

LOITERING FACTORS AND PARENTING RELATION
AMONG ADOLESCENT SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS
IN THE FOUR STATES

Associate Prof. Dr. Azizi Hj. Yahaya
Nalini A/P Madavan
15, Jalan Tembaga,
Taman Sri Skudai,
81300 Skudai, Johor.

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the study is to identify the dominant factors that contribute to loitering among school students and parenting relation of adolescents. Approximately 500 students from 18 schools from Johore, Malacca, Negeri Sembilan and Selangor were selected by using cluster of cluster in this study. The data were collected using questionnaire which was adopted from Parental Behaviour Inventory (PBI), Teenagers Personality Questionnaires (TPAS) and The Parental Aspect Questionnaires (PAAS). The alpha Cronbach for this instrument for loitering factors was 0.8596, parenting styles was 0.8879 and parenting roles was 0.8975. The findings indicated that there were significant correlations with family relation factors, self-regulation teenagers, religion education, parenting styles and parents as a role-model. However, there were no significant differences with friendship relation and environment. Family relation factor was the most dominant factor that determine the teenagers students. The findings also shows that democratic parenting styles and parents as a role-model were in high level.

INTRODUCTION

Loitering give us the clear picture of what is given on in the society today where importance of the problem is been highlighted in Malaysia now. Psychological and loitering between the youths are gaining lot of attention from the public. The nature of the problem is subjective and changes according to situation, surrounding and also time. A lot of reports are being published in papers, magazines and other firms of broadcasting to show the seriousness of this problems which youths are facing in Malaysia.

Just hanging around doing nothing is one of the serious problem which are seen here. It has been one of the important topic which are discussed in seminars, from and also lectures about youth. The wastage of this is kind of a sickness over here where it is not only done by the male but also by the female youths. This kind of thing is usually done by youths.

According to Hall (1904) being a youth means you are happier in a different kind of dimensions where it is stressful for them. It happens because there are going through a lack of time when they are deciding what to do with their life. According to Harre and Lamb (1983) youths will try to lead their lifestyles following their family, peers and also teachers who made them feel comfortable being with them.

Datuk Dr. Abdul Hamid Othman in local newspaper (Berita Harian: 15th February 1994) said that youths who usually squander around are usually those who newly

migrated to the town area. Usually this happens because there is lack of communication between their family and also neighbours who wants to keep their life to themselves.

Papalia and Olds (1978) said relationship between youths would lead to a new culture in their life. A good and healthy interaction between them can bring them to different heights in life such as tolerance, respecting each other and also helping out each other. But, if is the other way round it can lead to disaster.

Those who likes to go to entertainment outlets are those who are influences by the peers said Anthony (in Iran Herman, 1995). A shopping complex in England nicknamed the female youth as rabbits and the male as rats as their maun, agends is to interact with their same age group of peers. This is a common phenomena in the city as these are a lot of interesting places to go. A systematic way of handling this problem is needed to study this matter carefully.

There are lots of youths who like to wonder around in shopping centeres, videos arcades and the most popular one is cyber café. This was the most hottest topic talk about around 1994 till 1995. There has been a lot of discussion done them the media to discuss about this problem.

Bowlly (in Shahizan, Tsai Chen Chuan and Saw Hooi Chin, 2004) said a good relationship between parents and childrens will help them to think positively about themselves and also others. Unlike those who are being neglected by their parents. When there is good interaction they would feel appreciated, loveable, responsible, learn to trust one another and also a will have good judgement in life.

Parents responsibility is to lead the childrens to the correct pathway because this will leave a positive impact on their childrens. Rice and Kobak (in Shahizan Hassan, Tsai Chen Chuen and Saw Hoon Chin, 2004) said nowadays youths spend most of their time with their friends. It is said a good inter-relationship with parents are important in developing positive way of thinking. With parental support they become more independent.

Parental guidance is important because that's where they learn to develop mentally, physically and also socially. Indirectly it develops an individual personality. So parents play an important role in bringing up their hids to the correct path of life as their childrens look up to them as an example.

Robiah et. al (2001) thinks that religions background plesant important role in enriching the youths life which proper guidance from religious background they will know how to read their life positively and also according to their culture said Sarina Othman (1995).

Those youths who are into disciplinary problems in school will have problems concentrating in their studies and it would lead to failure. About 723 samples which has been done from 10 diffuculties schools in the district of Johore by Othman (in Oskasmazila, 2000). From the studies done it shows that family environment doesn't effect their academic studies.

Eventhough youths is learning to be independent, they still need their parents to support them. Small (1990) said youth wants their parents to respect them, give love to have the same interest and also to accept them.

LOITERING AMONG TEENAGERS

Idris (2000) has done a studies about the loitering among the youths in the city of Johore Bahru. It is said that this problem accured because there were less communication between the family, their environment and also lack of religious background. From here we can see a close knitted family among the society can help to overcome this problem. It is proven only parents can help their childrens with their problem. Youths get influences easily by the media compared to their parents and also education in school. From here we can know youths are easily influence by outside factors.

PARENTAL RELATION AMONG THE TEENAGERS

Parental guidance is the most important factor in the up-bringing of their childrens. Parents responsibility is to guide them in their perspective religion. A good example, which is done daily and also praying together in a family will be a positive impact on the youth. They should also be thought about religious rules and also stuf on birds and bees before they become a youth to guide them.

According to Kaplan (1975) this problem is close knitted with physopatology where they have problem developing their personality, mental and emosional depression. It has also been said that those who have family problems easily get involve in loitering.

STUDYING TEENAGERS

Youth in a frame of time in a human's life when they view entering youth nowadays it is not the same as last time because now days they matures as early as 11 years old compared to last time which was 15 years old.

The tradisional youth theory emphasize on family values and also sexual identity during their growing period said by Freud (1958) which also includes desire said Erikson (1968). This would be their future.

METHOD

This is a descriptive studies to get the quantitative data to see the linkage between the loitering factor and parental guidance among the studying youths. Samples has been taken from 500 students from different secondary schools in Johore, Malacca, Negeri Sembilan and Selangor. The study instrument is a set of research questionnaires which has been changed from Teenagers Personality Questionnaire, Parental Behaviour Inventory and Parental Aspect Questionnaire.

FINDINGS

An Analysis Regarding Loitering Factors And Parental Linkage Among Students

An analysis has been done regarding loitering problems and also parental linkage among the students. The results are shown from the lowest point to the highest point. They are as below:-

| Level Of Mean | Symbol Of Preparation |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1.00 - 2.33 | Low |
| 2.34 - 3.66 | Moderate |
| 3.67 - 5.00 | High |

a. Analysis Loitering Factors - Family Relationship

Table 1: Level Of Respondent For Family Relationship

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Low | 13 | 2.6 |
| Moderate | 222 | 44.4 |
| High | 265 | 53.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Table I shows the linkage between the respondent and their family. They were 265 respondents (53.0 percent) shows they have good relationship with their family. Those who are not that close to their family comes to 222 respondents (44.4 percent) and there are not many who aren't close with their family which is about 13 person only (2.6 percent).

b. Analysis Loitering Factors - Peers

Table 2: Level Of Respondent For Peers

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Low | 3 | 0.6 |
| Moderate | 334 | 66.8 |
| High | 163 | 32.6 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

This second table shows the loitering problems between peers and the respondents. There are more than half of them prefer to hang around with their peers that is about 334 respondent (66.8 percent). In the highest chart it shows there are 163 respondent (32.6 percent) and the lowest one shows only 3 respondent (0.6 percent).

c. Analysis Loitering Factors - Environment

Table 3: Level Of Respondent For Environment

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Low | 1 | 0.2 |
| Moderate | 431 | 86.2 |
| High | 68 | 13.6 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

The third table shows the linkage between those students and their environment. The middle chart shows there are 431 respondent (86.2 percent) who are affected by their environment. Followed by 68 respondent (13.6 percent) in the highest chart and only one respondent (0.2 percent) who is really not affected by it. From here we can see they are more prone to change because of their environment.

d. Analysis Loitering Factors - Self-Regulation

Table 4: Level Of Respondent For Self-Regulation

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Low | 10 | 2.0 |
| Moderate | 393 | 78.6 |
| High | 97 | 19.4 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Table 4 shows how does youth own problems affects them with the self regulation. More than three quarter that is 78.6 percent which is about 393 respondents is affected because of this problem. In the highest chart it shows there are 97 respondent (19.4 percent) and the lowest is 10 respondent (2.0 percent). The analysis shows that the majority respondent is in the second level where they have strength and weakness in themselves.

e. Analysis Loitering Factors - Religion Studies

Table 5: Level Of Respondent For Religion Studies

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Low | 6 | 1.2 |
| Moderate | 272 | 54.4 |
| High | 222 | 44.4 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Table 5 shows the linkage between religious studies. The second level shows that there are 272 respondent (54.4 percent). As for the highest level is 222 respondents (44.4 percent) and the lowest level is only 6 respondent (1.2 percent). Analysis shows that majority respondents are in the second level.

f. Analysis The Most Dominant Factors That Influences Loitering

Table 6: The Most Dominant Factors That Influences Loitering

| NO. | FACTORS | MEAN | LEVEL |
|------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1 | Family relation | 4.06 | High |
| 2 | Peers | 3.48 | Moderate |
| 3 | Environment | 3.30 | Moderate |
| 4 | Self-regulation | 3.26 | Moderate |
| 5 | Religion education | 3.55 | Moderate |

Table 6 shows the factors which can affect the students. The most dominant factor is the relationship between them and their family about 4.06. Followed by religion education (3.55), peers (3.48), environment (3.30) and the self-regulation (3.26).

g. Analysis Aspect Of Autocratic Parenting Style

Table 7: Level Of Respondent For Autocratic Parenting Style

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Low | 3 | 0.6 |
| Moderate | 370 | 74.0 |
| High | 127 | 25.4 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

From table 7, we can see the autocratic way of being brought up. About 370 respondent (74.0 percent) are being brought up this way. Followed by 127 (25.4 percent) and only 3 respondent (0.6 percent) are not really affected by this method.

h. Analysis Aspect Of Democratic Parenting Styles

Table 8: Level Of Respondent For Democratic Parenting Styles

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Low | 17 | 3.4 |
| Moderate | 168 | 33.6 |
| High | 315 | 63.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Table 8 shows democratic way of being brought up. About 63 percent that is 315 respondent are being brought up this way. Less than 33.6 percent (168 respondent) and the least is 17 respondent (3.4 percent) are being trained this way.

i. Analysis Aspect Of Permissive Parenting Styles

Table 9: Level Of Respondent For Permissive Parenting Styles

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Low | 3 | 0.6 |
| Moderate | 310 | 62.0 |
| High | 187 | 37.4 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Table 9 shows permissive way of growing up. The nud range is the highest which is 310 respondents (62.0 percent). Followed by 187 respondent (37.4 percent) and the lowest in the chart is 3 respondent (0.6 percent) who are affected by this way.

j. Analysis The Most Dominant Factor That Influences Parenting Styles

Table 10: Level Of Respondent Parenting Styles

| NO. | PARENTING STYLES | MEAN | LEVEL |
|------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1 | Autocratic | 3.41 | Moderate |
| 2 | Democratic | 3.77 | High |
| 3 | Permissive | 3.49 | Moderate |

Table 10 show how the three different ways affect the upbringing of a child by their parents. The most dominant factor is the democratic way of bringing up 3.77, followed by permissive way (3.49) and autocratic way (3.41).

k. Analysis Parents Role Teaching Early Education

Table 11: Level Of Respondent For Parents Role As Teaching Early Education

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Low | 30 | 6.0 |
| Moderate | 273 | 54.6 |
| High | 197 | 39.4 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Table 11 shows the important of parents teaching early education for their child. The nud table shows the highest number 273 respondents (54.6 percent), then 197 respondents (39.4 percent) and the lowest is 30 respondent (6.0 percent).

l. Analysis Parents Role As Religious Studies

Table 12: Level Of Respondent For Parents Role As Religious Studies

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Low | 64 | 12.8 |
| Moderate | 266 | 53.2 |
| High | 170 | 34.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Table 12 shows when they are being taught religious studies by their parents. The range is 266 respondents (53.2 percent), followed by 170 respondents (34.0 percent) and the lowest is 64 respondents (12.8 percent) that are affected by this way.

m Analysis Parents Role As A Role-Model

Table 13: Level Of Respondent For Parents Role As A Role-Model

| Level | Amount | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Low | 11 | 2.2 |
| Moderate | 149 | 29.8 |
| High | 340 | 68.0 |
| Total | 500 | 100.0 |

Table 13 shows how the respondents behavior when they see the parents show in good role of parenting. Most of them follow their parents that is 340 respondents (68.0 percent). Followed by 149 respondents (29.8 percent) and the lowest in the table is 11 respondent (2.2 percent).

n. Analysis The Most Dominan Factor Influence Parents Role

Table 14: Level Of Respondent That Followed By Parents Role

| NO. | ROLE | MEAN | LEVEL |
|-----|----------------------------|------|----------|
| 1 | Teaching early education | 3.41 | Moderate |
| 2 | Teaching religious studies | 3.30 | Moderate |
| 3 | Parents as a role-model | 3.84 | High |

Table 14 shows how different way of bringing up affects the respondents. The most dominant factor is they follow the good example showed by their parents (3.84), followed by early education (3.41) and religious studies (3.30).

Analysis Relation Loitering Factors With Academic Achievement

Table 15: Analysis Relation With Loitering Factors (Peers) With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Peers |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.06 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.19 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 15 shows the vales of correlation coefficient, r as a factor for loitering factor with peers and how well they do academically is 0.06. This shows the correlation is weak and opposite of it. The value $p=0.19$ which is bigger than 0.05 so this hipotesis is accepted. This show that there is no significant factor between academic studies and loitering factors with their peers.

Table 16: Analysis Relation Loitering Factor (Family Relationship) With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Family relationship |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.13** |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.003 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.01$

Table 16 shows the value of correlation coefficient r as a factor for loitering because of family relation and how well they do academically is equivalent to -0.13 . This shows that the correlation is weak and not accurate as the value of $p=0.003$ and smaller than 0.01 , so the hypothesis is not accepted. This shows there is relevant factor between family relation and doing well academically.

Table 17: Analysis Relation Between Loitering Factors (Environmental) With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Environmental |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.05 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.27 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 17 shows the value of correlation, r as a factor for environmental and the linkage with their studies is -0.05 . There is weakness in it was $p=0.27$, which is bigger than 0.05 so this hypothesis is accepted. This shows there is no significant role between academic studies and environment.

Table 18: Analysis Relation Between Loitering Factors (Self-Regulation) With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Self-regulation |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.11* |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.01 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 18 shows the value of the correlation, r as a factor for the respondent self regulation and their academic studies which -0.11 . There is weakness in it because $p=0.01$ which is smaller value than 0.05 so this hypothesis is not accepted. This means when the students have problems it affects them academically.

Table 19: Analysis Relation Between Loitering Factor (Religious Studies) With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Religious studies |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.13** |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.003 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----|-----|
| | N | 500 | 500 |
|--|---|-----|-----|

Significance level $\alpha = 0.01$

Table 19 shows the value of correlation, r as a factor for religious studies together with their academic studies is equivalent to 0.13. There is weakness in this factor because $p=0.003$ which is smaller than 0.01 so this hypothesis is not accepted. This shows there is relevance between religious studies and academic achievement.

Table 20: Analysis Relation Between Parenting Styles (Autocratic Style) With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Autocratic style |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.09* |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.046 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 20 shows the value of correlation, r as a factor for autocratic way of up bringing and doing well academically is -0.09. There is weakness in this area because $p=0.046$ which vallue is smaller than 0.05 so this hypothesis is not accepted. This shows there is relevance between this two factors.

Table 21: Analysis Relation Between Parenting Styles (Permissive Style) With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Permissive style |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.14** |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.002 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.01$

Table 21 shows the value of correlation, r as a factor for permissive way of upbringing and doing well academically is -0.14. There is weakness in this studies as $p=0.002$ which value is smaller than 0.01 so this hypothesis is not accepted. There is significant role between this two factors.

Table 22: Analysis Relation Between Parenting Styles (Democratic Style) With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Democratic style |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.13** |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.005 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.01$

Table 22 shows the values of correlation, r as a factor for democratic way of up bringing and doing well academically is -0.13. There is weakness in this studies as $p=0.005$ which value is smaller than 0.01 so this hypothesis is not accepted. It shows there is significant role between this two factors.

Table 23: Analysis Relation Between Parents Role As A Role-Model With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Role-model |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.16** |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.0001 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.01$

Table 23 shows the value of correlation r as a factor for good role shown by parents and doing well academically is -0.16. There is weakness in this studies as $p=0.0001$ which value is smaller than 0.01 so this hypothesis is not accepted. There is significant role between this two factors.

Table 24: Analysis relation Between Parents Role Teach Religion Studies With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Teach religion studies |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.07 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.15 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 24 shows the values of correlation, r as a factor when parents teach religious studies compared to their academic studies is 0.07. There is weakness in this studies as $p=0.15$ which value is higher than 0.05, so this hypothesis is accepted. It shows there is no significant role between parents teaching religious studies with their academic studies.

Table 25: Analysis Between Parent Role Give Early Education With Academic Achievement

| Correlation | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Correlation | Academic achievement | Teach early education |
| Academic achievement | Spearman rho | 1.00 | -0.08 |
| | Sig. (2 tailed) | - | 0.08 |
| | N | 500 | 500 |

Significance level $\alpha = 0.05$

Table 25 shows the values of correlation, r as a factor when parents give their childrens early education compared to their academic studies is -0.08. There is weakness in this sector as $p=0.08$ which value is higher than 0.05, so this hypothesis is accepted. It shows there is no significant role between this two subjects.

DISCUSSION

From the studies shown we can see family play an important role in a child's life. Peers is just one of the reason for the loitering and other factors are like environment, self-regulation and religious studies which play one of roles. These are the contributing factors for the loitering activities. We can see them clearly from the table shown before.

Democrational way of bringing up childrens are widely done. Permissive and autocratic way of bringing is another way of being done. From here we can see that youths prefer to be brought up the democrational way because they able to discuss and compromise with each other. Permissive and autocratic way is less preferred by youth nowadays.

Studies shown a good role shown by parents is very effective in bringing up childrens because childrens tend to follow their parents. Early education and religious background don't seem so important because probably parents don't really emphasize on them.

There is a significant role between academic studies with the loitering activities such as family problems, self-regulation faced by students during their youth period and also religious studies. From here we can conclude that democrational way of up bringing and showing good example to childrens are very important because this can make them to be positive in life.

CONCLUSION

Loitering activities are not new in Malaysia. There is a significant role between this problem and the way they are brought up by their parents especially those who are studying in secondary schools. Parents should be able to guide their children at home because this will lessen the loitering activities in the society. They should also guide them in their religion studies.

REFERANCE

- Amato, P.R. and Keith B., (1991). "Parental Divorce and Adult Well Being: A Metaanalysis". *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 53, 43-48.
- Ann Wan Seng, (1994). "Karenah Remaja Hari Ini". Kuala Lumpur : Fajar Bakti.
- Hall, G.S., (1904). "Adolescence: Its Psychology, and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education". (2 Vols). New York : Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Harre, R. and Lamb, R., (1983). "The Encyclopedic Dictionary Of Psychology". Great Britain : Basil Blackwell.
- Iran Herman, (1995). "Tingkahlaku Lepak Di Kalangan Remaja Luar Bandar". Bangi : Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia : True Times.
- Mohamad Jantan, (1994). "Menangani Isu Budaya Lepak" dalam Minda Pelajar.
- Muhd. Mansur Abdullah and Siti Nordinar Mohd Tamin, (1998). "Psikologi Remaja". Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd.
- Oskasmazila Bt Osman, (2000). "Hubungan Antara Amalan Keibubapaan Dengan Masalah Sosial Di Kalangan Pelajar Diploma Sains". Universiti Teknologi Malaysia : Tesis Ijazah Sarjana Muda.
- Papalia, D.E. and Olds, S.W., (1978). "Human Development". New York : Mc Graw Hill.
- Robiah Kulop Hamzah, (2001). "Remaja Dan Pengurusan Diri". Kuala Lumpur : Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Ruth, L.A., (1997). "Children's Cognitive Development Piaget's Theory and the Process Approach". New York : Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Sarina Othman, (1995). "Menangani Masalah Bohsia". *Moral dan Pendidikan*, 7. ms. 48-50.
- Shahizan, Tsai Chen Chien and Saw Hooi Chin, (2004). "Intrapersonal & Interpersonal Untuk Remaja". Kuala Lumpur : PTS Publication & Distributors.

Small, S.A., (1990). "Preventives Programs That Support Families With Adolescents". Washington, DC : Carnegie Council on Adolescents Development.

Whitaker, S. and Bny, B.H., (1991). "Overt and Covert Parental Conflict and Adolescent Problems". Observed Marital Interaction in Clinic of Non-Clinic Families, *Adolescence*. 26, 865-871.

Youniss, J.U. and Smollar, J., (1985). "Adolescent Relations With Mothers, Fathers and Friends". Chicago : University of Chicago Press.