

Parenting and Family Processes in Adolescent Future Orientation: A Systematic Review Protocol

INPLASY202690070

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2026.9.0070

Received: 15 September 2026

Published: 16 September 2026

Buana, YD; Kadiyono, AL; Agustiani, H; Cahyadi, S.

Corresponding author:

Yudha Dharma Buana

yudha23004@mail.unpad.ac.id

Author Affiliation:

Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Support - No specific funding or external sponsorship was received for this systematic review. The review was conducted within an academic context at Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia.

Review Stage at time of this submission - Retrospective registration. Literature searching, deduplication, study selection, full-text eligibility assessment, data extraction and coding, critical appraisal, and the main narrative and thematic synthesis have been completed. The final analytical corpus has been frozen at 37 included studies. Final verification, reporting, and manuscript preparation are ongoing, and the review has not yet been submitted for journal publication.

Conflicts of interest - None declared.

INPLASY registration number: INPLASY202690070

Amendments - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 16 September 2026 and was last updated on 16 September 2026.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective This systematic review aims to synthesize empirical evidence on parenting and family processes associated with future orientation among adolescents, with particular attention to:

- (1) the parenting and family processes that have been examined,
- (2) the patterns and direction of their associations with adolescent future orientation, and
- (3) the mechanisms and contextual conditions through which these associations have been reported to operate.

RQ1: What parenting and family processes have been examined in relation to adolescents' future orientation?

RQ2: What patterns of association have been reported between parenting and family processes and adolescents' future orientation?

RQ3: Through what mechanisms and under what contextual conditions are parenting and family processes associated with adolescents' future orientation?

Rationale Adolescence is a developmental period in which individuals increasingly formulate goals, expectations, plans, and commitments concerning their future. Future orientation is therefore an important developmental construct for understanding how adolescents anticipate, evaluate, and prepare for future possibilities. Although future orientation develops through interactions between individual and contextual

influences, the family remains a particularly salient developmental context during adolescence.

Existing empirical research has examined a range of parenting and family processes in relation to adolescent future orientation, including parental support and warmth, parenting practices, autonomy and control, monitoring, parent–adolescent relationship quality and communication, family connectedness, parental expectations and values, and future-related socialization. However, this evidence is dispersed across different theoretical traditions, operational definitions, measurement approaches, developmental contexts, and study designs.

A systematic synthesis is therefore needed to organize this fragmented evidence and clarify the role of parenting and family processes in adolescent future orientation. The present review integrates empirical studies examining relational, behavioral, cognitive, and socialization processes within parent–adolescent, caregiver–adolescent, and family relationships.

Condition being studied This review focuses on adolescent future orientation within developmental psychology, specifically examining parenting and family processes as relational and social-contextual influences on adolescents' future-oriented development. The domain includes relational, behavioral, cognitive, and socialization processes within parent–adolescent, caregiver–adolescent, and family relationships and their associations with adolescents' future orientation. Future orientation is considered a multidimensional developmental construct reflecting how adolescents anticipate, evaluate, and engage with their future through future-directed cognitions, motivations, affective evaluations, goals, expectations, planning, and related orientations. Structural or material family characteristics, such as socioeconomic status, household income, poverty, assets, or food insecurity, are considered contextual factors rather than eligible family processes when examined in isolation.

METHODS

Search strategy A systematic electronic search was conducted on 9 September 2026 across eight bibliographic databases and publisher platforms: Scopus, MEDLINE Ultimate via EBSCOhost, ScienceDirect, SAGE Journals, SpringerLink, Emerald Insight, Cambridge Core, and ERIC. The search covered database inception to the date of the final search, with no publication-year restriction.

The search strategy was structured around three core concepts: future orientation, parenting/family processes, and adolescence. Search syntax and field restrictions were adapted to the functionality of each database or platform. The principal search terms included “future orientation”; parenting and family terms such as parent*, famil*, maternal, paternal, mother*, father*, caregiver*, and parenting; and adolescent terms such as adolescen*, teen*, youth*, “young people”, “young person*”, and terms referring to secondary-school-aged populations. Controlled vocabulary was incorporated where available.

The Scopus search was conducted in title, abstract, and keyword fields using: TITLE-ABS-KEY("future orientation") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(parent* OR famil* OR maternal OR paternal OR mother* OR father* OR caregiver*) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(adolescen* OR teen* OR youth* OR "young people" OR "young person*" OR "secondary school*" OR "high school*" OR "middle school*" OR "junior high school*" OR "senior high school*" OR "vocational school*" OR "vocational high school*"). Equivalent or platform-adapted strategies were applied in the remaining information sources.

Across all searches, 689 records were identified before deduplication. After removal of 249 duplicate occurrences, 440 unique records remained for title and abstract screening.

Participant or population Adolescents primarily aged 10–19 years or populations corresponding to secondary-school age were eligible. Studies involving mixed age groups were eligible only when adolescent participants constituted the relevant target population or adolescent-specific evidence could be separated. No restrictions were imposed on sex/gender, ethnicity, country, or socioeconomic background. Studies focused exclusively on adults, young children, or mixed populations from which adolescent evidence could not be meaningfully separated were excluded.

Intervention Not applicable as an intervention in the conventional PICO sense. The exposures of interest were relational, behavioral, cognitive, and socialization processes within parent–adolescent, caregiver–adolescent, or family relationships, including parenting styles and practices, parental warmth and support, monitoring and control, autonomy support or granting, parent–adolescent communication and relationship quality, family connectedness or relational climate, parental expectations, beliefs and values, and family socialization of the future. Structural or material

family characteristics examined in isolation were not considered eligible exposures.

Comparator Not applicable. The review did not require a predefined comparator group. Eligible studies could compare levels, categories, profiles, or patterns of parenting/family processes, or estimate associations between eligible family processes and adolescent future orientation without a formal comparator.

Study designs to be included Empirical primary studies using quantitative observational, longitudinal, cross-sectional, path-analytic, structural equation modelling, profile-based, or experimental/intervention designs were eligible where they examined an eligible parenting/family process in relation to adolescent future orientation. Non-empirical articles, narrative or systematic reviews, conceptual papers, commentaries, and other reports without eligible primary empirical evidence were excluded.

Eligibility criteria Studies were eligible when they: (1) examined adolescents primarily aged 10–19 years or secondary-school-aged populations, with adolescent-specific evidence separable where mixed populations were used; (2) examined at least one relational, behavioral, cognitive, or socialization process within parent–adolescent, caregiver–adolescent, or family relationships; (3) assessed future orientation explicitly named, conceptualized, or operationalized within a future-orientation framework; (4) reported an eligible pathway in which a parenting or family process predicted, explained, was associated with, shaped, moderated, or otherwise contributed to adolescent future orientation, including models in which future orientation subsequently mediated downstream outcomes; and (5) reported primary empirical research.

Studies were excluded when family exposure consisted solely of structural or material characteristics such as socioeconomic status, income, poverty, household assets, food insecurity, or broad demographic characteristics without an eligible relational or parenting process; when the future-related outcome consisted only of an adjacent construct such as aspirations, hope, purpose, future selves, generic expectations or plans, optimism, future time perspective, or future-oriented self-efficacy unless explicitly conceptualized or operationalized as future orientation; when the population was ineligible or adolescent evidence was not separable; when no eligible family-to-future-orientation pathway was examined; or when the report was non-empirical.

Information sources Electronic searches were conducted in eight bibliographic databases and publisher platforms: Scopus, MEDLINE Ultimate via EBSCOhost, ScienceDirect, SAGE Journals, SpringerLink, Emerald Insight, Cambridge Core, and ERIC. Searches were conducted on 9 September 2026 and covered records available from database inception to the final search date, with no publication-year restriction. Search fields, controlled vocabulary, and platform-specific search functions were adapted to each information source. No additional information sources beyond the documented electronic database and publisher-platform searches were included in the primary identification process.

Main outcome(s) The main outcome is adolescent future orientation, defined as a developmental construct reflecting how adolescents think about, anticipate, evaluate, and organize their future. Eligible outcomes include future orientation measured as a global construct or through explicitly defined dimensions such as future expectations, goals, planning, anticipation, perceived future prospects, orientation toward success, uncertainty about the future, or other future-directed dimensions when these are explicitly conceptualized or operationalized within a future-orientation framework.

Studies were not considered eligible solely because they assessed adjacent constructs such as aspirations, hope, purpose, future selves, expectations, plans, optimism, future time perspective, or future-oriented self-efficacy unless the study explicitly identified and operationalized these constructs as part of, or as a measure of, adolescent future orientation.

Additional outcome(s) No additional review outcomes were defined. Adolescent future orientation was the primary outcome of the review. Variables reported as potential mediators, moderators, contextual conditions, or downstream outcomes were extracted when relevant to understanding the mechanisms and conditions linking parenting and family processes with adolescent future orientation, but were not treated as separate outcomes of the review.

Data management Search records were exported from the respective databases and publisher platforms and consolidated into a master database for record management and deduplication. Duplicate records were identified using bibliographic information, including DOI and normalized title information, and were removed conservatively before screening. The consolidated

search yielded 689 records, from which 249 duplicate occurrences were removed, leaving 440 unique records for title and abstract screening.

Screening decisions, full-text eligibility decisions, exclusion reasons, and inclusion status were documented in structured audit files to maintain an explicit decision trail. Reports progressing to full-text assessment were tracked separately, and reasons for exclusion at the full-text stage were recorded and reconciled with the final PRISMA counts.

For included studies, study identifiers and extracted information were maintained in structured spreadsheets. Data relevant to the review questions were coded into analytical categories covering parenting and family processes (RQ1), patterns and directions of association with adolescent future orientation (RQ2), and reported mechanisms and contextual conditions (RQ3). Following the final eligibility and conceptual-boundary audit, the analytical corpus was frozen at 37 included studies.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis

Methodological quality and risk of bias of all 37 included studies were assessed using design-appropriate JBI critical appraisal tools. Analytical cross-sectional and related observational studies were assessed using the revised JBI critical appraisal tool for analytical cross-sectional studies, longitudinal studies using the revised JBI cohort tool, and the randomized prevention trial using the revised JBI tool for randomized controlled trials. Item-level judgments were recorded as Yes, No, Unclear, or Not applicable, with supporting evidence notes. An Unclear judgment was assigned when the available reporting did not provide sufficient information to establish that a methodological criterion had been met.

Critical appraisal findings were used to qualify interpretation of the narrative and thematic synthesis rather than as an automatic basis for study exclusion. For synthesis purposes, review-level categories of lower, some, or higher methodological concerns were used to summarize patterns across appraisal items; these categories were interpretive classifications developed for this review and were not treated as official JBI global scores. Particular caution was applied to causal interpretation of cross-sectional evidence because temporal precedence could not be established by design.

Strategy of data synthesis A narrative and thematic synthesis was conducted because

substantial heterogeneity was present across study populations, operational definitions of future orientation, parenting and family-process exposures, measurement instruments, study designs, and statistical approaches. A quantitative meta-analysis was therefore not undertaken.

The synthesis was organized according to the three review questions. For RQ1, parenting and family processes were coded into conceptually defined domains, and studies were allowed to contribute to more than one domain where multiple eligible family processes were examined. Frequencies and proportions were summarized using the total included-study denominator (N=37), with categories treated as non-mutually exclusive.

For RQ2, findings were synthesized according to the reported direction and pattern of association between parenting/family processes and adolescent future orientation. Studies were classified as showing positive significant, negative significant, mixed or conditional, null, or unclear/not-counted patterns. The primary summary used all included studies as the denominator, with additional summaries based on classifiable studies where appropriate.

For RQ3, reported mediators, explanatory pathways, moderators, and contextual conditions were extracted and grouped thematically into recurring mechanism and context categories. These categories were not treated as mutually exclusive, and counts were used descriptively rather than as estimates of prevalence. Critical-appraisal findings were integrated into interpretation.

Subgroup analysis No formal statistical subgroup analysis was conducted because the review used narrative and thematic synthesis rather than meta-analysis. However, where sufficient evidence was available, patterns were examined descriptively across relevant study characteristics and contextual conditions, including sex/gender, cultural or country context, socioeconomic or material context, developmental or educational stage, school and peer context, and future-orientation domain or profile. These comparisons were used to explore possible sources of heterogeneity and contextual variation rather than to estimate pooled subgroup effects.

Sensitivity analysis No formal sensitivity analysis was conducted because the review used narrative and thematic synthesis rather than meta-analysis. Robustness was considered through the documented conceptual-boundary and eligibility

audit and through critical-appraisal findings. Studies were not automatically excluded on the basis of methodological concern categories. Where relevant, the interpretation of findings considered whether conclusions appeared to depend disproportionately on studies with greater methodological concerns. No leave-one-out analysis, influence diagnostics, pooled-effect sensitivity analysis, or other statistical sensitivity analysis was performed. Descriptive sensitivity checks were undertaken to examine the robustness of the review findings to alternative methodological decisions. These included checks based on publication-year cutoffs and conceptual-boundary decisions concerning eligibility of parenting/family exposures and future-orientation outcomes. The purpose was to determine whether overall patterns of evidence were materially dependent on particular inclusion decisions or restricted time windows. Because the review did not conduct meta-analysis, no leave-one-out analysis, influence diagnostics, or pooled-effect sensitivity analyses were performed. Sensitivity findings were interpreted qualitatively alongside the main narrative and thematic synthesis.

Language restriction No language restriction was applied during the electronic searches.

Country(ies) involved Indonesia.

Other relevant information This review was conducted with an explicit audit trail documenting study identification, deduplication, screening, full-text eligibility assessment, data extraction, and synthesis decisions. During the review process, the conceptual boundaries for eligible parenting/family processes and future-orientation outcomes were clarified to ensure consistent application of the review questions. Relational, behavioral, cognitive, and socialization processes within parent-adolescent, caregiver-adolescent, and family relationships were distinguished from structural or material family characteristics examined in isolation. Similarly, adjacent future-related constructs were distinguished from outcomes explicitly conceptualized or operationalized as future orientation.

These clarifications were applied through a final conceptual-boundary and eligibility audit, with changes retained in the audit trail rather than overwritten. The resulting analytical corpus was frozen at 37 included studies. The final PRISMA counts, eligibility decisions, and analytical coding constituted the locked evidence base used for the review synthesis.

Keywords Future orientation; Adolescents; Parenting; Family processes; Parent-adolescent relationship; Parental support; Family socialization.

Dissemination plans The findings of this systematic review are intended to be disseminated through publication in a peer-reviewed academic journal and may also be presented through relevant academic or scientific forums.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - Yudha Dharma Buana - Review conception and design; literature searching; study screening and eligibility assessment; data extraction and coding; critical appraisal; data synthesis; protocol preparation; and manuscript drafting.

Email: yudha23004@mail.unpad.ac.id

Author 2 - Anissa Lestari Kadiyono - Supervision; methodological and conceptual guidance; review and revision of the protocol and manuscript.

Author 3 - Hendriati Agustiani - Supervision; conceptual guidance; review and revision of the protocol and manuscript.

Author 4 - Surya Cahyadi - Supervision; methodological and conceptual guidance; review and revision of the protocol and manuscript.