80 | -5.29 | -2.11 |
| Total Difficulties | Low | Middle | 3.88* | 1.03 | 1.84 | 5.92 |
| | | High | 7.09* | 1.28 | 4.55 | 9.64 |
| | High | Middle | -3.21* | 1.29 | -5.77 | -.64 |
| Prosocial behavior | High | Low | 1.20* | .39 | .42 | 1.98 |

Discussion

These results show that across most parenting dimensions, perceptions of parents' behavior by adolescents are not significantly different by gender, thus aligning with the literature suggesting that contemporary parenting may be less guided by traditional gender role norms (Pinquart, 2023; Nelson et al., 2022). Generally, both boys and girls in the present study view fathers and mothers similarly regarding warmth, structure, and control, possibly due to an increasingly egalitarian attitude in family contexts with more balanced parenting roles that are not as differentiated by the child's gender (Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2020). Further, the satisfaction of basic psychological needs was similarly found among the genders, thus indirectly confirming equal opportunities regarding autonomy, competence, and relatedness among family settings (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Yu et al., 2023).

Despite the general similarity of perceptions of parents, self-perception, and behavior found gender differences. Girls reported higher levels of positive self-perception and less inclination toward negative behavioral patterns, corroborating previous findings that adolescent girls frequently possess better emotional regulation abilities and stronger interpersonal skills (Cabello et al., 2021; Yun & Jang, 2023). This may account for the slightly higher levels of prosocial behavior found in girls, consistent with the findings that females tend to engage more in behaviors driven by empathy and cooperation (Katz et al., 2020; Wang & Fletcher, 2021). Such subtle differences further underscore the need for gender-sensitive approaches in adolescent well-being interventions, particularly regarding emotional expression and behavior control strategies targeted at boys.

Contrarily, adolescents from the nuclear family structure reported their fathers and mother's parenting in more positive terms, whereas those from joint families reported more negative parenting dimensions. Namely, in this case, adolescents from nuclear families perceived their parents' negative behaviors much less, confirming previous research which indicated that in nuclear family environments, parents can interact more directly with their adolescent children, thus providing a more consistent environment full of emotional support (Pinquart, 2023). With joint family systems, having potential high social capital, differences in parental roles may also arise due to intergenerational disagreements, leading to inconsistent patterns of parenting (Dwairy & Menshar, 2006). Negative perceptions of parenting were also reported higher among adolescents from joint families due to the sharing of attention among multiple caregivers or more controlling practices.

Nuclear family adolescents had their needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness more highly satisfied. This means that the nuclear family system tends to fulfill such variables as autonomy and relatedness, which play an important role in adolescents' growth and psychological well-being, as proposed by self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2020). The apparent inferiority in the satisfaction of such needs experienced by joint family systems could be a direct reflection of the hierarchal and collectivistic structure that they impart on their constituents, thus favoring conformity over individual agency (Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2020). Joint family adolescents scored significantly higher in difficulty behavioral outcomes, therefore providing consistent support for the view of increased emotional or behavioral problems due to need frustrations. These results imply that although the joint family system provides robust external support, its intricate relations could hinder children's need satisfaction and emotional regulation (Wang & Fletcher, 2021).

It provides significant differences in parental contexts, needs fulfillment, and adolescent outcomes according to mothers' working status. More generally, adolescents with employed mothers reported significantly lower negative behavior in parenting and negative-perceived children reported by parents, suggesting that employment may lead to more organized, less intrusive parenting. This emphasizes that working mothers mostly tend toward authoritative styles that include both warmth and autonomy support despite being time-restricted (Bianchi, 2011). Notably, although there was no significant difference in the scores for positive parenting between groups, adolescents with working mothers reported greater satisfaction of basic psychological needs, particularly in competence and autonomy. Earlier research seems to be in line with these findings by suggesting that working mothers may impart lessons of independence and responsibility in their children, which ultimately gives them a better perspective of competence and agency (Hill & Lynch, 1983; Grolnick, 2003).

Thus, the adolescents with non-working mothers had reported significantly more total difficulties—an indication of greater behavioral and emotional problems, all of which can be interpreted as resulting in more parental monitoring or psychological control in stay-at-home parenting, as more time spent at home does not necessarily lead to a higher quality of interaction. Although not statistically significant, prosocial behavior was found to be slightly higher among children from working mothers, probably because they are exposed to more diverse social models and values of cooperation. These findings support the importance of quality over sheer presence in parenting, with working mothers largely being able to balance warmth and discipline well and getting better adaptive outcomes for their children (Milkie et al., 2015).

Evidence indicated an obvious income differential lying between parenting and psychological variables. Higher family income adolescents reported independent of both parental influence on their parenting positively and fewer negative parenting experiences, especially from the father. This finding is in line with literature arguing that economic security enables parental warmth, autonomy support, and consistent discipline (Conger & Donnellan, 2007). In contrast, lower-income children reported instances of psychological control and negative parenting. This may refer to when financial stress adversely affects the parent's emotional state, very likely driving parenting to an extreme (Gershoff et al., 2007). These patterns were similarly echoed in the children's perspective: children from higher-income families perceived less negativity and more support in their parent-child relationship.

Basic psychological needs satisfaction (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) was far more enhanced in the lives of adolescents coming from wealthier families. Hence, it implies that while economic resources act as facilitators of material conditions, at the same time, they create an environment in which such essential psychological needs are fulfilled, hence fostering well-being and adjustment (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Higher-income adolescents, on the other hand, also exhibited significant emotional and behavioral problems, while also engaging in more prosocial behavior. This suggests that financial support may act as a "buffer" against stressors and encourage the processes of developing social-emotional competencies; however, that must be viewed in a holistic manner, examining how societal inequalities and stressors shape family processes and the developmental outcomes thereof (Yoshikawa et al., 2012).

The analysis conducted afterwards showed substantial differences in parenting dimensions, basic psychological needs, and adolescent behavioral outcomes across different levels of income of the fathers, thereby signifying how powerful an influence

socioeconomic status is with respect to family dynamics and adolescent well-being. Higher father income was reliably linked to more parental positivity (father and mother), less negative parenting behaviors, and greater satisfaction of adolescents' basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. The adolescents themselves had reduced emotional and behavioral difficulties and greater prosocial behavior. The findings corroborate that more financial resources are likely to give parents an opportunity to provide more support to enriching environments conducive to healthier psychological development and adaptive behavior for children (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Conger & Donnellan, 2007). On the contrary, low income might amplify parenting stress, reducing emotional availability, leading to emotional dysregulation and compromised social functioning for children (Yoshikawa et al., 2012). This provides a strong basis for requiring targeted economic and parenting programs for low-income families to counter the detrimental effects of development.

Conclusion

The findings upon demographic variables are gender, family system, maternal employment, and income levels, suggesting that contextual and socioeconomic variables significantly affect parenting practices, satisfaction of psychological needs, and adolescent behavior outcomes. Adolescents from nuclear families, higher-income households with working mothers, tended to describe greater parental involvement, higher satisfaction of autonomy, competence, relatedness, and fewer emotional or behavioral problems. By and large, these patterns suggest that supportive parenting and satisfaction of basic psychological needs link very closely with family dynamics and economic resources, which indicates that interventions to enhance adolescent well-being among different backgrounds need to be carefully tailored to specific family and community-level conditions.

Recommendations

Despite offering some very useful insights about the influence of parenting context, basic psychological needs, and behavioral outcomes across demographic variables, this study has its own limitations. First, there is social desirability bias due to the use of self-report measures. Second, because of the cross-sectional design, it is not possible to make any causal inference about the variables. Third, the sample was restricted to a specific cultural and geographical context, which limits the generalizability of findings to wider populations. Future studies should adopt longitudinal designs that follow respondents over time in order to have a better insight into causal relationships. Furthermore, much needed to improve the understanding of adolescent behavior would be achieved by supplementing self-report data with other sources such as teacher or peer reports. Sampling across broader cultural and socioeconomic diversity will also increase the external validity of results. Developing parenting practices and basic psychological needs interventions must reflect how family systems and economic conditions interact.

References

- Alam, S., Nazir, M., & Hadi, S. (2020). *Family systems and adolescent adjustment: The moderating role of parenting*. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 35(2), 98–114.
- Ali, S., Qureshi, H., & Ahmad, S. (2023). *Parenting and adolescent well-being: A cultural lens from South Asia*. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 64(1), 34–45.
- Amoah, C. F., Tetteh, R., & Donkor, E. (2022). *Family structure and child development in sub-Saharan Africa: A review of emerging evidence*. *African Journal of Social Sciences*, 14(3), 67–79.
- Bianchi, S. M. (2011). Changing families, changing workplaces. *The Future of Children*, 21(2), 15–36. <https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2011.0013>
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 371–399.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Moore, K. A., & Carrano, J. (2020). The role of fathers in adolescent development across diverse contexts. *Youth & Society*, 52(5), 603–624.
- Cabello, M., Gomez, J., & Ortega, M. (2021). *Gendered parenting and adolescent emotional regulation*. *Journal of Adolescence*, 89, 79–90.
- Cabrera, N. J., Volling, B. L., & Barr, R. (2020). *Fathers are parents, too! Widening the lens on parenting for child development*. *Child Development Perspectives*, 14(3), 152–157.
- Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., & Song, Y. (2020). *A teacher-focused intervention to enhance need-supportive teaching*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(4), 759–777.
- Conger, R. D., & Donnellan, M. B. (2007). An interactionist perspective on the socioeconomic context of human development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 175–199.
- Dwairy, M., & Menshar, K. E. (2006). Parenting style, individuation, and mental health of Egyptian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29(1), 103–117.
- Farooq, R., Khalid, A., & Zainab, S. (2024). *Working mothers and adolescent behavior: A cross-sectional study in urban Pakistan*. *Asian Journal of Psychology*, 29(1), 101–118.
- Fegert, J. M., Vitiello, B., Plener, P. L., & Clemens, V. (2020). Challenges and burden of the coronavirus pandemic for child and adolescent mental health. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 174(9), 819–820.
- Gershoff, E. T., Aber, J. L., Raver, C. C., & Lennon, M. C. (2007). Income is not enough: Incorporating material hardship into models of income associations with parenting and child development. *Child Development*, 78(1), 70–95.
- Grolnick, W. S. (2003). *The psychology of parental control: How well-meant parenting backfires*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hill, J. P., & Lynch, M. E. (1983). The intensification of gender-related role expectations during early adolescence. In J. Brooks-Gunn & A. C. Petersen *Girls at puberty* Springer.

- Jang, H., Kim, E. J., & Reeve, J. (2021). Longitudinal test of self-determination theory's motivation mediation model. *Motivation and Emotion*, 45(3), 358-375.
- Katz, L. F., Hessler, D. M., & Zigler, S. (2020). *Gender and parental emotion coaching: Associations with adolescent regulation*. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 34(2), 153-164.
- Khan, F., & Rehman, R. (2021). Parental responsiveness and adolescent outcomes in Pakistan: A socio-demographic analysis. *Journal of Family Studies*, 27(3), 489-503.
- Latif, S., Iqbal, M., & Rafiq, H. (2023). Perceived parenting and adolescent aggression: Role of gender and cultural norms. *Pakistan Journal of Behavioral Science*, 43(1), 77-95.
- Mazzone, A., Camisasca, E., & Miragoli, S. (2021). Economic hardship, parenting, and adolescent adjustment: A mediation model. *Journal of Family Issues*, 42(4), 817-837.
- Milkie, M. A., Nomaguchi, K. M., & Denny, K. E. (2015). Does the amount of time mothers spend with children or adolescents' matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 77(2), 355-372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12170>
- Mujtaba, S., Tariq, M., & Usman, H. (2023). Socioeconomic inequality and parenting: Implications for adolescent resilience. *South Asian Journal of Development*, 12(2), 209-225.
- Mushtaq, R., Abbas, Q., & Fayyaz, F. (2022). Working mothers and children's behavioral issues: A correlational study. *Journal of Social Research and Development*, 9(1), 13-25.
- Nelson, S. K., Kushlev, K., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2022). Parents and adolescents: Mutual influence and well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 73, 273-301.
- Pinquart, M. (2023). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with internalizing symptoms in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 64(1), 4-16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13651>
- Repetti, R. L., Wang, S. W., & Saxbe, D. (2019). Adolescent perceptions of parenting and their psychological functioning. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(6), 1120-1131.
- Riaz, S., & Shah, H. (2024). Parenting, poverty, and psychological adjustment in Pakistani adolescents. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 38(1), 64-78.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior (2nd ed.). *Springer*.
- Sahithya, B. R., Manohari, S. M., & Raman, V. (2021). Parenting styles and emotional regulation in adolescents. *Journal of Indian Association for Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 17(1), 20-35.
- Sandhu, M., & Kaur, G. (2021). Parental acceptance-rejection and gender differences in adolescents. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, 12(3), 387-392.

- Singh, S., & Mahapatra, S. (2022). Socialization, gender roles, and adolescent well-being. *Indian Journal of Psychology*, 97(2), 89–104.
- Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2020). A theoretical upgrade of the concept of parental psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory. *Developmental Review*, 57, 100930. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2020.100930>
- Tokiya, M., & Suzuki, Y. (2021). Employment of mothers and its association with adolescent behavior. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 52(1), 1–17.
- Tsai, A. C., Weiser, S. D., & Dilworth, S. E. (2023). *The role of poverty in adolescent mental health: Global insights. The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, 7(5), 344–352.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Ryan, R. M., & Soenens, B. (2022). Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness. *Guilford Press*.
- Wang, M. T., & Fletcher, A. C. (2021). School engagement and social behavior: Gender differences across early adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 50(2), 289–302.
- Wang, Q., & Fletcher, A. C. (2021). Parenting styles and academic adjustment in diverse adolescents. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 35(3), 398–410.
- Yaffe, Y. (2018). Parenting and adolescent self-concept: A literature review. *Current Psychology*, 37(3), 531–540.
- Yoshikawa, H., Aber, J. L., & Beardslee, W. R. (2012). The effects of poverty on the mental, emotional, and behavioral health of children and youth: Implications for prevention. *American Psychologist*, 67(4), 272–284.
- Yu, S., Levesque-Bristol, C., & Maeda, Y. (2023). Meta-analysis on the relationship between basic psychological needs and well-being: A self-determination theory perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 149(1), 1–31
- Yun, H., & Jang, S. J. (2023). *Gender differences in perceived parenting and adolescent outcomes: A mediation analysis. Youth & Society*, 55(2), 215–234.
- Yun, H., & Jang, S. J. (2023). Gender differences in perceived parenting and adolescent outcomes: A mediation analysis. *Youth & Society*, 55(2), 215–234.
- Yun, H., & Jang, S. J. (2023). Gender differences in social-emotional competencies among adolescents: Implications for psychological well-being. *Child Indicators Research*, 16, 1145–1160
- Zhao, L., Li, X., & Wang, Y. (2023). Family demographics and adolescent psychological health: A cross-national review. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 54(2), 367–382.
- Zhou, Y., Wang, Y., & Qian, M. (2020). Socioeconomic status and adolescent behavioral outcomes: A mediated model. *Journal of Adolescence*, 81, 90–101.