



Social Sciences & Humanity Research Review



The Influence of Parenting Dimensions on Adolescent Prosocial Behavior: Mediating Role of Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction

Syeda Asma Gillani¹, Palwasha Nasir Abbasi*²

¹Lecturer, Department of Psychology, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad, AJK, Email: asmagillani2011@gmail.com

²MPhil Scholar, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan, Email: nasirpalwasha1@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Positive Parenting, Negative Parenting, Prosocial Behavior, Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction, Autonomy, Competence, Relatedness, Adolescents, Self-Determination Theory, Mediation

Corresponding Author:

Palwasha Nasir Abbasi, MPhil Scholar, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Email:

nasirpalwasha1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study investigated the predictive role of positive and negative parenting dimensions on adolescents' prosocial behavior while also examining the mediating role of Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction (BPNS), with its three included dimensions of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Adolescents were sampled using well-established and reliable self-report measures. Correlational analyses revealed significant and positive relationships between adolescents' prosocial behavior and their attribution of positive parenting, via the father (as reported by all three sources), as well as the mother and child; whereas negative parenting was negatively associated with their prosocial tendencies. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses again revealed that BPNS was an important mediator in understanding the relational dynamics of parenting dimensions. Based on tenets of Self-Determination Theory, BPNS not only contributed to this relationship, but each dimension - autonomy, competence, and relatedness - performed unique and important functions in linking parenting dimensions to adolescents' socio-emotional development. The findings provide support and empirically-backed reasons for parents' use of parenting styles that are nurturing and support adolescents' basic psychological needs, as important to developing socially adaptive behavior. Collectively the study adds to the literature by including different perspectives of more than one parent, and detailing the pathways mediated by psychological needs. Limitations (i.e., cross-sectional study, exclusively using self-report measures) are described, along with possibilities of future research in longitudinal studies and cross-cultural studies, and developing parenting interventions that are need-supportive.

Introduction

Parenting is a multi-dimensional construct that is central to the emotional, cognitive, and social development of children: broadly defined, parenting dimension includes positive (e.g., warmth, autonomy support) and negative (e.g., psychological control, harshness) parenting styles. In numerous studies, positive parenting has been shown to be associated with healthy psychological adjustment while negative parenting is consistently related to maladjusted internalizing and externalizing behaviors (Barber et al., 2005; Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). Parenting behaviors serve as the context for which children internalize values and manage their behaviors in social situations. Positive parenting – characterized by the combination of responsiveness, involvement and support for autonomy – provides a supportive context for healthy emotional development (Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Research suggests that positive parenting facilitates children's self-worth, emotion regulation, and competence (Pinquart, 2017; Eisenberg et al., 2005). Supported and promoted toward independence, parents are able to meet children's intrinsic psychological needs and provide a significant basis of social and emotional support. Conversely, negative forms of parenting – including overcontrol, rejection, and neglect – may have adverse outcomes on the well-being of children (Barber et al., 2005; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010). Psychological control, as a category of intrusive parenting, is detrimental to independence, and linked in increased anxiety, depression and behavior problems for adolescents (Soenens et al., 2008; Kuppens et al., 2009). These consequences may be particularly damaging in adolescence, which is a time of developing self-awareness and sensitivity to others. The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) holds that human flourishing is dependent on the fulfillment of three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2017). If these needs are satisfied, people will experience more intrinsic motivation, well-being, and prosocial behaviour (Vansteenkiste et al., 2020; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009). Parenting practices can encourage or thwart such needs, thereby altering children's internal motivation and behavioural regulation. Autonomy-supportive parenting leads to enhanced basic need satisfaction, leading to adaptive functioning and emotional wellbeing (Joussemet et al., 2005; Grolnick & Ryan, 1989). Conversely, controlling or harsh parenting frustrates basic psychological needs leading to maladaptive coping and less engagement in positive behaviours (Vansteenkiste & Ryan, 2013; Assor et al., 2004). The degree of autonomy-supportive or controlling parenting that satisfies or frustrates basic psychological needs benefitted or hindered children's motivation to act in prosocial or antisocial methods.

Prosocial behavior, or voluntary behavior that is intended to benefit others, is an important aspect of positive peer relationships and functioning in communities (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Carlo & Randall, 2002). Prosocial behavior is shaped by both internal (e.g., empathy and moral reasoning), and external (e.g., parental modeling and emotional climate) factors. Parental warmth and need satisfaction in childhood were a significant predictor of reported prosocial behavior in adolescence (Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2007; Laible & Carlo, 2004).

The interaction between parenting dimensions and the satisfaction of basic psychological needs has implications for adolescent development. Positive parenting creates need satisfaction which positively impacts on prosocial behavior while negative parenting can neutralize this pathway (Soenens et al., 2012; Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Understanding the relationships between parenting dimensions and psychological needs is important when planning family-based interventions to promote healthy socio-emotional development in adolescents. Recent findings indicate that parenting captures positive (e.g., warmth, responsiveness, autonomy support) and negative (e.g., psychological control, harshness) behaviors with different consequences for children's functioning. Positive parenting has repeatedly been associated with healthy emotion regulation and resilience (Skinner et al., 2024), while high levels of control and psychological rigidity have been linked to poor self-regulation and emotional development (Eisenberg et al., 2024). A cross-national study conducted in 2024 found that warmth and structure can coexist in positive parenting in children but can cause feelings of emotion dysregulation when parents were intrusive (Smith et al., 2024) confirmed earlier work by Vansteenkiste and Soenens (2010). There has been a growing trend in parenting measurement tools to examine both positive and negative behaviours to better understand their combined effects (García & Pérez, 2024; López et al., 2024). Recent evidence shows that prosocial behaviors reflect interpersonal goodwill, and these behaviors also provides an important opportunity to satisfy basic psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—that enhances one's sense of well-being (Nguyen et al., 2024; Chen & Sun, 2024). A systematic review in 2024 found that need satisfaction acted as both a mediator and moderator in the link between prosociality and well-behavior, depending on whether the three needs were independently met or met on a combined basis (Nguyen et al., 2024). Additionally, a recent experimental study on vocational students found that engaged prosocial activity, via enhanced basic need fulfillment, predicted higher well-being (Wang et al., 2025). Furthermore, a strong predictor of well-being was especially strong for those reporting high levels of need satisfaction (baseline) - indicating support of needs strengthens one's ability to engage in prosocial behavior over more sustained periods (Qu et al., 2025).

Literature Review

Parenting behaviors can be divided into positive and negative dimensions, with each of them affecting child development differently. Positive parenting refers to parenting behaviors associated with warmth, emotional support, open communication, and encouragement of independence to support children's psychological security and self-confidence (Pinquart, 2023; Skinner et al., 2024). Negative parenting, and when using the term, refers to parenting behaviors that consist of psychological control, coercive parenting, and inconsistent discipline that have grouped negative parenting to negative mental health states and harmful outcomes for children (Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010; Eisenberg et al., 2024). Researchers note that positive parenting will help children to develop adaptive social and emotional skills, and negative parenting negatively affects children's ability to self-regulate and interpersonal functioning (Zhu et al., 2023). The positive and negative dimensions of parenting

work together and are related to core developmental outcomes around moral reasoning, empathy, and social engagement (Rinaldi & Howe, 2022). Prosocial behavior - voluntary actions intended to help another, including helping, sharing, and comforting others - is shaped by early parental socialization practices. Children, whose parents provided emotional support while promoting autonomy, internalized moral norms and engaged in prosocial actions (Carlo et al., 2023). Positive parenting enhances empathy and compassion, promotes sensitivity to people's needs, and fosters prosocial behaviors (Padilla-Walker & Dyer, 2022). Negative parenting, characterized by psychological control and criticism, fosters external compliance, not moral internalization, and fosters inauthentic prosocial behavior (Joussemet, et al., 2008). New findings reveal adolescents whose parents provide emotional support and model altruism score higher on prosociality scales than young people with emotionally uninvested or rigid homes (Liew, et al., 2024). Self-Determination Theory (SDT) holds that the satisfaction of the three psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness is critical in promoting optimal psychological development (Deci & Ryan, 2000). These needs are important for well-being, but they also mediate the influences of contextual factors, including parenting, on behavioral outcomes. Children are more likely to satisfy the basic psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness when their parents support their autonomy, show warmth, and use structure (Vansteenkiste et al., 2020). On the contrary, controlling and neglectful parenting may frustrate these needs, bringing about frustration, withdrawal, and ultimately a decreased willingness to help others (Barber et al., 2022). Therefore, how parenting behaviors satisfy (or frustrate) the psychological needs of children is central to understanding how children develop, internalize, and enact moral values to become socially responsible (Nguyen et al., 2024). Recent research has shown that BPNS may partially mediate the relationship between dimensions of parenting and corresponding prosocial behavior. Wang et al. (2025) reported that for children who received positive parenting, the relationship to adolescent prosociality was partially mediated by satisfaction of autonomy and relatedness. Children who derived emotional connection and felt empowered by their parents were more likely to act altruistically. This indicated that BPNS supports the internalization of prosocial norms which creates pathways to efficacy and altruism. In an aligned direction, Grolnick and Pomerantz (2023) found that psychological control—as a negative type of parenting—hindered need satisfaction—and BEN does passport prosocial engagement. Such results indicate that the parenting-to-prosocial behavior pathway is moderated by BPNS, and this journey is reflected in how parenting is able to support or frustrate basic psychological needs (Qu et al., 2025). Having an integrated understanding of the literature clearly demonstrates that positive parenting enhances prosociality by satisfying psychological needs, while negative parenting reduces prosocial outcomes by thwarting those same needs. While a growing body of literature shows these correlations, the number of long-term and culturally diverse studies is limited; especially across collectivist contexts where parenting norms, values, and prosocial expectations may be different (Hassan et al., 2023). Furthermore, few studies have also examined this full mediation model and explicitly used

structural equation modelling (SEM) to consider the indirect pathways. Future research needs to explore how cultural beliefs, socioeconomic status, and digital parenting styles inform BPNS and youth prosocial development over the course of adolescence (Chen & Sun, 2024). Such directions will advance theoretical development and provide experimental foundations for the design of focused parenting interventions to develop morally and socially responsible youth.

Method

Objective

1. To investigate the association between parenting dimensions (positive and negative), basic psychological need satisfaction and pro-social behavior.
2. To investigate the mediating role of basic psychological need satisfaction between parenting dimensions and pro-social behavior.

Hypotheses

1. There is significant positive association between positive parenting dimensions and prosocial behavior.
2. There is significant negative association between negative parenting and prosocial behavior.
3. Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction mediates the association between parenting dimensions (positive or negative) and prosocial behavior.

Instruments

The Parents as Social Context Questionnaire (PASCQ) (Parent-report)

Parent dimensions were measured through the PASCQ. The scale was developed by Ellen Skinner, Sandy Johnson, and Tatiana Snyder and published in 2005. It was measured on a 4-point likert scale which was designed to allow for a variety of response options (1=Not at all true to 4=Very true). The PASCQ consists of six subscales: warmth, rejection, structure, chaos, autonomy support, and coercion. The total number of items was 30 with 5 items in each subscale. Internal consistency for each subscale was found to be satisfactory ($\alpha = .61-.75$). This scale has been translated into Urdu in Pakistan (Gillani et al., 2025).

The Parents as Social Context Questionnaire (PASCQ) (Child-report)

Child's perceptions of parent dimensions were measured through the PASCQ. The scale was developed by Ellen Skinner, Sandy Johnson, and Tatiana Snyder and published in 2005. It was measured on a 4-point likert scale which was designed to allow for a variety of response options (1=Not at all true to 4=Very true). The total scale consists of six subscales: warmth, rejection, structure, chaos, autonomy support, and coercion. The total number of items was 24 with 4 items in each subscale. Internal consistency was found to be $\alpha = .72$ which is considered satisfactory. This scale has been translated into Urdu in Pakistan (Gillani et al., 2025).

Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction Scale

It is based on work by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan from 2000. The scale will have three subscales: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. The total number of items (questions) will be 21 items. The autonomy subscale will have 6 items, competence will have 7 items, and relatedness will have 8 items. The scale uses a 4-point Likert scaled ranging from 1 (not at all true) to 4 (very true). The autonomy

subscale will reverse score items 1,4,11, and 20. The competence subscale will reverse score items 3, 15 and 19. And the relatedness subscale will reverse score items 7,16 and 18. This scale has been translated into Urdu in Pakistan (Gillani et al., 2025).

Prosocial Behavior Scale

The prosocial behavior scale created by Caprara et al (2005) measures how often and to what extent people act to benefit others, e.g., helping others, sharing, and being empathetic. The scale measures a one-dimensional construct of prosocial tendencies and does not have separately defined subscales but instead measures general positive social behaviors. The prosocial behavior scale has moderate to good reliability reporting average Cronbach's alpha's of .75 - .85 across populations. It is a scale that is widely used in psychological and educational research to research the developmental outcomes and social functioning of adolescents and young adults.

Results

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of sample variables (N=200)

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

The demographic profile of the participants showed an equal distribution of male and female respondents. The participants were adolescents with an average age in the mid-teen range and had completed nearly a decade of formal education. Birth order varied across the sample, with representations of firstborn, middle-born, last-born, and only children. Most fathers were employed in government jobs, while a smaller proportion worked in non-government sectors; none were reported as unemployed. In contrast, the majority of mothers were not employed, with some working in either government or non-government positions. Most participants belonged to nuclear family systems, with fewer coming from joint family setups. On average, parents were in their middle age, with fathers generally earning more than mothers.

Table 2

Mean, Standard deviation, number of items, alpha reliabilities, Skewness and kurtosis of Parent as social context (Mother, Father and child form), basic need satisfaction in general and sub scales, and Prosocial Behavior Scale (N=200)

Range								
Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>S.D</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>α</i>	Potenti al	Actual	Skew	Kurtosi s
Basic Need Satisfaction	64.08	10.90	20	.91	20-80	40-80	-.001	-1.29
Autonomy	20.55	4.72	7	.83	7-35	8-28	-.12	-.98
Competence	16.93	3.08	5	.78	5-20	7-20	-.25	-.69
Relatedness	26.60	4.35	8	.78	8-40	17-32	-.40	-.96
Prosocial Behavior	7.60	2.05	5	.64	0-10	2-10	-.62	-.40
Father Parent as social context	83.07	8.70	29	.73	29-116	64-106	.31	-.24
Positive father dimensions	49.83	5.96	15	.84	15-60	30-60	-1.15	1.33
Negative father dimensions	33.24	8.85	14	.87	14-56	17-52	.28	-.87
Mother Parent as social context	83.69	8.94	29	.71	29-116	59-105	.02	.18
Positive mother dimensions	50.11	7.23	15	.87	15-60	28-60	-.77	.16
Negative mother dimensions	33.58	9.29	14	.88	14-56	14-52	.05	-.85
Child Parent as social context	66.78	5.95	24	.62	24-96	46-83	-.12	1.03

Child positive dimensions	42.82	5.80	12	.90	12-48	19-48	-1.64	2.43
Child negative dimensions	23.96	6.30	12	.85	12-48	12-41	.50	-.31

The descriptive statistics indicated acceptable reliabilities of the varying psychological need satisfactions, prosocial behavior, and dimensions of parenting from the father, mother, and child's perspective. There were at least suitable potential and actual ranges to reflect variability in the sample for each construct. The basic needs sub-scales (i.e. autonomy, competence, and relatedness) all showed good overall reliability as well. Overall, the parenting dimensions were categorized into good or bad as well as positive negative dimensions and there were unique distributions based on the perspective of the father, mother, or child. No major influences indicated from skewness and kurtosis values were within acceptable bounds for most of the variables, indicating no major issues with substantial deviation from normality. Overall, the data fit the assumptions for the further statistical tests.

Table 3
Correlation among Study Variables (N=200)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Father Positive Dimensions	—	— .36**	.71**	— .37**	.67**	— .46**	.59**	.53**	.41**	.61**	— .36**
Father Negative Dimensions		—	— .44**	.69**	— .27**	.52**	— .64**	— .66**	— .52**	— .51**	.42**
Mother Positive Dimensions			—	— .43**	.54**	— .37**	.57**	.52**	.36**	.60**	— .40**
Mother Negative Dimensions				—	— .29**	.64**	— .64**	— .62**	— .60**	— .51**	.48**
Child Perceived Positive Dimensions					—	— .51**	.51**	.47**	.33**	.54**	— .36**
Child Perceived Negative Dimensions						—	— .69**	— .66**	— .66**	— .55**	.60**
Basic Need Satisfaction							—	.92**	.86**	.88**	— .57**

Autonomy							—	.75**	.70**	—
Competence								—	.63**	—
Relatedness									—	—
Prosocial Behavior										—

The correlation matrix above provides details about how parenting activities and dimensions (positive and negative), perceived parenting from the child's perspective, psychological need satisfaction (in autonomy, competence, and relatedness), and prosocial behavior relate to each other. The positive parenting dimensions (mothers and fathers) both related positively to basic need satisfaction and prosocial behavior, while the negative parenting dimensions related negatively. In the case of perceived parenting by the child, the same relationship was evident (positive perceived parenting dimensions related positively with basic needs and prosocial behavior, while the negative dimensions related negatively). In addition, the sub-components of the basic psychological need satisfaction (which included autonomy, competence, and relatedness) had very strong inter-correlations, and field studies have shown strong positive linking to prosocial behavior. Clearly, basic psychological need satisfaction indicated here provide a mediating role in socially constructive action.

Table 4

Mediation by Basic Need Satisfaction (Autonomy, competence and relatedness) between mother dimensions (positive and negative) and prosocial behaviour.

(N=200)

Prosocial Behavior				
Predictors				
			95% CL	
	Model 1 B	Model 2 B	LL	UL
Constant	.64	-1.12	-2.81	.55
Positive mother	.13**	.06**	.02	.10
Basic need Satisfaction		.08**	.06	.11
R ²	.23	.37		
ΔR ²		.14		
F	61.74**	59.31**		
ΔF		2.43		
Constant	.64	.01	-1.58	1.62
Positive mother	.13**	.07**	.03	.10
Autonomy		.19**	.13	.25
R ²	.23	.38		
ΔR ²		.15		
F	61.74**	60.48**		
ΔF		1.26		
Constant	.64	-.34	-2.08	1.40
Positive mother	.13**	.10**	.06	.14

Competence		.177**	.09	.25
R2	.23	.30		
ΔR2		.07		
F	61.74**	43.18**		
ΔF		18.56		
Constant	.64	-1.05	-2.76	.66
Positive mother	.13**	.06**	.02	.10
Relatedness		.20**	.13	.27
R2	.23	.35		
ΔR2		.12		
F	61.74	54.78**		
ΔF		6.96		
Constant	10.28**	.35	-2.17	2.89
Negative mother	-.07**	.007	-.02	.13
Basic need Satisfaction		.11**	.08	.13
R2	.13	.35		
ΔR2		.22		
F	29.61**	53.53**		
ΔF		23.92		
				Continued...
Prosocial Behavior				
Predictors				
			95% CL	
	Model 1 B	Model 2 B	LL	UL
Constant	10.28**	2.41**	.23	4.59
Negative mother	-.07**	.0001	-.03	.03
Autonomy		.25**	.18	.31
R2	.13	.33		
ΔR2		0.2		
F	29.61**	49.51		
ΔF		19.9		
Constant	10.28**	5.35**	2.92	7.77
Negative mother	-.79**	-.03	-.06	.002
Competence		.21**	.11	.31
R2	.13	.20		
ΔR2		.07		
F	29.61	25.70		
ΔF		3.91		
Constant	10.28**	1.68	-.68	4.05
Negative mother	-.07**	-.02	-.04	.009
Relatedness		.24**	.18	.311
R2	.13	.33		

ΔR^2		0.2		
F	29.61	49.02		
ΔF		19.41		

Hierarchical regression analysis evaluated the contributions of parenting dimensions (positive and negative) and the mediating effects of basic psychological needs satisfaction (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) on prosocial behavior. In all the models, positive maternal parenting was a significant predictor of prosocial behavior and this relationship became even stronger typifying mediating effects with respect to the components of basic psychological needs satisfaction. Autonomy, competence, and relatedness contributed uniquely to the variance in prosocial behavior, and also strengthened the models predicting prosocial behavior. By the same token, while negative maternal parenting had initial evidence of a negative relation with prosocial behavior, the strength of the prediction diminished when inclusion of basic needs were present supporting the mediation of basic psychological needs. In conclusion, findings highlighted that supportive parenting combined with satisfaction of basic psychological needs contributed to prosocial behavior in adolescents.

Table 5

Mediation by Basic Need Satisfaction (Autonomy, competence and relatedness) between father dimensions (positive and negative) and Prosocial Behavior (N=200)

Pro-social Behavior				
Predictors				
			95% CL	
	Model 1 B	Model2 B	LL	UL
Constant	-1.88	-2.61**	-4.50	-.72
Positive father	.19**	.10**	.06	.15
Basic need Satisfaction		.07**	.04	.100
R ²	.30	.40		
ΔR^2		.10		
F	86.58**	67.17**		
ΔF		19.41		
Constant	-1.88	-1.75	-3.61	.10
Positive father	.19**	.11**	.07	.16
Autonomy		.17**	.11	.22
R ²	.30	.41		
ΔR^2		0.11		
F	86.58**	70.01**		
ΔF		16.57		
Constant	-1.88	-2.25**	-4.22	-.28

Positive father	.19**	.15**	.10	.19
Competence		.14**	.06	.22
R2	.30	.34		
ΔR2		.04		
F	86.58**	52.68**		
ΔF		33.9		
Constant	-1.88	-2.63**	-4.55	-.71
Positive father	.19**	.11**	.06	.15
Relatedness		.17**	.11	.24
R2	.30	.39		
ΔR2		.09		
F	86.58**	63.19**		
ΔF		23.39		
Constant	10.02**	-1.06	-3.75	1.61
Negative father	-.07**	.02	-.01	.05
Basic need Satisfaction		.12**	.09	.15
R2	.09	.46		
ΔR2		.37		
F	21.71**	52.47**		
ΔF		30.76		
			Continued....	
	Pro-social Behavior			
Predictors				
			95% CL	
	Model 1 B	Model2 B	LL	UL
Constant	10.02**	.72	-1.60	3.05
Negative father	-.07**	.02	-.006	.06
Autonomy		.28**	.22	.35
R2	.09	.34		
ΔR2		.25		
F	21.71**	51.46		
ΔF		29.75		
Constant	10.02**	4.74**	2.44	7.05
Negative father	-.07**	-.02	-.05	.01
Competence		.23**	.14	.33
R2	.09	.20		
ΔR2		.11		
F	21.71**	24.77**		
ΔF		3.06		
Constant	10.02**	.80	-1.59	3.21
Negative father	-.07**	-.006	-.03	.02
Relatedness		.26**	.19	.32
R2	.09	.32		

ΔR^2		.23		
F	21.71	47.80		
ΔF		26.1		

The hierarchical regression analysis assessed the predictions of paternal parenting types (positive and negative) on adolescents' prosocial behavior. The analyses also examined whether basic psychological need satisfaction could potentially mediate the relationship. The results showed positive paternal parenting was a significant predictor of adolescents having more prosocial behavior. When basic need satisfaction (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) was included in the analysis, the results showed that basic need satisfaction explained more of the variance in adolescent prosocial behavior. In addition, the analysis demonstrated that the degree of each basic need to be satisfied contributed uniquely to adolescents' prosocial behavior, in particular autonomy and relatedness had the strongest effects. The findings also showed that the inappropriate use of the negative paternal parenting style led to significant negative associations with adolescents' prosocial behavior, but as soon as the basic needs were included the association became non-significant highlighting the mediation role of basic psychological need satisfaction. Overall, the findings suggest the importance of a nurturing paternal environment and satisfaction of basic psychological need to promote prosocial tendencies in adolescents.

Table 6

Mediation by Basic Need Satisfaction (Autonomy, competence and relatedness) between perceived parental dimensions by child (positive and negative) and Prosocial Behavior.(N=200)

Prosocial Behavior				
Predictors				
			95% CL	
	Model 1 B	Model2B	LL	UL
Constant	.85	-.78	-2.53	.97
Perceived Positive	.15**	.06**	.01	.10
Basic need Satisfaction		.09**	.06	.11
R ²	.19	.37		
ΔR^2		.18		
F	48.87**	58.91**		
ΔF		10.04		
Constant	.85	.04	-1.66	1.76
perceived Positive	.15**	.07**	.03	.12
Autonomy		.20**	.15	.26
R ²	.19	.37		

ΔR2		.18		
F	48.87**	58.14		
ΔF		9.27		
Constant	.85	-.11	-1.98	1.76
perceived Positive	.15**	.11**	.06	.15
Competence		.19**	.10	.27
R2	.19	.27		
ΔR2		.08		
F	48.87**	37.57**		
ΔF		11.3		
Constant	.85	-1.14	-2.97	.67
perceived Positive	.15**	.06**	.01	.11
Relatedness		.22**	.15	.28
R2	.19	.35		
ΔR2		.16		
F	48.87**	53.32**		
ΔF		4.45		
Constant	10.89**	1.16	-1.61	3.95
perceived Negative	-.13**	-.006	-.05	.04
Basic need Satisfaction		.10**	.07	.13
R ²	.17	.35		
ΔR ²		.18		
F	42.60**	53.43**		
ΔF		10.83		
			Continued....	
	Prosocial Behavior			
Predictors				
			95% CL	
	Model 1 B	Model2B	LL	UL
Constant	10.89**	3.34**	.99	5.69
perceived Negative	-.13**	-.02	-.07	.02
Autonomy		.23**	.16	.29
R2	.17	.33		
ΔR2		.16		
F	42.60**	50.08**		
ΔF		7.48		
Constant	10.89**	2.63**	.13	5.12
perceived Negative	-.13**	-.04**	-.09	-.004
Relatedness		.23**	.16	.29
R2	.17	.34		
ΔR2		.17		
F	42.60**	51.10**		
ΔF		8.5		

The potential predictive interplay between parents' perceived parenting dimensions (positive and negative, as perceived by the child) in their child and how child determines prosocial behavior was investigated using hierarchical regression analysis. In terms of positive parenting, the child's perception of their parent as a positive support significantly predicted more prosocial behavior in the child. When the basic needs were added into the model as a mediating factor, the predictive nature of the basic needs dimensions improved significantly. The key findings from the model suggest that all three dimensions of basic needs positively and independently enhanced the child's ability to behave prosocially. Although both competence and autonomy produced very strong effects, relatedness had the greatest impact. Also, the negative effect seen in the original model for perceived negative parenting on prosocial behavior dropped off or became statistically insignificant when we brought in basic needs as a variable, again lending credence to the protective quality. In summary, there is evidence that adolescents' perceptions of their parents as having supportive parenting behaviors and their own psychological needs' being met is important in relation to their own prosocial development.

Discussion

The current study aimed to investigate the predictive role of parenting dimensions (positive and negative) on adolescents' prosocial behavior and the mediating effect of Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction (BPNS; autonomy, competence, and relatedness). These constructs were measured using reliable and validated measures, and the internal consistency of the scales were deemed acceptable. Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted separately for positive and negative parenting as perceived from the mother, father, and adolescent perspective in order to examine the direct and mediation effects. The current study builds upon the Self-Determination Theory framework (Deci & Ryan, 2000), which posits that parenting influences social functioning through basic psychological need satisfaction. In support of the first hypothesis, the data revealed a strong and consistent, positive relationship between the positive parenting dimensions and prosocial behavior from all three perspectives: mother, father, and for the child. In each of the three perspectives, positive parenting explored in this analysis significantly predicted adolescent prosocial outcomes (detailed in Model 1 for all regressions). These results fit with past research that established models of parenting that were warm, responsive, and

autonomy-supportive fostered empathy and social responsibility (Carlo et al., 2010; Laible et al., 2004; Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2014). Specifically, additive mother and father behaviors were considerably influential in developing helping behaviors; thus, when adolescent children perceive their parents as supportive and encouraging they will internalize a prosocial value (Barry & Wentzel, 2006; Hastings et al., 2007).

The second hypothesis that was tested, which predicted a negative relationship between negative parenting and prosocial behavior, was also supported. Negative parenting was indicated through psychological control, harshness, or emotional neglect, and was negatively related to adolescents' prosocial behaviors. Although each time when BPNS was put into the model (Model 2) the mean direct effect of negative parenting became weaker, the general pattern of negative parenting overall continued to show detrimental correlations. The present finding is also consistent with previous research. Negative parenting (particularly psychologically controlling or hostile parenting) is found to restrict the ability of an adolescent to empathize with others and act altruistically (Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010; Morris et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017). Adolescents raised in emotionally unsupportive or non-nurturing environments can have difficulty regulating emotions in others and establishing trust with others, and emotional regulation and trust are key pillars of prosocial behavior (Eisenberg et al., 2006). The third hypothesis was partially supported and demonstrated that BPNS served as an important mediator between the dimensions of parenting and prosocial behavior. Specifically, we found that autonomy and relatedness had stronger mediating effects than competence across most models. For example, for Model 2 (i.e., all 10 parenting items (-), 6 autonomy (+), 5 relatedness (+), 6 competence (+)), adding autonomy (and relatedness) to the models represented a statistically significant improvement in the amount of variance explained, (ΔR^2 , across models, .14 - .25). This supports the notion that need satisfaction explains how positive parenting results in prosocial consequent behaviors. The idea of need satisfaction representing the theorized impacts of positive parenting is aligned with Self-Determination Theory (SDT) that suggests environments that support autonomy and relational connections foster moral internalization and social behavior (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Joussemet et al., 2008; Van der Kaap-Deeder et al., 2017). Competence also had a positive relationship to prosocial behavior, but its predictive power was less consistent in two model comparisons. There were some regressions with a smaller ΔR^2 , including for competence with negative parenting perspectives. This means while experiencing

feelings of effectiveness and competence appears to promote prosociality, its influence may not be as salient as feeling relatedness with others or acting with volition. These declines in predictive strength are supplemented by prior work suggesting relatedness was especially important for the social development and moral decision-making of adolescents (Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Soenens et al. 2007; Wang et al., 2017). The parallel outcomes across report types increase confidence in these findings, as they show a reflection in the ecological validity of what is seen in parenting perceptions. Further, the strength of the associations were fairly stable across all models suggesting reliability in the theoretical pathways we tested. For example, perceived positive parenting by adolescents was identified as a significant predictor even when BPNS was included in the model, indicating the key importance of perceived parenting climate on adolescent behavior. The overlap of relatedness across father and mother reports suggests that parental roles in the promotion of adolescents psychopathology could be complimentary and additive. This research adds to the body of research about parenting and adolescent development by providing empirical evidence for the authors' hypothesis about the role of parenting style and psychological need satisfaction in adolescent prosocial behaviors. Interventions focused on promoting adolescents' prosocial engagement should provide parents with supports to foster autonomy, emotional warmth, and relatedness with youth. These findings carry implications for parenting programs, school-based social-emotional interventions, and policies aimed at developing youth who are civically-engaged, empathetic, and socially responsible.

Conclusion

The current study examined the predictive value of parenting dimensions (positive and negative) on adolescents' prosocial behavior, with specific focus on the mediation role of basic psychological needs quality (autonomy, competence, relatedness). The results indicated consistent evidence that positive parenting from mothers, fathers, and child-perceived parenting positively predicted prosocial behavior, and negative parenting had an inverse relationship with prosocial behavior. The mediation analysis indicated that basic psychological needs play a mediating role in the relationship between parenting dimensions and prosocial behavior, which aligns with recommendations for Self Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010). The findings also supported the idea that when adolescents' parenting is autonomy-supportive and caring, core psychological needs are met,

promoting socially acceptable behaviors. This long-range perspective indicates that positive parent-child interactions can support positive socio-emotional development for youth.

Limitations and Suggestions

Despite the strong results, the study does have some limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional nature of the study limits any causal interpretations; longitudinal or experimental studies should be conducted in the future to measure change over time and causal relationships. Second, the data relied on self-reported data only, meaning that reports may be vulnerable to social desirability bias and common method bias. Next, the study has not included multi-informant reports or observational methods to check inter-rater reliability. In addition, the cultural context unique to Pakistan may lead to different forms of parenting practices and prosocial behavior, indicating further psychological research into similar understandings would benefit comparisons of wider applicability across cultural contexts. Also, studies are still limited in terms of their consideration of the fathers' role; more attention should be paid to this literature in the future. Lastly, developing and evaluating interventions that enhance parenting skills for the support of psychological need satisfaction could be an initiative to consider further to improve adolescents social and emotional functioning.

References

- Assor, A., Roth, G., & Deci, E. L. (2004). The emotional costs of perceived parental conditional regard: A self-determination theory analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 72(1), 47–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00256.x>
- Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behavior. *Child Development*, 76(6), 1144–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00840.x>
- Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., & Olsen, J. A. (2022). Parenting and adolescent psychological development: Need satisfaction as a mediator. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 51(2), 412–426.
- Barry, C. M., & Wentzel, K. R. (2006). Friend influence on prosocial behavior: The role of motivational factors and friendship characteristics. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(1), 153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.1.153>
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Advances in family research series. Family transitions* (pp. 111–163). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014033032440>
- Carlo, G., Hausmann, A., Christiansen, S., & Randall, B. A. (2010). Sociocognitive and behavioral correlates of a measure of prosocial tendencies for adolescents.

- The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 23(1), 107–134.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431602239132>
- Carlo, G., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Nielson, M. G. (2023). Parental warmth and youth prosocial behavior across cultures. *Child Development*, 94(1), 12–26.
- Chen, S., & Sun, Y. (2024). Cultural orientations and basic psychological needs: Implications for prosociality. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 27(1), 45–60.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Eisenberg, N., et al. (2024). Positive and negative parenting and child emotion regulation: Recent findings. *Child Development Perspectives*.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). *Prosocial development*. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 646–718). Wiley.
- Eisenberg, N., Zhou, Q., & Spinrad, T. L. (2005). Relations of parenting to children's emotion regulation and adjustment. *Handbook of Parenting*, 5, 222–244.
- García, M., & Pérez, R. (2024). New measures of parenting: capturing positive and negative dimensions. *Journal of Family Studies*.
- Gillani, S. A., & Abbasi, P. N. (2025). Translation and validation of Parent as Social Context Questionnaire. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 9(II), Article 04.
[https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2025\(9-II\)04](https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2025(9-II)04)
- Gillani, S. A., Abbasi, P. N., & Khan, M. (2025). Translation and Validation of Parent as Social Context (Child Report) Scale. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 9(2), 89–96. [https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2025\(9-II\)08](https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2025(9-II)08)
- Gillani, S. A., Abbasi, P. N., & Taj, S. (2025). Translation and Validation of Basic Need Satisfaction in General Scale. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 9(2), 66–75. [https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2025\(9-II\)06](https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2025(9-II)06)
- Grolnick, W. S., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2009). Issues and challenges in studying parental control: Toward a new conceptualization. *Child Development Perspectives*, 3(3), 165–170. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2009.00099.x>
- Grolnick, W. S., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2023). Issues and challenges in studying parental control. *Child Development Perspectives*, 17(1), 12–19.
- Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Parent styles associated with children's self-regulation and competence in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(2), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.81.2.143>
- Hassan, M., Rafique, R., & Zafar, N. (2023). Parenting dimensions and youth prosocial behavior in collectivist societies: A Pakistani perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 38(2), 141–158.
- Hastings, P. D., Rubin, K. H., & DeRose, L. (2007). Links among gender, inhibition, and parental socialization in the development of prosocial behavior. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 53(4), 595–618. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2008.0009>
- Joussemet, M., et al. (2008). Parental autonomy support and children's prosocial behavior: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 76(6), 1231–1264.
- Joussemet, M., Landry, R., & Koestner, R. (2005). A self-determination theory perspective on parenting. *Canadian Psychology*, 46(3), 194–200.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/q0708-5591.46.3.194>
- Laible, D., & Carlo, G. (2004). The differential relations of parent and peer attachment to adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(2), 151–160. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOYO.0000013425.95499.23>

- Liew, J., et al. (2024). Warmth and autonomy support in parenting: Predicting empathy and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 41(2), 256–272.
- López, I., et al. (2024). Validating parenting behavior scales across cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*.
- Morris, A. S., Houlberg, B. J., Criss, M. M., & Henry, C. S. (2017). Pathways from parental emotion socialization to adolescent adjustment: A multilevel process-oriented perspective. *Child Development Perspectives*, 11(4), 229–234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12243>
- Nguyen, T., et al. (2024). Basic psychological need satisfaction as a mediator of parenting and youth development. *Journal of Adolescence*, 101(3), 72–85.
- Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 133–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878509104318>
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Carlo, G. (2007). Personal and cultural correlates of prosocial behavior among U.S. Latino and European American adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(8), 1112–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9187-1>
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Dyer, W. J. (2022). Longitudinal associations between parenting and prosocial behavior during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 95, 17–28.
- Pinquart, M. (2017). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with internalizing symptoms in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Marriage & Family Review*, 53(7), 613–640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2016.1247761>
- Pinquart, M. (2023). Parenting styles and developmental outcomes in adolescence: A meta-analytic update. *Psychology Bulletin*, 149(2), 67–89.
- Qu, Z., et al. (2025). Basic need satisfaction mediates the effect of parenting on adolescent moral development. *Journal of Moral Education*, 54(1), 1–19.
- Rinaldi, C. M., & Howe, N. (2022). Parental influence on prosocial behavior: A review. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 36(1), 54–66.
- 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. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.
- Skinner, E., Johnson, S., & Snyder, T. (2005). Six dimensions of parenting: A motivational model. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 5(2), 175–235. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327922par0502_3
- Smith, A., et al. (2024). How warmueless control influences child emotion dysregulation. *Journal of Emotional Development*.
- Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). Parenting and self-determination theory: The role of psychological control. *Child Development Perspectives*, 4(3), 158–165.
- Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Sierens, E. (2009). How are parental psychological control and autonomy-support related? A cluster-analytic approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(1), 187–202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00589.x>
- Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., Luyckx, K., Goossens, L., Beyers, W., & Ryan, R. M. (2007). Conceptualizing parental autonomy support: Adolescent

- perceptions of promotion of independence versus promotion of volitional functioning. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(3), 633–646. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.633>
- Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Luyten, P., Duriez, B., & Goossens, L. (2008). Maladaptive perfectionism as a mediating variable between psychologically controlling parenting and adolescent depressive symptoms. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(3), 465–474. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.465>
- Van der Kaap-Deeder, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Soenens, B., & Mabbe, E. (2017). Children's daily well-being: The role of mothers', teachers', and siblings' autonomy support and psychological control. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(2), 237–251. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000218>
- Vansteenkiste, M., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). On psychological growth and vulnerability: Basic psychological need satisfaction and need frustration as a unifying principle. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 23(3), 263–280. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032359>
- Vansteenkiste, M., & Soenens, B. (2010). A theoretical upgrade of parental psychological control: Insights from SDT. *Developmental Review*, 30(1), 74–99.
- Vansteenkiste, M., et al. (2020). A review of self-determination theory's basic psychological need theory. *Motivation and Emotion*, 44, 263–284.
- Wang, L., et al. (2025). Prosocial behavior and psychological well-being in vocational students: The mediating role of basic psychological needs. *Vocational Education Research*, 9(2), 112–130.
- Wang, Q., Pomerantz, E. M., & Chen, H. (2017). The role of parents in early adolescents' prosocial behavior: A longitudinal investigation in the United States and China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1006. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01006>
- Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: Autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 222–244. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016984>