

AN ANALYSIS OF OPTIMAL ATTACHMENT AND POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT OF ADOLESCENTS

Wah Wah Sann¹, Khin Nyunt Nyunt Saw²

Abstract

The main aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between optimal attachment and positive youth development of adolescents in Myanmar. Thus, this study examined the optimal attachment of adolescents by gender, family types and number of siblings. In addition, the study analyzed adolescents' positive youth development by gender and parents' education level. A total of 1110 participants (Grade 9 and Grade 10 students) from six regions and four states were selected by using random sampling technique. Explanatory sequential mixed method was used. Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment (Ercan Kocayourk, 2010) (Cronbach's alpha = 0.89) was used to measure the optimal attachment of adolescents. Then, Positive Youth Development Inventory (Arnold, 2012) (Cronbach's alpha = 0.92) was used to examine the positive youth development of adolescents. According to the results of independent samples *t*-test, it was found that there were significant differences in optimal attachment by gender. Moreover, the ANOVA results revealed that there were also significant differences in optimal attachment by family types and number of siblings. Concerning positive youth development of adolescents, the results of independent samples *t*-test showed that there were significant differences in positive youth development by gender. Then, ANOVA results showed significant differences in positive youth development by parents' education level. Moreover, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation revealed that the optimal attachment of adolescents was positively correlated with their positive youth development ($r = 0.425$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, it can be concluded that the quality of optimal attachment can cause the well positive youth development of adolescents.

Keywords: Attachment, Optimal Attachment, Positive Youth Development

Introduction

Importance of the Study

In 21st century, society demands good citizenships to develop all round developed nations. The role of youth plays as a crucial part in society. Adolescence is a vital period that will determine how a person will view and interact with the society as an adult. It is important to provide adolescents with adequate opportunities and to support independent decisions. Parents and peers involve the main role in adolescence. Parents are the closet components in the development of an individual (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). The biological, psychological and emotional bonds constructed by parents with children are limitless relationships and these relationships develop into a model of attachment (Bowlby, 1982; Rice 1990; Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). After parents, peers are the next components who will foster relationships with youths in their development. Collaborations with positive peers are important for the psychological development and healthy social life. The role of peers is a place of reference such as seeking identity, influencing tendencies and ambitions, evaluating and strengthening their own values as well as to seek advice, strengthen behaviors, solve problems, try new roles, share experiences and to understand the gender differences (Jas Laile Suzana, 2008). In addition, peer attachment influences individual development through cognitive and social aspects where interactions between youths can speed up their cognitive development as compared to quiet and shy ones.

¹ Department of Educational Psychology, Mandalay Education Degree College

² Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education

Aim of the Study

The main aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between optimal attachment and positive youth development of adolescents.

The specific objectives of this study were described as follows.

1. To explore the optimal attachment to parents and peers during adolescence
2. To find out the differences of optimal attachment during adolescence by gender, family types and number of siblings
3. To examine the differences of positive youth development during adolescence by gender and parents' education level
4. To investigate the relationship between optimal attachment and positive youth development of adolescents.

Definitions of Key Terms

Attachment : Attachment is defined as an enduring affection bond of substantial intensity (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987).

Optimal Attachment : Attachment can be defined as a secure emotional bond or connection between two people for the purpose of gaining a sense of safety and security (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991).

Positive Youth Development: Development that promotes positive outcomes for young people by providing opportunities, relationships and supports to promote outcomes of competence, confidence, connection, character and caring (Lerner et al., 2006).

Review of Related Literature

Optimal Attachment in Adolescence

Attachment theory focused primarily on infancy and early childhood. This is due to the notion that “children from mental representations of relationships based on their interactions with and adaptation to their care-giving environment” (Nakash et al., 2002). This is where adolescents have the opportunity to rework and consolidate the early childhood separation-individuation process (Applegate & Shapiro, 2005). Adolescents can begin to integrate multiple attachment experiences in order to construct a more generalized stance toward future attachments (Hesse, 1999). Blos (1969) termed adolescence as the second phase of separation and individuation with the first phase at the end of the second year of life. This parallel is crucial to the understanding of the importance of attachment during adolescence as well. During adolescence, it is necessary for parents to provide a balance of supportive affection, discipline and encouragement of independence in order to foster new attachment schemas (Cozolino, 2006). Communication quality between parents and adolescents is also important (Allen & Land, 1999). It is through the reassurance and support of parental attachment that adolescents are able to develop a positive sense of self. High quality parent-child communication during adolescence is associated with positive family functioning. It includes sharing feelings, addressing difficult issues, actively listening and encouraging children to ask for questions and help when needed (Boone & Lefkowitz, 2007). Adolescents that are more securely attached are more likely to seek out

positive information and accept it than insecurely attached adolescents (Dykas & Cassidy, 2007). Securely attached or optimal attached adolescents tend to remember interactions, even those that were negative with their parents more positively over time due to their general positive feelings about their relationship with parents. Securely attached adolescents are more likely to have positive perceptions of family, peers and other than insecurely attached adolescents.

Positive Youth Development

Positive youth development (PYD) refers to childhood and adolescents developmental experiences that provide optimal preparation for the attainment of adult potential and well-being. PYD views youth as having assets to be supported, nurtured and developed rather than as having problems to be solved and risks to be managed. Building the assets and skills of adolescents can result in both immediate and long-term positive effects on the mental and physical health, economic development and overall well-being of adolescents, their families and their communities (Patton et al., 2016). Successful negotiation of adolescence is marked not only by the avoidance of problems such as substance abuse, school failure, oppositional behavior and depression (Pittman, Irby & Ferber, 2001), but also by the successful transition into adulthood as a healthy, happy, fully functioning member of society (Furstenberg & Eccles, 2000). PYD concept is built from a framework known as the “5Cs” of positive youth development (Lerner, 2009). Developmental scientists have suggested that positive youth development encompasses psychological, behavioral and social characteristics that reflect “Five Cs”. Those “Cs” are competence, confidence, connection, character and caring. A child or adolescent who develops with Five Cs is considered to be thriving. This model of PYD emphasizes the strengths of adolescents and as a consequence enables youth to be seen as resources to be developed. The model pointed out that positive development occurs if the strengths of youth enormous potential for systematic growth are aligned systematically with positive, growth promoting resources in the ecology of youth (Benson, 2006).

Method

Research Design

Quantitative survey method was used in this study.

Participants of the study

There were 1110 participants in the present study. The participants were selected Grade 9 and Grade 10 students from Nay Pyi Taw, Mandalay Region, Magway Region, Yangon Region, Bago Region, Ayeyarwaddy Region, Kachin State, Shan State, Mon State and Kayar State. Selected participants consist of 458 males and 652 females.

Instruments

The first instrument was the Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment (IPPA) which was developed by Ercan Kocayoryk (2010). This instrument consists of 54 items and which were examined by five-point Likert scale to measure the attachment of adolescents from parents and peers by three subscales: trust, communication and alienation. For positive youth development variable, Positive Youth Development Inventory (PYDI) developed by Arnold et al. (2012) was used with four-point Likert scale. It consists of 48 items and five subscales: Competence, Confidence, Connection, Character and Caring.

Findings

By using the statistical analysis, the collected data were analyzed and the results will be described in the following session.

Table 1. Mean and Standard Deviation of Optimal Attachment of Adolescents

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Mother Attachment	1110	29	90	65.49	8.857
Father Attachment	1110	23	87	61.82	10.162
Peer Attachment	1110	29	90	65.65	7.764
Total Optimal Attachment	1110	92	267	192.97	20.091

Optimal attachment constitutes mother attachment, father attachment and peer attachment. In order to investigate whether there were gender differences in mother attachment, father attachment, peer attachment of adolescents. The mean scores of males and females in mother attachment, father attachment and peer attachment were analyzed in Table 2.

Table 2. Mean, Standard Deviation and Independent Samples *t*-test Results of Mother Attachment, Father Attachment, Peer Attachment and Total Optimal Attachment by Gender

Variable	Subscale	Gender	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Mother Attachment	Trust	Male	458	25.26	4.118	.066	.947
		Female	652	25.24	3.922		
	Communication	Male	458	32.50	5.902	- 2.024*	.043
		Female	652	33.21	5.595		
	Alienation	Male	458	7.22	2.086	-1.478	.140
		Female	458	7.41	2.176		
Father Attachment	Trust	Male	458	24.43	4.668	- 1.410	.159
		Female	652	24.82	4.388		
	Communication	Male	458	31.22	6.470	1.069	.285
		Female	652	30.81	6.219		
	Alienation	Male	458	6.05	2.216	-1.647	.100
		Female	652	6.27	2.169		
Peer Attachment	Trust	Male	458	23.82	4.478	-13.34***	.000
		Female	652	26.79	2.928		
	Communication	Male	458	21.65	4.585	-19.000***	.000
		Female	652	26.32	3.592		
	Alienation	Male	458	15.16	4.682	4.009***	.000
		Female	652	14.28	2.571		

Variable	Subscale	Gender	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Total Optimal Attachment	Trust	Male	458	73.45	10.237	-7.674***	.000
		Female	652	77.53	7.476		
	Communication	Male	458	85.33	13.747	-8.539***	.000
		Female	652	91.59	10.657		
	Alienation	Male	458	28.44	7.233	1.623	.105
		Female	652	27.88	4.095		

Note. *Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

***Mean difference is significant at 0.001 level.

According to Table 2, the results of independent samples *t*-test confirmed that there were significant differences in peer attachment and total optimal attachment by gender ($p < 0.001$). The mean scores of female adolescents were higher than the mean scores of male adolescents. The female adolescents were significantly higher than the male adolescents in the subscales of peer attachment (Trust, Communication, Alienation). However, significant differences were not found in mother attachment and father attachment by gender.

Table 3. ANOVA Results of Mean Comparison for Mother Attachment, Father Attachment and Peer Attachment by Family Types

	Subscale	Family Types	N	Mean	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Mother Attachment	Trust	Both Parents	766	25.47	3.742	2.100	.079
		Only Mother	160	24.89	4.116		
		Only Father	42	24.71	4.910		
		Grandparents	67	24.75	4.577		
		Other Guardians	75	24.45	5.006		
	Communication	Both Parents	766	33.17	5.624	2.243	.062
		Only Mother	160	32.87	5.872		
		Only Father	42	32.69	5.766		
		Grandparents	67	31.27	5.793		
		Other Guardians	75	32.03	6.236		
	Alienation	Both Parents	766	7.20	2.074	2.689	.050
		Only Mother	160	7.49	2.203		
		Only Father	42	7.67	2.068		
		Grandparents	67	7.75	2.177		
		Other Guardians	75	7.79	2.548		
Father Attachment	Trust	Both Parents	766	25.08	4.145	7.430***	.000
		Only Mother	160	23.10	5.301		
		Only Father	42	24.95	4.504		
		Grandparents	67	23.78	5.280		
		Other Guardians	75	24.29	4.736		

	Subscale	Family Types	N	Mean	SD	F	p
	Communication	Both Parents	766	31.44	6.132	6.337***	.000
		Only Mother	160	28.89	6.966		
		Only Father	42	32.00	5.683		
		Grandparents	67	29.87	6.213		
		Other Guardians	75	31.19	6.377		
	Alienation	Both Parents	766	6.09	2.151	3.338*	.010
		Only Mother	160	6.11	2.048		
		Only Father	42	6.17	2.368		
		Grandparents	67	7.01	2.306		
		Other Guardians	75	6.53	2.517		
Peer Attachment	Trust	Both Parents	766	25.62	3.920	.593	.668
		Only Mother	160	25.58	3.736		
		Only Father	42	25.57	4.500		
		Grandparents	67	25.63	4.451		
		Other Guardians	75	24.89	3.619		
	Communication	Both Parents	766	24.47	4.686	.561	.691
		Only Mother	160	24.24	4.722		
		Only Father	42	24.12	4.151		
		Grandparents	67	24.73	4.541		
		Other Guardians	75	24.77	4.376		
	Alienation	Both Parents	766	14.60	3.719	.493	.741
		Only Mother	160	14.51	3.550		
		Only Father	42	14.71	3.233		
		Grandparents	67	14.79	3.028		
		Other Guardians	75	15.16	3.460		

Note. *Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

***Mean difference is significant at 0.001 level.

According to the ANOVA results, the significant differences were found in father attachment by their family types.

Table 4. Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for Father Attachment by Family Types

	Subscale	(I)Family Types	(J)Family Types	Mean Difference (I-J)	p	
Father Attachment	Trust	Both Parents	Only Mother	1.980***	.000	
	Communication	Both Parents	Only Mother	2.555***	.000	
		Only Father	Only Mother	3.113*	.034	
	Alienation	Grandparents	Both Parents		.927**	.008
			Only Mother		.909*	.035

Note. *Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

**Mean difference is significant at 0.01 level.

***Mean difference is significant at 0.001 level.

The Tukey HSD results showed that the adolescents who live with both parents possess more trust and communication with their fathers than the adolescents who live with only mother. And then, the adolescents who live with only father also had communication with father than the adolescents who live with only mother. However, the adolescents who live with grandparents would be more alienated than the adolescents who live with both parents and only mother.

Table 5 ANOVA Results of Mean Comparison for Mother Attachment, Father Attachment and Peer Attachment by Number of Siblings

	Subscale	Number of Siblings	N	Mean	SD	F	p
Mother Attachment	Trust	1 to 3	755	25.23	3.989	.052	.950
		4 to 6	271	25.24	3.962		
		Over 6	84	25.38	4.288		
	Communication	1 to 3	755	33.02	5.694	.413	.662
		4 to 6	271	32.66	5.957		
		Over 6	84	32.79	5.353		
	Alienation	1 to 3	755	7.23	2.127	3.003	.050
		4 to 6	271	7.59	2.185		
		Over 6	84	7.42	2.061		
Father Attachment	Trust	1 to 3	755	24.63	4.660	.043	.958
		4 to 6	271	24.72	4.231		
		Over 6	84	24.70	4.002		
	Communication	1 to 3	755	30.91	6.479	.297	.743
		4 to 6	271	31.03	6.118		
		Over 6	84	31.46	5.572		
	Alienation	1 to 3	755	6.08	2.191	3.473*	.031
		4 to 6	271	6.48	2.229		
		Over 6	84	6.07	1.981		
Peer Attachment	Trust	1 to 3	755	25.45	3.977	1.555	.212
		4 to 6	271	25.93	3.676		
		Over 6	84	25.40	4.249		
	Communication	1 to 3	755	24.20	4.687	3.075*	.047
		4 to 6	271	25.00	4.409		
		Over 6	84	24.17	4.822		
	Alienation	1 to 3	755	14.56	3.773	2.908	.055
		4 to 6	271	15.05	3.151		
		Over 6	84	14.08	3.541		

Note. *Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

According to the number of siblings, there were significant differences in father attachment and peer attachment. The alienation subscale was significant in father attachment and communication subscale was significant in peer attachment. There was no difference in mother attachment. The researcher also conducted the Tukey HSD multiple comparisons analysis.

Table 6. Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for Father Attachment and Peer Attachment by Number of Siblings

	Subscale	(I) Number of Siblings	(J) Number of Siblings	Mean Difference (I-J)	P
Father Attachment	Alienation	4 to 6	1 to 3	.401*	.026
Peer Attachment	Communication	4 to 6	1 to 3	.799*	.040

Note. *Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

According to the results in Table 6, the number of siblings (4 to 6) group was more alienated with father than the number of siblings (1 to 3) group. However, the number of siblings (4 to 6) group was communicated with peers than the number of siblings (1 to 3) group.

Table 7. Mean and Standard Deviation of Positive Youth Development of Adolescents

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mean %	SD
Competence	1110	25	70	44.37	79.23	5.483
Confidence	1110	13	45	27.80	77.22	3.769
Connection	1110	11	40	25.63	80.09	3.439
Character	1110	13	45	27.80	77.22	3.769
Caring	1110	13	40	25.54	79.81	3.583
Positive Youth Development	1110	84	240	150.82	71.14	16.344

Table 8. Mean, Standard Deviation and Independent Samples *t*-test Results of Positive Youth Development by Gender

Subscale	Gender	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	P
Competence	Male	458	44.83	5.891	2.374*	.018
	Female	652	44.04	5.158		
Confidence	Male	458	28.13	4.000	2.454*	.014
	Female	652	27.57	3.582		
Connection	Male	458	25.75	3.664	.968	.333
	Female	652	25.55	3.272		
Character	Male	458	28.13	4.000	2.454*	.014
	Female	652	27.57	3.582		
Caring	Male	458	25.54	3.784	.011	.991
	Female	652	25.54	3.438		
	Female	652	149.96	15.304		

Note. *Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

According to the results of independent samples *t*-test analysis, the significant difference was found in competence, confidence, and character scales ($p < 0.05$). However, there were no significant differences in connection and caring subscales by gender. After that, ANOVA analysis was conducted to see the differences of positive youth development by father's education level. The results were reported in Table 9.

Table 9. ANOVA Results of Mean Comparison for Positive Youth Development by Father's Education Level

Subscale	Father's Education Level	N	Mean	SD	F	P
Competence	Graduate	161	45.18	5.842	3.755**	.005
	High School	319	44.90	5.375		
	Middle School	358	44.23	5.754		
	Primary School	222	43.36	4.920		
	No Schooling	50	43.74	4.707		
Confidence	Graduate	161	28.38	4.097	5.191***	.000
	High School	319	28.35	3.663		
	Middle School	358	27.57	3.922		
	Primary School	222	27.12	3.411		
	No Schooling	50	27.18	3.015		
Connection	Graduate	161	25.70	3.942	1.178	.319
	High School	319	25.94	3.351		
	Middle School	358	25.54	3.501		
	Primary School	222	25.37	3.156		
	No Schooling	50	25.26	2.933		
Character	Graduate	161	28.38	4.097	5.191***	.000
	High School	319	28.35	3.663		
	Middle School	358	27.57	3.922		
	Primary School	222	27.12	3.411		
	No Schooling	50	27.18	3.015		
Caring	Graduate	161	26.27	3.737	6.502***	.000
	High School	319	26.01	3.588		
	Middle School	358	25.30	3.599		
	Primary School	222	25.01	3.398		
	No Schooling	50	24.22	2.881		

Note. ** Mean difference is significant at 0.01 level.

***Mean difference is significant at 0.001 level.

The results of ANOVA explained that the positive youth development of adolescents was significantly different according to their fathers' education level. Moreover, the competence, confidence, character and caring scales were also significantly different. But the connection scale

was not significant by their fathers' education level (See Table 9). And then, Tukey HSD multiple comparisons was conducted and the results were shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for Positive Youth Development by Father's Education Level

Subscale	(I) Father Education Level	(J) Father Education Level	Mean difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Competence	Graduate	Primary School	1.815*	.012
	High School	Primary School	1.538*	.011
Confidence	Graduate	Primary School	1.257*	.011
	High School	Primary School	1.226*	.002
Character	Graduate	Primary School	1.257*	.011
	High School	Primary School	1.226**	.002
Caring	Graduate	Middle School	.974*	.032
		Primary School	1.264**	.005
		No Schooling	2.053**	.003
	High School	Primary School	1.000*	.011
		No Schooling	1.789**	.008

Note. *Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

** Mean difference is significant at 0.01 level.

According to the results of Table 10, Graduate fathers' adolescents and adolescents whose fathers possess high school education level were higher than the adolescents whose fathers are no schooling and have primary education level in competence, confidence, character and caring subscales. And then, Graduate fathers' adolescents were also higher than the adolescents whose fathers possess middle school education level in caring subscale.

Table 11. ANOVA Results of Mean Comparison for Positive Youth Development by Mother's Education Level

Subscale	Mother's Education Level	N	Mean	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Competence	Graduate	175	44.57	5.842	3.755**	.005
	High School	240	45.16	5.375		
	Middle School	344	44.43	5.754		
	Primary School	275	43.87	4.920		
	No Schooling	76	42.89	4.707		
Confidence	Graduate	175	27.77	4.097	5.191***	.000
	High School	240	28.65	3.663		
	Middle School	344	27.85	3.922		
	Primary School	275	27.33	3.411		
	No Schooling	76	26.68	3.015		

Subscale	Mother's Education Level	N	Mean	SD	F	p
Connection	Graduate	175	25.39	3.942	1.178	.319
	High School	240	26.16	3.351		
	Middle School	344	25.73	3.501		
	Primary School	275	25.43	3.156		
	No Schooling	76	24.78	2.933		
Character	Graduate	175	27.77	4.097	5.191***	.000
	High School	240	28.65	3.663		
	Middle School	344	27.85	3.922		
	Primary School	275	27.33	3.411		
	No Schooling	76	26.68	3.015		
Caring	Graduate	175	25.67	3.737	6.502***	.000
	High School	240	26.25	3.588		
	Middle School	344	25.60	3.599		
	Primary School	275	25.12	3.398		
	No Schooling	76	24.17	2.881		

Note. ** Mean difference is significant at 0.01 level.

***Mean difference is significant at 0.001 level.

According to the ANOVA Table 11, positive youth development of adolescents was also significant difference among their mothers' education level at 0.01 level and at 0.001level respectively in competence, confidence, character and caring subscales. The researcher also conducted Tukey HSD multiple comparisons.

Table 12. Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for Positive Youth Development by Mother's Education Level

Subscale	(I) Mother Education Level	(J) Mother Education Level	Mean difference (I-J)	p
Competence	High School	No Schooling	2.268*	.014
Confidence	High School	Primary School	1.320**	.001
		No Schooling	1.970**	.001
Connection	High School	No Schooling	1.382*	.019
Character	High School	Primary School	1.320**	.001
		No Schooling	1.970**	.001
Caring	Graduate	No Schooling	1.503*	.018
	High School	Primary School	1.134**	.003
		No Schooling	2.083***	.000
	Middle School	No Schooling	1.434*	.013

Note. * Mean difference is significant at 0.01 level.

** Mean difference is significant at 0.01 level.

***Mean difference is significant at 0.001 level.

According to the results of Table 12, Graduate mothers' adolescents were higher than adolescents whose mothers are no schooling in caring subscale. And then, the adolescents whose mothers possess high school education level were also higher than the adolescents whose

mothers are no schooling and have primary education level in all subscales of positive youth development. Moreover, the adolescents whose mothers passed middle school education level were higher than the adolescents whose mothers are no schooling.

Relationship between Optimal Attachment and Positive Youth Development of Development

One of the objectives of the study, the correlational analysis was used to find out whether there is a relationship between optimal attachment and positive youth development of adolescents. Therefore, Pearson correlation coefficient was conducted and the result was shown in the Table 13.

Table 13. Correlation between Optimal Attachment and Positive Youth Development of Adolescents

Variables	Optimal Attachment	Positive Youth Development
Optimal Attachment	1	.425**

Note. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

According to the Table 13, the result revealed that there was a significant relationship between optimal attachment and positive youth development because the correlation coefficient was statistically significant ($r = .425, p < 0.01$). In other words, this means that if the adolescents' optimal attachment was higher, their positive youth development would be higher.

Discussion

In this study, the significant differences in optimal attachment and positive youth development of adolescents through the socio-demographic variables were examined. The optimal attachment of adolescents was examined by gender, family types and number of siblings. According to the results, there were significant differences by gender, family types and number of siblings in optimal attachment. According to independent samples *t*-test results, the female adolescents were significantly higher than the male adolescents in the subscales of peer attachment. However, significant differences were not found in mother attachment and father attachment by gender. Moreover, ANOVA results showed that the adolescents who live with both parents possess more trust and communication with their fathers than the adolescents who live with only mother. And then, the adolescents who live with only father also had communication with father than the adolescents who live with only mother. However, the adolescents who live with grandparents would be more alienated than the adolescents who live with both parents and only mother. According to the number of siblings, there were significant differences in father attachment and peer attachment. There was no difference in mother attachment.

In positive youth development of adolescents, there were significant differences by gender, father's education level and mother's education level. According to the results of independent samples *t*-test analysis, the significant differences were found in competence, confidence, and character scales by gender. However, there was no significant difference in connection and caring subscales by gender. The results of ANOVA explained that the positive youth development of adolescents was significantly different according to their fathers' education level and their mothers' education level at 0.01level and at 0.001level respectively. Moreover, there was a positively correlation between optimal attachment and positive youth

development of adolescents. The high quality of optimal attachment can cause the well positive youth development of adolescents.

Conclusion

The first objective of the study was to explore the optimal attachment to parents and peers during adolescence. To examine the first objective, Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment (IPPA) was used. It contains 54 items and three subscales, trust, communication and alienation. The optimal attachment of adolescents was studied into three categories, mother attachment, father attachment and peer attachment. It was found that the mother attachment and peer attachment of adolescents were higher than the father attachment of adolescents. The second objective was to find out the differences of optimal attachment of adolescents by gender, family types and number of siblings. It was found that optimal attachment of adolescents was significantly different according to their gender differences, family types and number of siblings.

The female adolescents were significantly higher than the male adolescents in peer attachment. And then, the adolescents who live with both parents possess more trust and communication with their fathers than the adolescents who live with only mother. According to the number of siblings, there were significant differences in father attachment and peer attachment. The third objective of the study was to examine the positive youth development of adolescents by gender and parents' education level. To examine this third objective, Positive Youth Development Inventory (PYDI) was applied in this study. It consists of 48 items and five subscales, competence, confidence, connection, character and caring. The result showed that the significant differences were found in competence, confidence, character scales by gender. It was found that the male adolescents of optimal attachment were higher than the female adolescents of optimal attachment. Moreover, there was significantly different in positive youth development by parents' education level. The adolescents who possess more educated parents were higher than the adolescents who possess low educated level parents in positive youth development. Finally, the fourth objective was to investigate the relationship between optimal attachment and positive youth development of adolescents. To establish the objective, Pearson's product moment correlation was calculated in this study. It was found that there was a positive correlation between optimal attachment and positive youth development of adolescents. The high quality of optimal attachment can cause the well positive youth development of adolescents. Today's young people, adolescents, belong to the most promising generation in the history of the world. They stand at the summit of the ages. Thus, all civil societies share a common interest in promoting the development of responsible, global citizens. Parents are the closest component in the development of an individual. Parent-child relationship is important in developing social, emotional and cognitive development. After parents, peers are the next individuals who will foster relationship with youth in their development. Collaborations with positive peers are important for the psychological development and healthy social life. Thus, the findings of this study suggest that the optimal attachment with parents and peers are the key variables in enhancing the positive youth development of adolescents.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge all of the people who supported throughout this process. First and foremost, we would like to thank to Dr. Kay Thwe Hlaing (Rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. May Myat Thu (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. Nyo Nyo Lwin (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education) and Dr. Khin Khin Oo (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education) for their permission to conduct this research. Then, we wish to express our gratitude to Dr. Khin Hnin Nwe (Professor, Head of Department, Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education) for her guidance, suggestions and supports throughout this study. Moreover, we would also like to thank to all the participants for their active participation in collecting the required data.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bowlby, J. (1991), *An ethological approach to personality development*. American Psychologist, 46, 331-341.
- Allen, J. P. & Land, D. (1999). Attachment in adolescence. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 319–335).
- Applegate, J. S., & Shapiro, J. R. (2005). *Neurobiology for clinical social work: Theory and practice*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Armsden, G.C., & Greenberg, M.T. (1987). The Inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*.
- Arnold, M. E., Nott, B. D., & Meinhold, J. L. (2012). *The Positive Youth Development Inventory*. Oregon State University.
- Benson, P. L., (2006). Positive Youth Development: Theory, Research, and Applications. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 894–941).
- Blos, P. (1969). *On adolescence: a Psychoanalytic Interpretation*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Boone, T.L., Lefkowitz, E.S (2007). Mother-Adolescent Health Communication: Are All Conversations Created Equally? *J Youth Adolescence* 36, 1038-1047.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52(4), 664–678.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In *International Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 3, 2nd. Ed.* Oxford: Elsevier.
- Cozolino (2006) Why We Need Therapy—and Why It Works: A Neuroscientific Perspective, *Smith College Studie in Social Work*, 84:2-3, 157-177, DOI:[10.1080/00377317.2014.923630](https://doi.org/10.1080/00377317.2014.923630)
- Dykas M. J., Ziv Y. Cassidy J (2007). Attachment and peer relations in adolescence. *Attachment & Human Development*. 2008; 10:123–141.
- Furstenberg, F., Cook, T. & Eccles, J. (2000). *Managing to make it: Urban families in adolescent success*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hesse, E. (1999). The adult attachment interview: Historical and current perspectives. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 395–433).
- Jas Laile Suzana J. Shah Alam: Arah Pendidikan Sdn. Bhd; (2008). *Introduction to children and adolescents psychology*.
- Kocayörük, E. (2010). A Turkish adaptation of the inventory of parent and peer attachment: The reliability and validity study. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 40, 133-151.
- Lerner, R. M., Dowling, E. M., & Anderson, P. M. (2006). Positive youth development: Thriving as the basis of personhood and civil society. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7(3), 172- 180.
- Lerner, R. M. (2009). The positive youth development perspective: Theoretical and empirical bases of a strengths-based approach to adolescent development. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 149–163).
- Nakash, O., Thomas, C., & Bradley, R. (2002). Clinical assessment of attachment patterns and personality disorder in adolescents and adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74(6), 1065–1085.
- Patton, G.C., Sawyer, S. M., Santelli, J. S., Ross, D. A., Afifi, R., Allen, N. B., et al. (2016). *Our future: a lancet commission on adolescent health and well-being*.
- Pittman, K. & Ferber, T. (2001). Unfinished Business: Further Reflections on a Decade of Promoting Youth Development. In P. L. Benson, K. J. Pittman (Eds.), *Trends in Youth Development: Visions, Realities and Challenges* (pp. 4-50). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Rice, KG. (1990) Attachment in adolescence: A narrative and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Youth Adolescent*.