



THE MODERATING EFFECT OF PARENTING STYLES TOWARDS THE RELATIONSHIP OF SELF-ESTEEM AND FRIENDSHIP QUALITY ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN ANGELES CITY

Rhem Rick N. Corpuz¹, Kyla Beatrice C. Yutuc², Saynoding L. Dimaronsing³,
Shan Nico G. Meneses⁴

¹Faculty, College of Criminal Justice Education, Angeles University Foundation, Angeles City, Philippines

^{2,3,4}Student, College of Criminal Justice Education, Angeles University Foundation, Angeles City, Philippines

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14782>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra14782

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between self-esteem, friendship quality, and adolescent criminality in the Philippines, a country with a high rate of delinquency. The research, conducted on 198 adolescents aged 15-17 in Angeles City, found that authoritative parenting promotes positive friendships and self-esteem, while permissive and authoritarian parenting styles lead to less desirable outcomes. The study emphasizes the need for interventions tailored to the cultural context of the Philippines to promote positive adolescent development and reduce criminal behavior. Future research should use longitudinal and mixed-methods approaches to gather diverse and representative samples. Understanding the interplay between parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and adolescent misbehavior is crucial for developing effective therapies.

KEYWORDS: juvenile delinquency; parenting styles; self-esteem; friendship quality; angeles city; philippines

I. INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency is a global issue affecting millions of young people. In 2018, the Philippine National Police Directorate for Intelligence and Investigative Management reported 11,324 documented cases of juvenile involvement in criminal activity [1]. This rise in juvenile delinquency has prompted researchers to investigate contributing factors. Keizer et al. (2019)[2] found that self-esteem, parenting approaches, and the quality of friendships are associated with juvenile delinquency. It's worth noting that juvenile delinquency is a concern in many countries, including the Philippines, where the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention estimated 424,300 juvenile arrests in 2020 [3]. In Europe, there are issues with juvenile justice systems lacking effective measures for rehabilitation [4].

The term "parenting style" refers to how parents interact with their children, including how they raise, teach, and instruct them [5]. It affects the child's personality, behavior, and world perspective. It is essential to acknowledge that parenting styles are not static and that parents may vary between types depending on the circumstances, their age, and their needs at that stage of development. The authoritative parenting style is distinguished by the parent's warmth and attentiveness, as well as explicit and consistent rules and expectations [6]. Authoritarian parents are strict and demanding, often using harsh punishments to enforce their rules. They prioritize obedience and discipline over empathy

and understanding. The permissive parenting style involves a high level of warmth and affection from the parent but little to no control or discipline [7]. Permissive parents allow their children to make decisions, often without guidance or consequences. Children raised in a permissive household may struggle with self-control, have difficulty following rules and authority, and have a sense of entitlement.

An individual's all-encompassing evaluation of their worth or value is what is meant by the term "self-esteem." Mineev et al. (2018)[8] elaborated that self-esteem is a personal and subjective assessment of one's capabilities, achievements, and qualities regarding how one sees oneself. In contrast, those with low self-esteem are more likely to struggle with feelings of insecurity, self-doubt, and self-criticism [9]. Morris Rosenberg makes one of the most used scales in measuring self-esteem. He defined self-esteem as "an attitude toward the self that is either favorable or unfavorable, which, in turn, is a function of the extent to which the individual perceives himself as being competent to cope with the fundamental challenges of life and of his ability to achieve the goals he values" [10]. Self-competence is an essential aspect of self-esteem. It refers to a person's belief in their ability to perform tasks and achieve goals. It is often related to their sense of mastery and effectiveness in various aspects of life [11]. Self-liking is the cornerstone of a positive self concept and is vital for general health and happiness [12]. Suppose a person has a high level of self-liking. In that case, they can have positive feelings about



themselves, recognize and value the aspects that make them unique, and be compassionate and kind to themselves.

The qualities and facets of a friendship that contribute to its robustness, physical and mental well-being, and overall positivity are referred to as its "friendship quality" [13]. The study by Omuris (2019)[14] elaborated on factors that may measure friendship. It involves various factors, like honesty, mutual trust, respect, communication, empathy, support, and having similar interests or values. When two people have a strong sense of connection and intimacy, they can open up to one another and feel safe discussing their innermost thoughts and emotions [15]. This is the hallmark of a solid and lasting friendship. Because it paves the way for open and honest conversation, the resolution of conflicts, and the solution of problems, effective communication is also an essential component of the quality of a friendship. Conflict is a significant characteristic of children's friendships, correlated with the continued existence of the bond and its potential to end. Closeness, on the other hand, is the idea that friendship provides acceptance, validation, and attachment. Symbolic interactionists emphasize the importance of morality and reflected appraisal in friendships. Help and Aid refer to the process of providing assistance to a disruptive child. Security is a crucial aspect of friendship, as young adults consider the perception of friendships being stable and capable of continuing despite issues and conflict. They believe their friends can be trusted and rely upon, and the friendship will be strong enough to endure any disagreements or negative events. The modern approach to finding out factors that strengthen a friendship or identify friendship qualities is conducted by recent studies. In 1994, Bukowski et al. [16] characterized friendship qualities in four dimensions. These dimensions include companionship, conflict, closeness, help, and security.

International researchers have examined how self-esteem, parenting approaches, friendship quality, and adolescent misbehavior are related, but this relationship can vary based on social and cultural contexts. Therefore, it's crucial to investigate these connections within the Philippines to develop culturally and socially appropriate interventions.

Low self-esteem is linked to criminal behavior, and certain parenting styles, like authoritarian parenting, are associated with criminal behavior among Filipino teenagers. Friendship quality has been linked to better developmental outcomes, while negative peer pressure can lead to criminal behavior. However, there's limited research on the link between these elements and juvenile delinquency. Some studies have shown a positive 4 correlation between criminal thinking styles, criminal social identity, and authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, but a negative correlation with authoritative parenting [17]. Self-esteem also plays a role in juvenile delinquency, with some studies showing a small but significant negative effect. For instance, Ong et al. (2019)[18] found a substantial relationship between self-stigma and self-esteem, while Xiang et al. (2018)[19] found that children

with authoritarian parents have lower self-esteem and a greater propensity to join delinquent groups. Climent-Galarza et al. (2022)[20] investigated how parental socialization impacts a child's likelihood of engaging in delinquent behavior. Garcia et al. (2020)[21] found that adolescents with indulgent and authoritarian parents had a lower risk of alcohol use and addiction, and Masud et al. (2019)[22] found that authoritative parenting styles reduce adolescent aggression.

Peer relationships can also contribute to delinquent behavior, especially when individuals receive social support from delinquent peers [23]. Cho and Galehan (2020)[24] confirmed these findings. Research has shown that adolescents with inadequate friendship qualities, experiences of victimization from bullying and child abuse, and poor friendship quality are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior. Alienation from the mother is a significant predictor of subsequent criminality, and peer interactions, particularly with delinquent peers, are highly connected to later delinquent behavior [25]. Additionally, Buchanan et al. (2020)[26] found that the pandemic has impacted the relationship between friendship, self-esteem, and parenting styles concerning juvenile delinquency. Self-esteem is also a dominant factor among sex offenders committing crimes [27]. Parenting style and peer attachment relationships play a role in the likelihood of delinquent behavior [6]. Moreover, a combination of social support from family and friends can mitigate the adverse impact of sibling victimization on mental health, self-esteem, and delinquent behavior [28].

A. General Objective

The research will explore how parenting strategies influence the connection between self esteem, friendship quality, and delinquent behavior in young people. It will also examine how self-esteem and friendship quality relate to juvenile delinquency. Additionally, the study will look into whether different parenting styles, like authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive, affect the relationship between self-esteem and friendship quality, as well as their impact on juvenile delinquency.

B. Specific Objectives

- a) How may the parenting styles of respondents be described in terms of:
 - a. authoritarian;
 - b. authoritative; and
 - c. permissive?
- b) How may the friendship quality be described in terms of:
 - a.companionship;
 - b. conflict;
 - c. closeness;
 - d. help; and
 - e. security?
- c) How may the respondent's self-esteem be described in terms of:



- a. self-competence;
- b. self-confidence?

d) Does parenting styles moderate the relationship between self-esteem and friendship quality?

e) Does parenting styles moderate the relationship of self-esteem and friendship quality on juvenile delinquency?

II. METHODS

The research study involves a series of meticulous steps to ensure accurate and meaningful data collection. The researchers initiate the study with a formal request letter, demonstrating their commitment to ethical standards. The subject professor's involvement in validating a questionnaire checklist is crucial for ensuring the survey questions are reliable, valid, and aligned with the research objectives. This collaborative approach reflects the collaborative nature of research, where experienced individuals contribute their expertise. The study methodology in Angeles City, Pampanga, demonstrates a systematic approach to data collection, as surveys provide insights into complex social phenomena. The geographical location of the study may have implications for the study results. Informed consent is a critical ethical consideration, ensuring participants are aware of the purpose and potential implications of their involvement. Operational definitions of terminologies used in the study help eliminate ambiguity and enhance the reliability and validity of the collected data. Requesting sincerity from participants emphasizes the importance of honest and accurate responses, as insincere or inaccurate responses can lead to skewed results. The primary objective of the research is to investigate the potential mediating impact of parenting styles on self-esteem and friendship quality, which is important for various fields like psychology, education, and social sciences. After completing the survey, the researchers gathered and tabulated participants' responses for analysis. This process involves statistical techniques and data interpretation, helping answer research questions and contribute to the broader academic and practical discourse. The researchers' systematic and ethical approach emphasizes collaboration, transparency, and the ultimate goal of contributing to knowledge in the field.

C. Study Design

Exploratory research is a method used to understand the link between parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency. It helps in identifying variables, data collection methods, and analysis techniques [29]. Through a quantitative study, this approach can delve into the experiences of adolescents with various parenting styles, their self-worth perceptions, and friendship quality, shedding light on potential moderating effects of parenting styles on self-esteem and friendship quality.

Exploratory research proves valuable in grasping the connection between parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency. It also offers insights into possible mediating effects and points out areas for further research and intervention [30].

D. Study Participants

Sample size

The study will take place in Angeles City, Pampanga, with 198 teenagers aged 15-17 from 33 barangays. We'll gather data using a survey that looks at self-esteem, parenting styles, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency behavior. We'll analyze the data using a descriptive approach and multiple regression analysis. The sample size is sufficient, coming from various schools in the city, making it representative. This broad sample and data collection approach enable us to apply our findings to other groups of people.

E. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria

To be eligible for the study on how parenting styles affect the link between self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency, participants must be 15-17 years old, either male or female, and living with their parents. They should also be capable of giving accurate answers about their parents' parenting styles, their own self-esteem, and the quality of their friendships with peers.

Exclusion Criteria

To be excluded from the study on how parenting styles affect the connection between self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency, individuals must be minors without parents. They should also reside within the boundaries of Angeles City and be residents of the particular barangays selected by the researchers.

F. Data Collection Procedure

The research study involves a series of meticulous steps to ensure accurate and meaningful data collection. The researchers initiate the study with a formal request letter, demonstrating their commitment to ethical standards. The subject professor's involvement in validating a questionnaire checklist is crucial for ensuring the survey questions are reliable, valid, and aligned with the research objectives. This collaborative approach reflects the collaborative nature of research, where experienced individuals contribute their expertise. The study methodology in Angeles City, Pampanga, demonstrates a systematic approach to data collection, as surveys provide insights into complex social phenomena. The geographical location of the study may have implications for the study results. Informed consent is a critical ethical consideration, ensuring participants are aware of the purpose and potential implications of their involvement. Operational definitions of terminologies used in the study help eliminate ambiguity and enhance the reliability and validity of the collected data. Requesting sincerity from participants emphasizes the importance of honest and accurate responses, as insincere or inaccurate responses can lead to skewed results. The primary objective of the research is to investigate the potential mediating impact of parenting styles on self-esteem and friendship quality, which is important for various fields like psychology, education, and social sciences. After completing the survey, the researchers gathered and tabulated participants' responses for analysis. This



process involves statistical techniques and data interpretation, helping answer research questions and contribute to the broader academic and practical discourse. The researchers' systematic and ethical approach emphasizes collaboration, transparency, and the ultimate goal of contributing to knowledge in the field.

G. Data Gathering Tool

The Friendship Qualities Scale was developed by Bukowski, Hoza, and Bolvin in 1994. It is a theoretically supported, multidimensional measurement tool for evaluating the quality of relationships between young children and their best friends based on five conceptually significant characteristics of the friendship relationship. These aspects include proximity, conflict, help or aid, camaraderie, and security. These measures were shown to represent different but related domains of friendship by a confirmatory factor analysis, which was used to assess the factor structure of this instrument. According to reliability assessments, a high level of internal consistency was found in each dimension. By seeing more excellent ratings for (a) mutual friends compared to non-mutual friends and (b) stable friends compared to non-stable friends, it was possible to confirm the scale's validity. Theoretical and practical concerns relating to these findings are examined in measuring friendship quality.

According to Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965) [10], the item response theory was used to examine This tool will be answerable by four options: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. A commonly used self-report tool for assessing individual self-esteem. Contrary to other prior studies that isolated separate self-confidence and self-depreciation factors, factor analysis found a single shared factor. For graded item answers, the data were fitted to a unidimensional model. Compared to a model that allowed the discriminations to be estimated freely, one that required the ten items to have equal discrimination was used. The unconstrained model, which considers that the ten items on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale do not all discriminate identically and have various relationships to one another's levels of self-esteem, was found to fit the data by the test of significance. The functional pattern of the items was analyzed in relation to their content, and findings are provided with implications for validating and creating future personality measures. It was used by Baumeister et al. (2003) [31], which further provides validity for the questionnaire of Rosenberg (1965).

By using the Perceived Parenting Style Scale, Divya and Manikandan (2013) [32] assess how children perceive their parents' behavior. According to three aspects, including authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive, it gauges the subject's perceived parenting style. It includes 30 items, each eliciting a response on a Likert scale of 1 to 4. According to Delbert Elliot (1985) [33], the National Youth Survey (NYS) Series Parents and teenagers were questioned about the occasions and actions of the previous year for this series to better comprehend both typical and unusual sorts of youth behavior. The demographic and

socioeconomic status of respondents, disruptive events in the home, neighborhood issues, parental aspirations for their children, labeling, the integration of family and peer contexts, parental discipline, parental involvement in the community, drug and alcohol use, victimization, pregnancy, depression, use of outpatient services, partner and respondent violence toward one another, and sexual activity were all the subjects of the data collection. Sex, ethnicity, birth date, age, marital status, and employment of the youngsters, as well as details on the parents' marital status and employment, are all considered demographic characteristics.

H. Validity and Reliability

The Friendship Qualities Scale (FQS) was developed by Bukowski, Hoza, and Bolvin (1994) [16] to assess the friendship qualities of children. It involves generating a pool of items related to friendship qualities, assessing their relevance and clarity through expert ratings, piloting with a sample of children, revising and testing with a larger sample, and refining the scale based on participant feedback. Content reliability is crucial in questionnaire development, as it ensures that the items accurately measure the concept they are intended to measure and are understandable and appropriate for the target population. The Friendship Qualities Scale (FQS) was developed to evaluate the qualities of children and adolescents' thriving friendships, consisting of 10 items measuring qualities like trustworthiness and loyalty. Content validation was crucial for its reliability, involving consultation with experts, pilot testing, item analysis, and revisions, ultimately confirming its validity as a measure of friendship qualities. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) is a 10-item self-report inventory developed in 1965 to measure global self-esteem. The content reliability process for the RSES involves piloting the items, examining the scale's correlation with other measures of self-esteem, establishing test-retest reliability, and norming the scale on the studied population.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), created in 1965, is a widely used self-report tool to assess self-esteem. Content validation for RSES includes expert review, clarity assessment, reliability measurement, validity assessment through comparisons with other self-esteem measures, and testing across diverse populations. Divya and Manikandan (2013) [32] present the Perceived Parenting Style Scale, which consists of 36 distinct items categorized into three subscales: Authoritarian, Authoritative, and Permissive. A study found that the scale had good internal consistency and test-retest reliability. The Perceived Parenting Style Scale (PPSS) measures individuals' perceptions of their parents' parenting styles. It demonstrated high validity through factor analysis and correlations with other parenting style measures. Researchers like Suhair, Fakhr, Nyoike, and Valke have utilized the PPSS in their studies. The Delbert Elliot 1985 National Youth Survey (NYS) [33] was comprehensive, developed based on an extensive review of relevant literature, expert feedback, pilot testing with a small sample of participants, and evaluating responses for internal consistency. This process



helped ensure that the data collected was accurate and reliable. The Delbert Elliot 1985 National Youth Survey (NYS)[33] Series involves a five step process for survey development: literature review, content review, field testing, pilot study, and result analysis, ensuring the survey's accuracy, reliability, and effectiveness.

I. Ethical Considerations

Conducting research on how parenting styles mediate the relationship between self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency is essential for ethical reasons. It should be done while prioritizing participants' safety, privacy, and rights [34]. The potential impact of this research on participants is significant and has broad implications [35]. Ethical considerations like informed consent and privacy are crucial, as they uphold participants' autonomy and dignity. Parents should be informed and give consent for their child's participation, and data should be kept confidential and anonymous [36]. Data should also be securely stored, with limited access [37]. Children in this study are persons between the age of 15-17 years old. They must be properly informed of their rights in this study and shall be given an informed consent and assent form to be answered by the respondent and parent, respectively.

Ethical principles extend to the publication of research results. Data and findings should be reported responsibly and without sensationalism [34]. Researchers should disclose potential risks to participants and protect their identities. Moreover, the ethical implications of the research should be considered, as they may influence public policy and how juvenile delinquency is addressed [36].

J. Statistical Analysis of Data

Multiple Regression Analysis, a statistical technique, is employed to study the relationship between a dependent variable and several independent variables [38]. It goes beyond simple linear regression, which looks at the connection between two variables, by involving multiple predictors [39]. The goal is to assess how well the independent variables collectively explain the variations observed in the dependent variable.

For instance, in the context of examining the moderating influence of parenting styles on the connection between self-esteem and friendship quality concerning juvenile delinquency, multiple regression analysis can be used. Researchers create a model that includes independent variables (self-esteem and friendship quality), a moderating variable (parenting style), and the dependent variable (juvenile delinquency) to estimate the impact of parenting styles on the relationship between self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

TABLE I

Age of Respondents			
Age	Frequency	Percent	
15	90	45.5	
16	106	53.5	
17	2	1	
Total	198	100	

This table displays a population's age distribution. Specifically, it indicates that 45.5% of the population is 15 years old, 53.5% is 16 years old, and 1% is 17 years old, making a total of 198 individuals in the sampled population.

TABLE II

Gender of Respondents			
	Male	Female	Total
Frequency	90	106	198
Percent	45.5	53.5	100

This table displays the gender distribution of a specified population. There are 90 males and 106 females, making up a total population of 198. The proportion of males is 45.5% and the proportion of females is 53.5%, totaling 100%.

This table represents the indicators of all parenting styles included in the questionnaire [32]. The data provided will be interpreted individually per the category provided by the author of the questionnaire's study.

TABLE III

Perceived Parenting Styles of the Respondent's Parents			
Indicators	X	VI	SD
Capable of making me understand "Right" and "Wrong".	3.80	Often	0.52
View everything with a critical mind.	3.07	Sometimes	0.63
Never find time for me to help during difficult situations.	2.39	Rarely	0.92
Congratulate me when I pass the exams.	2.74	Sometimes	0.92
I am compared with other friends/classmates.	2.29	Rarely	0.83
Never help me in doing day-to-day activities on time.	2.25	Rarely	0.81
My suggestions and ideas are considered.	2.74	Sometimes	0.86
Insult and beat me in front of others.	1.75	Rarely	0.95
No directions are given while doing things.	2.13	Rarely	1.01
I have the freedom to discuss anything	2.80	Sometimes	0.88
I often feel that I am being rejected for affection.	2.35	Rarely	1.00
No inquiries are made about the decisions taken by me.	2.64	Sometimes	0.89



During a crisis situation, they inquire about it.	2.78	Sometimes	0.92
Blame me even for minor things/issues	2.37	Rarely	0.94
Never provide an atmosphere for my studies.	2.44	Rarely	1.02
I get love and care from my parents.	3.12	Sometimes	0.86
Behave to me in a strict manner.	2.64	Sometimes	0.84
Never do anything to satisfy my needs.	2.43	Rarely	0.90
Being pursued for taking my own decisions.	2.72	Sometimes	0.70
Being scolded for not coming up to their expectations.	2.33	Rarely	0.87
Fail to inquire about the disturbances and suggest remedial measures.	2.29	Rarely	0.69
My opinions are considered in all important decisions related to home.	2.70	Sometimes	0.82
Blame me for not doing things properly.	2.36	Rarely	0.93
No effort is made to know about the progress of my studies.	2.01	Rarely	0.98
Provide guidance in studies and suggest ways for character formation.	2.45	Rarely	1.02
Being scolded without knowing the reasons for being late from the College.	1.98	Rarely	0.97
No inquiries are made about my likes and interests.	2.23	Rarely	0.86
At free time they spent time with me.	2.68	Sometimes	0.89
There is control over each of my activities.	2.69	Sometimes	0.81
They will not inquire about my abilities and goals.	2.26	Rarely	0.83
Average	2.51	Sometimes	0.87
Legend: Mean = X Verbal Interpretation = VI Standard Deviation = SD Variance = V			

The survey encompasses a range of statements pertaining to parental relationships with their children and the manner in which these interactions are seen by the participants. Every sentence is accompanied by a mean score, a verbal interpretation, standard deviation, and variance. The mean scores, which vary from 1.75 to 3.80, represent the average ratings given to each statement on a scale. The word interpretations, such as "Often," "Sometimes," and "Rarely," serve to provide qualitative context regarding the frequency or severity of the observed activities. Upon analyzing the mean scores, it becomes apparent that participants have a prevailing belief that their parents possess the ability to instill a moral compass, as denoted by a mean score of 3.80. This finding underscores the widespread and noteworthy nature of this particular facet of parental upbringing. Conversely, behaviors such as verbal insults and physical aggression displayed in the

presence of others (with an average score of 1.75) are seen as seldom incidents.

The standard deviations and variances offer insights into the extent or distribution of reactions. Lower standard deviations indicate a higher degree of consensus among respondents, whereas higher standard deviations signify a greater level of heterogeneity in the responses. In general, the data indicates that the participants have a moderate perception of their parents' level of involvement in their lives, characterized by the provision of support and care, albeit accompanied by occasional instances of criticism or strictness. Furthermore, it is evident that there exists a discernible divergence in perspectives, suggesting that distinct individuals encounter diverse encounters with the parenting approaches employed by their parents.

TABLE IV

Indicators of Authoritative Parenting Style				
Indicators	X	VI	SD	V
Capable of making me understand "Right" and "Wrong".	3.80	Often	0.52	0.27
Congratulate me when I pass the exams.	2.74	Sometimes	0.92	0.85
My suggestions and ideas are considered.	2.74	Sometimes	0.86	0.74
I have the freedom to discuss anything	2.80	Sometimes	0.88	0.77
During the crisis situation, they inquire about it.	2.78	Sometimes	0.92	0.84
I get love and care from my parents.	3.12	Sometimes	0.86	0.74
Being pursued for taking my own decisions.	2.72	Sometimes	0.70	0.50
My opinions are considered in all important decisions related to home.	2.70	Sometimes	0.82	0.67
Provide guidance in studies and suggest ways for character formation.	2.45	Rarely	1.02	1.03
At free time they spent time with me.	2.68	Sometimes	0.89	0.79
Average	2.85	Sometimes	0.84	0.72

The subsequent factors denote the characteristics of the authoritative parenting style. The results indicate that the authoritative parenting style is occasionally employed in Angeles City. The data indicates that parents frequently communicated clear distinctions between correct and incorrect behavior to their children, with a mean of 3.8, a standard deviation of 0.52, and a variance of 0.27. The interval of mean scores ranging from 2.45 to 2.74 indicates that parents occasionally acknowledged and expressed praise for their children's academic achievements while also granting them the liberty to engage in open discussions or inquire about any pressing issues. In addition, it was found that parents exhibited a moderate level of care and affection towards their children, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.12, a standard deviation of 0.86, and a variance of 0.74. Furthermore, parents tend to promote autonomy by encouraging their children to make



their own decisions, as indicated by a mean score of 2.72. Additionally, parents sought to provide guidance and engage in discussions regarding significant household matters, with a mean score of 2.70, a standard deviation of 0.82, and a variance of 0.67. However, it was observed that the occurrence of parents engaging in shared activities during their leisure time was relatively infrequent, with a mean of 2.68, a standard deviation of 0.88, and a variance of 0.78.

TABLE V

Indicators of Permissive Parenting Style				
Indicators	X	VI	SD	V
Never find time for me to help during difficult situations.	2.39	Rarely	0.92	0.85
Never help me in doing day-to-day activities on time.	2.25	Rarely	0.81	0.66
No directions are given while doing things.	2.13	Rarely	1.01	1.01
No inquiries are made about the decisions taken by me.	2.64	Someti mes	0.89	0.79
Never provide an atmosphere for my studies.	2.44	Rarely	1.02	1.04
Never do anything to satisfy my needs.	2.43	Rarely	0.90	0.81
Fail to inquire about the disturbances and suggest remedial measures.	2.29	Rarely	0.69	0.48
No effort is made to know about the progress of my studies.	2.01	Rarely	0.98	0.95
No inquiries are made about my likes and interests.	2.23	Rarely	0.86	0.74
They will not inquire about my abilities and goals.	2.26	Rarely	0.83	0.68
Average	2.31	Rarely	0.89	0.8

These results indicate that on average they employed a permissive parenting style less frequently than other styles, as evidenced by indicators for which parenting behaviors were rarely present, making an average of 2.31. The indicators for which parenting behaviors were found to be more rarely present showed a range of 0.69 standard deviation to 1.02 standard deviation, meaning that in these interactions, all parenting behaviors were generally either rarely present or generally close in frequency. Additionally, this yielded a variance of 0.8. Overall, these results point to a group of parents who employed, on average, a permissive parenting style that was significantly less common than other styles. The responses to the questions indicate a permissive parenting style, as few parental behaviors are observed. The majority of responses indicate that parents are providing support and guidance for their children. This may suggest that the parents do not set explicit expectations and limits. In addition, they rarely provide attentive and proactive parenting to ensure their child's requirements are met and interests are fostered.

TABLE VI

Indicators of Authoritarian Parenting Style				
Indicators	X	VI	SD	V
View everything with a critical mind.	3.07	Someti mes	0.63	0.40
I am compared with other friends/classmates.	2.29	Rarely	0.83	0.69
Insult and beat me in front of others.	1.75	Rarely	0.95	0.91
I often feel that I am being rejected for affection.	2.35	Rarely	1.00	1.01
Blame me even for minor things/issues	2.37	Rarely	0.94	0.88
Behave to me in a strict manner.	2.64	Someti mes	0.84	0.70
Being scolded for not coming up to their expectations.	2.33	Rarely	0.87	0.76
Blame me for not doing things properly.	2.36	Rarely	0.93	0.86
Being scolded without knowing the reasons for being late from the College.	1.98	Rarely	0.97	0.94
There is control over each of my activities.	2.69	Someti mes	0.81	0.65
Average	2.38	Rarely	0.88	0.78

The results indicated that participants rarely exhibited these indicators of authoritarian parenting styles. They only occasionally reported experiencing comparisons to others, being spoken to in a strict manner, and having activity control. This study also discovered that participants rarely experienced verbal insults, rejection of affection, blame for trivial issues, and being reprimanded without being informed of the reasons. The average reported frequency of these indicators of parenting style was low. Moreover, it demonstrates that the majority of authoritarian parenting indicators are rarely employed by parents. The average indicator score was 2.38 out of a possible 5, with a standard deviation of 0.88 and a variance of 0.78. This demonstrates that the authoritarian parenting style is rarely used by parents, although certain aspects are occasionally employed.

In a study by Bukowski et al. (1994) [16] on assessing friendship quality, participants' perceptions of their friendships were examined using various indicators. These indicators revealed details about closeness, companionship, help, security, and conflicts in friendships. The same approach was used to interpret the results of this study.

TABLE VII

Indicators of Friendship Quality				
Indicators	X	VI	SD	V
My friend and I spend all our free time together.	3.81	Little True	1.09	1.18
I can get into fights with my friend.	3.41	Little True	1.33	1.76
If I forgot my lunch or needed a little	4.13	Little True	1.09	1.19



money, my friend would loan it to me.				
If I have a problem at school or at home, I can talk to my friend about it.	4.13	Little True	0.94	0.88
If my friend had to move away, I would miss him/her.	4.12	Little True	1.00	1.00
My friend thinks of fun things for us to do together.	4.11	Little True	1.03	1.06
My friend can bug me or annoy me even though I ask him/her not to.	3.86	Little True	1.09	1.18
My friend helps me when I am having trouble with something.	4.15	Little True	0.77	0.59
If there is something bothering me, I can tell my friend about it even if it is something I cannot tell to other people.	3.70	Little True	1.10	1.21
I feel happy when I am with my friend.	3.82	Little True	1.23	1.51
My friend and I go to each other's houses after school and on weekends.	3.26	Somewhat True	1.23	1.53
My friend and I can argue a lot.	3.00	Somewhat True	1.12	1.25
My friend would help me if I needed it.	3.76	Little True	1.05	1.11
If I said I was sorry after I had a fight with my friend, he/she would still stay mad at me.	2.60	Somewhat True	1.26	1.58
I think about my friend even when my friend is not around.	3.42	Little True	1.18	1.39
Sometimes my friend and I just sit around and talk about things like school, sports, and things we like.	4.03	Little True	1.18	1.39
My friend and I disagree about many things.	3.23	Somewhat True	1.35	1.82
If other kids were bothering me, my friend would help me.	3.59	Little True	1.01	1.02
If my friend or I do something that bothers the other one of us, we can make up easily.	3.49	Little True	1.30	1.69

When I do a good job at something, my friend is happy for me.	4.29	Not at all True	1.03	1.06
My friend would stick up for me if another kid was causing me trouble.	3.94	Little True	1.02	1.04
If my friend and I have a fight or argument, we can say "I'm sorry" and everything will be alright.	4.06	Little True	1.12	1.27
Sometimes my friend does things for me, or makes me feel special.	3.67	Little True	1.22	1.48
Average	3.72	Little True	1.12	1.27

One of the indicators examined was the number of times participants and their friends spent together. The mean score for this indicator was 3.81, indicating that the participants reported spending a considerable quantity of their free time with their friends. As the participants actively chose to spend their recreational time together, this suggests a high level of companionship and closeness within these friendships. Another indicator concentrated on the occurrence of interpersonal conflicts. The participants' mean score for this indicator was 3.41, indicating that they admitted to occasionally fighting with their peers. While disagreements are a natural part of any relationship, the relatively lower mean score indicates that these disagreements were not pervasive or detrimental to the overall character of the friendships. The participants' perceptions of their peers' willingness to help were also evaluated. The average score for the indicator pertaining to lending money or providing assistance when required was 4.13. This indicates that the participants believed their peers would be supportive and willing to assist them in times of need, such as forgetting their lunch or needing financial assistance. This finding demonstrates a sense of trust, safety, and dependability in these alliances. In addition, participants were asked about their ability to discuss school or home issues with peers. This aspect's evaluative indicator received a mean score of 4.13. This high score indicates that the participants felt comfortable confiding in their friends and requesting their advice or support in times of need. This characteristic of friendship reflects the presence of emotional closeness and a supportive environment in these relationships.

The emotional attachment of participants to their peers was also investigated. The average score for the indicator measuring how much participants would mourn their friends if they moved away was 4.12. This score implies a strong emotional bond and attachment, indicating that the participants value their friendships and their role in their lives. In addition, the participant perceptions of their peers; ability to generate enjoyable 16 activities for the group were evaluated. This aspect was measured by an indicator with a mean score of 4.11. This high score indicates that the



respondents believed their friends were proactive in planning pleasant and engaging activities, which contributes to the sense of companionship and shared interests within these friendships. On the subject of conflict resolution, the participants were questioned about the forgiveness of their peers following an argument. The average score for the indicator regarding the likelihood of reconciliation was 4.06. This relatively high score indicates that participants believed their peers were willing to accept apologies in order to resolve conflicts and move forward. This characteristic of friendship reflects the significance of effective communication and conflict resolution in these relationships. Overall, the results of these indicators suggest that the participants perceived their friendships to be characterized by high levels of closeness, companionship, assistance, and security, as well as the occasional presence of conflicts. This indicates that the average score for the numerous statements on the friendship quality scale is 3.72, which corresponds to a rating of Little True. This suggests that the friendship between the two parties is generally powerful, but not flawless. There are still some disagreements or conflicts, but the friend relationship is generally positive. These results emphasize the positive qualities of these friendships and contribute to our understanding of the quality of friendships among the study participants.

TABLE VIII

Indicators of Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale				
Indicators	X	VI	SD	V
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	3.22	Agree	0.93	0.87
At times I think I am no good at all.	2.39	Disagree	0.90	0.82
I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	2.84	Agree	0.68	0.46
I am able to do things as well as most other people.	2.80	Agree	0.70	0.48
I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	2.07	Disagree	0.89	0.79
I certainly feel useless at times.	2.01	Disagree	1.03	1.07
I feel that I'm a person of worth.	3.27	Strongly Agree	0.89	0.79
I wish I could have more respect for myself.	3.35	Strongly Agree	0.90	0.82
All in all, I am inclined to think that I am a failure.	1.98	Disagree	1.07	1.15
I take a positive attitude toward myself.	3.22	Agree	0.91	0.83
Average	2.71	Agree	0.89	0.81

The mean (or average) is a measure of central tendency that indicates the typical response of all participants. In this instance, the range of mean ratings for each item is 1.98 to 3.35. The average score for all ten questions is 2.71. These scores provide an indication of the participants' general self-esteem. To facilitate

interpretation, verbal descriptions of each mean score are provided. The degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements is classified by verbal interpretations. For instance, a mean score of 3.22 indicates that, on average, participants agreed with the statement "Overall, I am satisfied with myself." Similarly, a mean score of 2.39 is designated as "Disagree," indicating that, on average, respondents disagreed with the statement "At times, I believe I am utterly incompetent." The standard deviation indicates the degree to which individual responses deviate from the mean score. In this instance, the standard deviations range from 0.68 to 1.03 for each variable. The greater the standard deviation, the greater the 17 responses variability. For example, a standard deviation of 0.68 indicates relatively less variability in responses to the statement "I feel that I have a number of good qualities." Variance, the square of the standard deviation, is an additional measure of variability. It measures the variance of scores relative to the norm. In this table, the variance values range from 0.46 to 1.15. For instance, a variance of 0.46 indicates that responses to the statement "I believe I possess a number of positive qualities" are less variable.

Examining the results, we find that, on average, the participants reported moderate levels of self-esteem. According to the provided verbal interpretation, the mean score of 2.71 lies within the "Agree" range. This indicates that participants have a comparatively positive view of their self-competence and self-liking, as they tend to agree with positive statements about themselves. With mean scores ranging from 2.80 to 3.30 on the first five self-competence assessment items, participants generally concurred with statements regarding their abilities and qualities. This demonstrates a favorable perception of their self-competence. Participants tended to concur with statements reflecting positive self-regard as they moved on to the second set of five items measuring self-liking. The range of mean scores for these items, 3.22 to 3.35, indicates that, on average, participants have a positive self-image and self-respect. Overall, these results indicate that the participants in this study have a moderately positive level of self-esteem, as evidenced by their confidence in their abilities and positive self-regard.

This study reveals that participants have a moderately positive level of self-esteem, as evidenced by their confidence in their abilities and positive self-regard. The data suggests that parental style can influence individuals' friendship quality and self-esteem. An authoritative parenting style, characterized by support, guidance, and open communication, is associated with higher self-esteem and superior friendship quality.

Conversely, a permissive parenting style, characterized by a lack of parental involvement, guidance, and support, may result in lower-quality friendships and possibly lower self-esteem. Perceived parenting styles indicate negative interactions between parents and children, which can negatively affect both the character of friendships and one's self-esteem. Children who perceive their parents as being critical, demeaning, or controlling



may struggle to develop positive friendships and a healthy sense of self. Based on the presented data, it is reasonable to conclude that parental style can influence individuals' friendship quality and self-esteem.

The mean score for friendship quality indicators is comparatively high, indicating that the majority of respondents have positive and fulfilling friendships. The average score for self-esteem is also moderately high, indicating that respondents have a reasonable amount of self-worth and confidence. The first significant finding is that indicators associated with spending time together, engaging in pleasant activities, and providing mutual support received consistently high ratings. This suggests that individuals with higher self-esteem may be more likely to participate in activities that foster friendship bonding and emotional support. Indicators involving conflicts and disagreements received slightly lower ratings, suggesting that self-esteem may play a role in the management and resolution of interpersonal conflicts. Individuals with higher self-esteem may have enhanced communication and problem-solving abilities, allowing them to navigate disagreements 18 more effectively and sustain harmonious relationships. Indicators relating to sharing personal problems with friends and requesting their emotional support received high ratings, suggesting that individuals with higher self-esteem are more likely to have open and trustworthy relationships where they feel comfortable discussing their difficulties and requesting advice or empathy. On the other hand, indicators of negative interactions, such as annoyance and conflicts, received moderate ratings. Low self-esteem may result in increased sensitivity to perceived slights or criticisms, which can strain the character of the friendship. Thus, there is evidence to suggest that self-esteem influences the character of friendships.

TABLE IX

Indicators of Juvenile Delinquency through National Youth Survey				
Indicators	X	VI	SD	V
purposely damaged or destroyed property belonging to your parents or other family members?	5.35	Low-Level Delinquency	0.88	0.77
purposely damaged or destroyed property belonging to a school?	5.63	Low-Level Delinquency	0.94	0.88
purposely damaged or destroyed other property that did not belong to you (not counting family or school property)?	5.77	Low-Level Delinquency	0.69	0.48
stolen (or tried to steal) a motor vehicle, such as a car or motorcycle?	5.74	Low-Level Delinquency	0.75	0.57
stolen (or tried to steal) something worth more than \$50?	5.65	Low-Level Delinquency	0.98	0.96

knowingly bought, sold or held stolen goods (or tried to do any of these things)?	5.68	Low-Level Delinquency	0.92	0.85
thrown objects (such as rocks, snowballs, or bottles) at cars or people?	5.66	Low-Level Delinquency	0.96	0.93
run away from home?	5.65	Low-Level Delinquency	0.89	0.79
lied about your age to gain entrance or to purchase something; for example, lying about your age to buy liquor or get into a movie?	5.36	Low-Level Delinquency	0.99	0.97
carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife?	5.70	Low-Level Delinquency	0.87	0.75
stolen (or tried to steal) things worth \$5 or less?	5.72	Low-Level Delinquency	0.85	0.72
attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing him/her?	5.80	Low-Level Delinquency	0.75	0.56
been paid for having sexual relations with someone?	5.84	Low-Level Delinquency	0.65	0.42
been involved in gang fights?	5.81	Low-Level Delinquency	0.73	0.54
sold marijuana or hashish ("pot," "grass," "hash")?	5.82	Low-Level Delinquency	0.71	0.50
cheated on school tests?	5.42	Low-Level Delinquency	1.16	1.35
hitchhiked where it was illegal to do so?	5.81	Low-Level Delinquency	0.76	0.58
stolen money or other things from your parents or other members of your family?	5.61	Low-Level Delinquency	1.03	1.05
hit (or threatened to hit) a teacher or other adult at school?	5.80	Low-Level Delinquency	0.68	0.46
hit (or threatened to hit) one of your parents?	5.79	Low-Level Delinquency	0.71	0.50
hit (or threatened to hit) other students?	5.40	Low-Level Delinquency	1.03	1.06



been loud, rowdy, or unruly in a public place (disorderly conduct)?	5.22	Low-Level Delinquency	1.33	1.78
sold hard drugs, such as heroin, cocaine, and LSD?	5.81	Low-Level Delinquency	0.79	0.62
taken a vehicle for a ride (drive) without the owner's permission?	5.79	Low-Level Delinquency	0.79	0.62
had (or tried to have) sexual relations with someone against their will?	5.83	Low-Level Delinquency	0.65	0.42
used force (strong-arm methods) to get money or things from other students?	5.75	Low-Level Delinquency	0.91	0.84
used force (strong-arm methods) to get money or things from a teacher or other adult at school?	5.85	Low-Level Delinquency	0.64	0.40
used force (strong-arm methods) to get money or things from other people (not students or teachers)?	5.82	Low-Level Delinquency	0.71	0.51
avoided paying for such things as movies, bus or subway rides, and food?	5.76	Low-Level Delinquency	0.74	0.55
been drunk in a public place?	5.68	Low-Level Delinquency	0.88	0.77
stolen (or tried to steal) things worth between \$5 and \$50?	5.78	Low-Level Delinquency	0.84	0.70
stolen (or tried to steal) something at school, such as someone's coat from a classroom, locker, or cafeteria, or a book from the library?	5.79	Low-Level Delinquency	0.83	0.69
broken into a building or vehicle (or tried to break in) to steal something or just to look around?	5.78	Low-Level Delinquency	0.76	0.58
begged for money or things from strangers?	5.75	Low-Level Delinquency	0.84	0.71
skipped classes without an excuse?	5.30	Low-Level Delinquency	1.21	1.46
failed to return extra change that a cashier gave you by mistake?	5.55	Low-Level Delinquency	0.98	0.96

been suspended from school?	5.76	Low-Level Delinquency	0.85	0.72
made obscene telephone calls, such as calling someone and saying dirty things.	5.77	Low-Level Delinquency	0.76	0.58
used: alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, and hard liquor)?	5.44	Low-Level Delinquency	1.26	1.58
marijuana--hashish ("grass," "pot," "hash")?	5.84	Low-Level Delinquency	0.68	0.46
Hallucinogens ("LSD," "Mescaline," "Peyote," "Acid")?	5.86	Low-Level Delinquency	0.63	0.39
Amphetamines ("Uppers," "Speed," "Whites")?	5.79	Low-Level Delinquency	0.86	0.74
Average	5.69	Low-Level Delinquency	0.85	0.76

National Youth Survey on Juvenile Delinquency, encompassing diverse measures of delinquent behaviors among young individuals, along with their respective statistical measures. The indicators encompass a range of behaviors, including but not limited to acts of property damage and theft, as well as more serious transgressions such as assault and engagement in drug-related activities. The statistical analysis includes the mean, verbal interpretation, standard deviation, and variance for each indicator, which offers valuable information regarding the frequency and dispersion of delinquent behaviors among the surveyed juvenile population.

Based on the indicators, the range of mean scores for all delinquent behaviors falls between 5.22 and 5.86, with an overall average of 5.69. The verbal interpretation of these scores is "Low-Level Delinquency." This implies that the surveyed adolescents exhibit a moderate level of involvement in delinquent activities, on average. It is imperative to acknowledge that this categorization does not connote the acceptability or dismissal of these actions, but rather their placement on the lower end of the delinquency continuum. The statistical measures of variance and standard deviation for each indicator provide information on the degree of spread or distribution of the data points in relation to the mean. Typically, the deviations and variances conform to a range of 0.63 to 1.33 and 0.39 to 1.78, respectively. Elevated standard deviations and variances are indicative of heightened response variability, implying that certain individuals exhibit these behaviors with greater frequency or intensity than others.



TABLE X

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.709 ^a	.502	.477	.86523
a. Predictors: (Constant), Self Esteem, Friendship Quality				

The relationship between two independent variables, Self Esteem and Friendship Quality, and a dependent variable, Parenting Styles, was examined. As depicted in the Model Summary, the results of the analysis provided insight into the relationship between the variables.

Self-Esteem, Friendship Quality, and Parenting Styles are moderately correlated, as indicated by the correlation coefficient (R) of 0.709. This suggests that higher Self-Esteem and higher Friendship Quality are associated with more positive parenting styles. Self-Esteem and Friendship Quality jointly explain approximately 50.2% of the variance in Parenting Styles. This suggests that these two variables play an important role in determining Parenting Styles, but the analysis does not account for other variables. Considering the number of predictors in the model, the Adjusted R Square of 0.477 provides a more conservative estimate of the proportion of variance explained by the variables. This adjusted value indicates that approximately 47.7% of the variance in parenting styles is attributable to self-esteem and friendship quality. The estimated Standard Error of the Estimate is 0.86523. This value represents the average difference between the observed Parenting Styles values and the model's predicted values. A lesser value indicates that the model fits the data more closely. There is a significant relationship between Self-Esteem, Friendship Quality, and Parenting Styles, according to the analysis.

TABLE XI

Anova Table						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	29.466	2	14.733	19.680	.000 ^b
	Residual	29.196	39	.749		
	Total	58.662	41			
a. Dependent Variable: Parenting Styles						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Self Esteem, Friendship Quality						

The study analyzed the relationship between self-esteem and friendship quality as independent variables and parenting styles. The results showed that self-esteem and friendship quality significantly influence parenting styles, with a p-value less than the 0.05 threshold. The residual component revealed unexplained

variance in parenting styles, with a sum of squares of 29.196 and a mean square of .749. The total sum of squares for parenting styles was 58.662, with a cumulative degree of freedom of 41. The study suggests that self-esteem and friendship quality are effective in accounting for the variability observed in parenting styles, indicating that parenting styles are significantly influenced by both factors.

The segment of the table pertaining to regression presents comprehensive details regarding the regression model in its entirety. The regression's sum of squares (ss), which equals 29.466, indicates that the independent variables fully account for the variance in parenting styles. The regression's degrees of freedom (df) are 2, which corresponds to the quantity of predictors included in the model. The computation of mean square (ms) involves the division of ss by the corresponding degrees of freedom, resulting in a value of 14.733 for the present scenario. The f-statistic value of 19.680 indicates the statistical significance of the regression model. The present findings suggest that the joint influence of the independent variables, namely self-esteem and friendship quality, is statistically significant in relation to parenting styles. The reported associated significance level (sig.) is less than the conventional threshold of 0.05, with a value of .000. The statistical significance of the p-value is indicative of compelling evidence against the null hypothesis, thereby implying that the association between the predictors and the outcome is not attributable to random chance.

The residual component of the table presents details regarding the variance that remains unaccounted for by the model. The residual sum of squares is 29.196, indicating the extent of unexplained variance in parenting styles attributable to the independent variables. The residual degrees of freedom are determined by subtracting the number of predictors from the overall sample size, resulting in a value of 39. The residual mean square (mse) was computed by dividing the sum of squares (ss) by the degrees of freedom (df), resulting in a value of .749. The total category within the table presents a comprehensive overview of the model. The total sum of squares, which signifies the overall variability in parenting styles, is 58.662. The cumulative degrees of freedom amount to 41, obtained by adding the degrees of freedom for the regression and the residual.

The findings suggest that the regression analysis incorporating self-esteem and friendship quality as independent variables effectively accounted for the variability observed in parenting styles. The findings indicate that parenting styles are significantly influenced by both self-esteem and friendship quality.



TABLE XII

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.717	.047		122.359	.000
	Friendship Quality	-.030	.021	-.335	-1.383	.175
	Self Esteem	-.013	.026	-.095	-.515	.609
	Parenting Styles	.023	.031	.162	.739	.465

a. Dependent Variable: Juvenile Delinquency

The objective of the data analysis was to examine the association among three variables, namely friendship quality, self-esteem, and parenting styles, and their impact on the dependent variable, juvenile delinquency. The table presented below exhibits the unstandardized and standardized coefficients, t-values, and levels of significance for every predictor. The constant term's coefficient, denoted by the "Constant" row, has a value of 5.717 and a standard error of .047. In the absence of any non-constant predictor variables, the intercept term represents the estimated value of the dependent variable (juvenile delinquency). The statistical significance of the constant term is indicated by the considerable p-value of .000 and the significant t-value of 122.359.

Regarding the predictor variables, the coefficient denotes the approximated alteration in the dependent variable for every unitary modification in the related predictor, while holding all other predictors constant. The coefficient of friendship quality is negative at -.030, which suggests that there exists an inverse relationship between friendship quality and juvenile delinquency. Specifically, a unitary increase in friendship quality is associated with a decrease of .030 in juvenile delinquency on average. The statistical analysis reveals that the t-value of -1.383 and the corresponding p-value of .175 do not provide sufficient evidence to establish a statistically significant relationship between friendship quality and juvenile delinquency at the .05 level of significance.

The regression analysis reveals that the coefficient for self-esteem is negative and equal to -.013. This indicates that an increase of one unit in self-esteem is linked to a decrease of -.013 in juvenile delinquency on average. The statistical analysis indicates that the relationship between self-esteem and juvenile delinquency is not

statistically significant at the chosen level of significance, as evidenced by the t-value of -.515 and p-value of .609.

The coefficient for parenting styles is 0.023, indicating that a rise of one unit in parenting styles is linked to an average increase of 0.023 in juvenile delinquency. The statistical analysis reveals that the association between parenting styles and juvenile delinquency is not statistically significant at the specified level of significance, as indicated by the t-value of .739 and p-value of .465.

It is noteworthy that the standardized coefficients, also known as beta coefficients, offer a means of assessing the relative importance of each predictor variable while accounting for differences in scaling. The utilization of standardized coefficients facilitates the comparison of the magnitudes of the effects of the predictors. Based on the specified level of significance, there is no statistically significant association between the predictor variables of friendship quality, self-esteem, parenting styles, and juvenile delinquency.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The study investigated the relationship between parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency among adolescents in Angeles City, Philippines. The findings revealed that, on average, participants adopted a moderately balanced parenting approach with occasional authoritative parenting elements. Participants reported strong connections with their friends, despite occasional conflicts, emphasizing the importance of supportive social relationships. In terms of self-esteem, participants generally had a positive self-concept and desired external validation. However, the study did not find significant correlations between parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency, failing to establish a causal relationship between these factors.

The outcomes of this research hold significant implications for understanding the dynamics of parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and their role in adolescent delinquency. While the study did not prove a direct link between these variables and delinquency, it highlights the importance of employing positive parenting methods, especially authoritative techniques involving warmth, support, and consistent discipline. Additionally, it underscores the positive impact of constructive social relationships on the psychological and emotional well-being of individuals. This information is crucial for developing strategies and interventions that support positive youth development and prevent delinquent behavior in adolescents.

The research contributes to the existing literature by examining the interplay of parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency in a Philippine context. It suggests that the relationships between these factors can vary based on social and cultural contexts, emphasizing the importance of culturally sensitive interventions.



However, the study has limitations. It did not establish causal relationships between the variables, indicating the need for further research. It also relied on self-reported data, which can be subject to biases and social desirability effects. Additionally, the sample may not fully represent the diverse socioeconomic, cultural, and geographic backgrounds in the Philippines, so generalizability is limited.

The study did not prove a direct link between parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency. This finding suggests that the hypothesis proposing a significant relationship between these variables was disproved. The reasons for this lack of correlation may be multifaceted, including the complex nature of human behavior, individual differences, and the potential influence of unmeasured variables.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Future researchers should focus on longitudinal research strategies to monitor changes and growth over time. A mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews, is recommended to achieve a comprehensive understanding. Researchers should also strive to obtain a diverse and representative sample of adolescents from various backgrounds. Additionally, conducting research in multiple data collection sites can capture developmental changes and longitudinal effects more accurately. Regression and mediation models can be employed to analyze quantitative data, while qualitative data analysis should involve coding interview transcripts thematically. Combining quantitative and qualitative evidence can provide a more comprehensive understanding of variable relationships.

The research community should further explore voids and limitations in this field to expand our knowledge of the complex interactions between parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency. This knowledge is essential for developing effective strategies and interventions to promote healthy adolescent development and prevent delinquent behavior.

While the study did not prove a direct link between parenting styles, self-esteem, friendship quality, and juvenile delinquency, it offers valuable insights into the importance of positive parenting practices and supportive social relationships in adolescent development. This research paves the way for future investigations to better understand and address the complex dynamics of juvenile delinquency in various cultural and social contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Macapagal, M. ABS-CBN News. (2019, January 25). PNP favors lowering criminal age, cites 'surge' in child offenders at age 12. ABS-CBN News. <https://news.abs-cbn.com/news/01/25/19/pnp-favors-lowering-criminal-age-cites-surge-in-child-offenders-at-age-12>
2. Keizer, R., Helmerhorst, K. O. W., & Van Rijn-Van Gelderen, L. (2019). Perceived Quality of the Mother-Adolescent and Father-Adolescent Attachment Relationship and Adolescents' Self-Esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(6), 1203-1217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01007-0>
3. Imperiale, T. (2018). Keeping Juvenile Conduct in Juvenile Court: Why the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act Does Not and Should Not Contain a Ratification Exception. *U. Chi. Legal F.*, 287.
4. Dünkel, F. (2014). Juvenile Justice Systems in Europe - Reform developments between justice, welfare and 'new punitiveness'. *Kriminologijos Studijos*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.15388/crimlithuan.2014.0.3676>
5. Kuppens, S., & Ceulemans, E. (2019). Parenting Styles: A Closer Look at a Well-Known Concept. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28(1), 168-181. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1242-x>
6. Mikkonen, K., Veikkola, H. R., Sorkkila, M., & Aunola, K. (2022). Parenting styles of Finnish parents and their associations with parental burnout. *Current Psychology*, 1-12.
7. Checa, P., & Abundis-Gutierrez, A. (2018). Parenting styles, academic achievement and the influence of culture. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Research Study*, 1(4), 1-3.
8. Minev, M., Petrova, B., Mineva, K., Petkova, M., & Strebkova, R. (2018). Self Esteem in adolescents. *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, 16(2), 114-118.
9. Wu, X., Qi, J., & Zhen, R. (2021). Bullying victimization and adolescents' social anxiety: Roles of shame and self-esteem. *Child Indicators Research*, 14.
10. Rosenberg, M. (1965). Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSE): acceptance and commitment therapy. *Measure*. Pack 61:52.
11. Muenks, K., Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2018). I can do this! The development and calibration of children's expectations for success and competence beliefs. *Developmental Review*, 48, 24-39.
12. Marsh, H. W., Seaton, M., Dicke, T., Parker, P. D., & Horwood, M. S. (2019). The centrality of academic self-concept to motivation and learning. *The Cambridge handbook of motivation and learning*, 36-62.
13. Liu, Y., Huebner, E. S., & Tian, L. (2022). Chinese children's heterogeneous friendship quality trajectories: Relations with school adjustment. *School Psychology*, 37(5), 410-419. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000507>
14. Omuris, E. (2019). Workplace friendship in hospitality organizations: A scale development. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(3), 1390-1411.
15. Berndt, T. (2018). Transitions in Friendship and Friends' Influence. In *Psychology Press eBooks* (pp. 57-84). <https://doi.org/10.4324/97813157589286-3>
16. Bukowski, W. M., Hoza, B., & Boivin, M. (1994). Measuring friendship quality during pre- and early adolescence: The development and psychometric properties of the friendship Qualities scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11(3), 471-484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407594113011>
17. Sana, F., Rafiq, M., & Iqbal, M. N. (2021). Criminal thinking styles and criminal social identity among juvenile delinquents: Moderating role of parenting styles. *Pakistan Journal of Neurological Sciences (PJNS)*, 16(2), 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X20981037>



18. Ong, R. S. T., Sazon, E. M. M., & Tan, L. M. L. (2019). *The young And the restless: The effect of self-compassion to the self-esteem and self-stigma of juvenile delinquents in the Philippines.*
19. Xiang, Y., Wang, W., & Guan, F. (2018). *The Relationship Between Child Maltreatment and Dispositional Envy and the Mediating Effect of Self-Esteem and Social Support in Young Adults.* *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01054>
20. Climent-Galarza, S., Alcaide, M., García, Ó.F., Chen, F., & García, F. (2022). *Parental Socialization, Delinquency during Adolescence and Adjustment in Adolescents and Adult Children.* *Behavioral Sciences*, 12.
21. García, O. B., Serra, E., Zacares, J., Calafat, A., & Garcia, F. (2020). *Alcohol use and abuse and motivations for drinking and non-drinking among Spanish adolescents: do we know enough when we know parenting style?* *Psychology & Health*, 35(6), 645–664. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2019.1675660>
22. Masud, H., Ahmad, M. S., Cho, K. W., & Fakhr, Z. (2019). *Parenting Styles and Aggression among Young Adolescents: A Systematic Review of literature.* *Community Mental Health Journal*, 55(6), 1015–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-019-00400-0>
23. Brezina, T., & Azimi, A. M. (2018). *Social Support, Loyalty to Delinquent Peers, and Offending: An Elaboration and Test of the Differential Social Support Hypothesis.* *Deviant Behavior*, 39(5), 648–663. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2017.1286190>
24. Cho, S., & Galehan, J. (2019). *Stressful life events and negative emotions on delinquency among Korean Youth: An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory Assessing Longitudinal Mediation Analysis.* *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 64(1), 38–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x19873079>
25. Mes, E. (2018). *Female Juvenile Delinquency: Examining the Relationship with Parental Attachment and Peer Relationships (Doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University).*
26. Buchanan, M., Castro, E. L., Kushner, M., & Krohn, M. D. (2020). *It's F**ing Chaos: COVID-19's Impact on Juvenile Delinquency and Juvenile Justice.* *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 45(4), 578–600. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-020-09549-x>
27. Loinaz, I., Sánchez, L., & Vilella, A. (2021). *Understanding Empathy, Self-Esteem, and Adult Attachment in Sexual Offenders and Partner-Violent Men.* *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(5–6), 2050–2073. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518759977>
28. Tucker, C. J., Finkelhor, D., & Turner, H. A. (2020). *Family and friend social support as mediators of adolescent sibling victimization and mental health, self-esteem, and delinquency.* *American Journal of adolescent sibling victimization and mental health, self-esteem, and delinquency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 90(6), 703–711. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000502>
29. Snyder, H. (2019). *Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines.* *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
30. Morrison, P. K., Jones, K. A., Miller, E., Cluss, P. A., George, D., Fleming, R., & Chang, J. C. (2022). *An exploratory study of the relationship between human service engagement, recidivism and completion of a Batterer intervention program.* *Journal of Family Violence*, 37(3), 475–485. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-021-00280-7>
31. Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. A., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). *Does High Self-Esteem Cause Better Performance, Interpersonal Success, Happiness, or Healthier Lifestyles?* *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 4(1), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1529-1006.01431>
32. Divya, T. V., & Manikandan, K. (2013). *Perceived Parenting Style Scale.* Department of Psychology, University of Calicut, Kerala, India.
33. Delbert, E. *National Youth Survey (1985)*
34. Farrugia, L. (2019). *WASP (Write a Scientific Paper): The ongoing process of ethical decision-making in qualitative research: Ethical principles and their application to the research process.* *Early human development*, 133, 48–51.
35. Alderson, P., & Morrow, V. (2020). *The ethics of research with children and young people: A practical handbook.* Sage.
36. Pelham, B. W., & Blanton, H. (2018). *Conducting research in psychology: Measuring the weight of smoke.* SAGE Publications.
37. Slep, A. M. S., Heyman, R. E., Snarr, J. D., Foster, R. E., Linkh, D. J., & Whitworth, J. D. (2012). *"Child emotional aggression and abuse: Definitions and prevalence": Corrigendum.* *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 36(3), 268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2011.11.002>
38. Oguntunde, P. G., Lischeid, G., & Dietrich, O. (2018). *Relationship between rice yield and climate variables in southwest Nigeria using multiple linear regression and support vector machine analysis.* *International journal of biometeorology*, 62(3), 459–469.
39. Maulud, D., & Abdulazeez, A. M. (2020). *A review on linear regression comprehensive in machine learning.* *Journal of Applied Science and Technology Trends*, 1(4), 140–147.