

Parenting Styles, Adverse Childhood Experiences, and Tendencies of Sectarian Prejudice Among Adolescents



By

Nawaz Amanat

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal's

National Institute of Psychology

Centre of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad, Pakistan

2021

**Parenting Styles, Adverse Childhood Experiences, and
Tendencies of Sectarian Prejudice Among Adolescents**

By

Nawaz Amanat

A Research Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Degree of Masters of Science
In Psychology

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal's

National Institute of Psychology

Centre of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad, Pakistan

2021

Certificate

Certified that master's thesis titled, "**Parenting Styles, Adverse Childhood Experiences and Tendencies of Sectarian Prejudice Among Adolescents**" has been approved for the submission to Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad.

(Dr. Aisha Zubair)

Supervisor

Dedicated to Erum

**Parenting Styles, Adverse Childhood Experiences, and
Tendencies of Sectarian Prejudice Among Adolescents**

Table of Contents

List of Tables	i
List of Appendices	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
Parenting Styles	1
Types of Parenting Styles	3
Influence of Sex, Ethnicity, or Family Type	6
Theories of Parenting Style	7
Prejudice	10
Types of Prejudice	12
Theories of Prejudice	15
Adverse Childhood Experiences	17
Prevalence and Impact of ACES in Adolescence	18
Relationship Among Study Variables: Empirical Evidences	20
Rationale of the Present Study	25
CHAPTER 2: METHOD	
Objectives	25
Hypotheses	25
Operational Definitions of Variables	25

Instruments	26
Research Design	27
Sample	27
Procedure	29
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS	30
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION	41
REFERENCES	
APPENDICES	

List of Tables

Table No.		Page No.
Table 1	Frequency and Percentage Along Demographic Variables of Sample ($N = 200$)	28
Table 2	Descriptive Statistics of Major Study Variables ($N = 200$)	30
Table 3	Correlation Matrix for Study Variables ($N = 200$)	31
Table 4	Regression Analysis for Predicting Sectarian Prejudice Tendencies from Parenting Styles and Adverse Childhood Experiences ($N = 200$)	32
Table 5	Gender Difference Across Study Variables ($N = 200$)	33
Table 6	Age Difference Across Study Variables ($N = 200$)	34
Table 7	Difference Across Father's Education Along Study Variables ($N = 200$)	35
Table 8	Difference Across Mother's Education Along Study Variables ($N = 200$)	36
Table 9	Mean Difference Across Birth Order for Study Variables ($N = 200$)	37

List of Appendices

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| Appendix A | Parental Authority Questionnaire |
| Appendix B | Sectarian Prejudice Scale |
| Appendix C | The Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire |
| Appendix D | Informed Consent and Demographic Sheet |
| Appendix E | Authors' Permissions |

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Aisha Zubair for always being available to help me out, for the continuous support and immense knowledge for thesis. His guidance helped me in the time of research and thesis writing.

There are no words that can express my gratitude for my family. I shall forever be in debt for the kindness of my parents. They are main source of strength and success in human life.

I would like to thank my friend Erum for all the support and motivation throughout the entire phase of research.

Nawaz Amanat

Abstract

The present study was designed to investigate the relationship between parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice among adolescents. In addition, role of demographic variables (gender, age, father's education, mother's education, and birth order) was also determined in relation to the study variables. Convenient sample ($N = 200$) comprising of girls ($n = 140$) and boys ($n = 60$) was collected from different government and private schools of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Instruments used in the present study were Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991), Sectarian Prejudice Scale (Zahid, 2020), and the Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire (Felitti et al., 1998). Results showed that authoritative parenting style was negatively related with authoritarian and permissive parenting while authoritarian parenting style was positively related with permissive parenting style. Permissive and authoritarian parenting style positively related with adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Authoritative parenting style was negatively related with adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Adverse childhood experiences positively related with adverse tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Gender differences revealed that authoritarian and permissive parenting as well as tendencies of sectarian prejudice were high among boys, whereas girls reported more adverse childhood experiences and authoritative parenting. Permissive and authoritarian parenting as well as adverse childhood experiences was high among early adolescents, whereas middle adolescents reported higher tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Results of One Way ANOVA disclosed that adolescents who have highly educated both mothers and fathers reflected higher perception of authoritative parenting and less experience of adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Last born adolescents reported more experiences of permissive parenting, more adverse childhood experiences and high tendencies of sectarian prejudice whereas adolescents who were middle born expressed more perception of authoritarian parenting, while first born reflected higher perception of authoritative parenting.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1

Introduction

Parenting has gained ample research attention from various scientific disciplines. Many theoretical frameworks emphasize that parenting plays a vital role in child development, which has fueled research investigating the role of parenting styles in the adverse experiences faced in childhood that can lead to development of extremist tendencies later in adolescence. The present research therefore intends to investigate the relationship between parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice.

Parenting Styles

Parenting style can be described as the manner in which parents interacts with their children on a regular basis. The way one treats children, what is required of them, and the types of rules that are formed and how they are implemented are all indications of style (Doepke et al., 2019). According to Baumrind (Segrin & Flora, 2019), parenting style is a concept that is used to describe how parents try to influence and raise their children. In order to fully comprehend this concept, two points must be kept in mind. The term parenting style refers to the various ways in which people raise their children. In other words, this typology should not be interpreted to involve deviant parenting, such as that found in coercive or neglectful households. She assumed that standard parenting revolves around issues of power. Regardless of how or to what degree parents attempt to discipline or socialize their children, it is believed that the primary role of all parents is to guide, educate, and control their children.

Colón and Jeisianne (2020) described that the parenting style took note of two important dimensions of parenting that is parental warmth and parental control.

Parental warmth. It refers to the level of love and approval a parent has for his or her child. Warm and caring parents are those who often smile at, compliment, and encourage their children while minimizing their criticism, punishment, and disapproval signals. Warmth-rated parents are concerned, involved, and affectionate toward their children (Ponti, Lucia, & Martina, 2019). Rohner (as cited in Triandis & Harry, 2018)

introduced parental acceptance-rejection theory which is based on warmth dimension of parenting style. Parental warmth is a binary measure, with approval at one end of the scale and rejection at the other. Parental warmth plays an essential part in the socialization procedure of children because the adolescent is likely to maintain the approval and love of warm parents and hardly need harsh punishment to show compliance to parental demands (Primus & Mark, 2018). Contrary to that the hazard of removal of affection by hostile parents is unlikely to prove an effective mechanism of socialization for the child who has rarely experienced parental love and hence may not be afraid of their disapproval.

Parental warmth also informs children of other socially acceptable responses that are accessible to them. Frequent justification and clarification of acceptable or unacceptable behavior aids in the child's internalization of social rules and identification of circumstances in which the given behavior is reasonable. Warmth from parents is likely to be related to response to a child's needs. Loving parents make their children feel good about themselves, which leads to a sense of confidence, lower stress, and strong sense of self. Rather than the high anxiety and stress associated with parental aggression and physical discipline, such behaviors are more likely to contribute to internalization of parental expectations (Chung et al., 2020).

Parental control. Parental love is insufficient for children's social growth. If children are to grow up to be socially and intellectually competent, some level of parental control is needed. As children move from childhood to adolescence, they resist external control and internal reinforcement increasingly becomes important. Parental control refers to the amount of autonomy that parent allows their children. Restrictive parents limit their children's freedom activity, surveying their children's behaviors to ensure that their rules and regulations are followed.

Earlier, regulation was defined in terms of the severity of which physical punishment was used, the accuracy with which punishment was used, the use of justification, and so on. Bonnaire (2019) started by enunciating and bloated the idea of parental control. She claimed that parental readiness to socialize their child differed conceptually from parental restriction. Parental controls refers to the expectations that parents impose on their

children to integrate into the family as a whole through maturity demands, monitoring, corrective efforts, and a willingness to console a disobedient child (Mligo, 2020). At any age, a parent's efficacy as a socializer is determined by their emotional relationship with their infant, the type of control they attempt to impose, and the appropriateness of the controls to the child's age and personality, as well as the situation's demands.

Types of parenting style. Categorizing parents on the basis of two dimensions of parenting style yields a classification of four types of parenting styles that are authoritarian, authoritative and permissive and neglecting-rejecting. But this research has focused on control dimension of parenting style.

Authoritarian parenting. Such parents are demanding, but they aren't always reactive. They strive to transform, monitor, and assess the child's actions according to some predetermined or utter norm. They forbid the child from questioning their demands. Misconduct is severely punished. These parents place a premium on compliance, conformity, and reverence for authority, as well as work, tradition, and maintaining order. The sharing of words between the child and the parent is discouraged. They make the decisions on what to do and what not to do. Rules are rigid and unyielding, and they can be applied without reason or reference to fairness standards. There are few opportunities for the child to make decisions or try new things. They limit the independence of the child and assign decision-making exclusively to them. According to Yu et al. (2020) there are two types of authoritarian parents i.e. authoritarian-directive who are extremely intrusive and non-authoritarian-directive who are regulatory but not intrusive or authoritarian in their use of power.

Hock et al. (2018) discovered that teenagers from authoritarian families have lower academic achievement than those from authoritative families. When interacting with their peers, the children appeared nervous and uncertain, and they often reacted with aggression when irritated. Pang et al. (2020) found differences in the response patterns of girls and boys raised in authoritarian families in a later study. She discovered that girls are particularly reliant and lack exploration and achievement inspiration, while some boys display high levels of frustration and defiance.

Authoritative parenting. According to Kuppens, Sofie, and Eva (2019) authoritative parents are great in responsiveness as well as demandingness. These parents establish basic guideline for children. They respect disciplinary clarity, but it is balanced by reasoning, flexibility, and verbal compromise. This disciplinary method gives children the opportunity to gain interpersonal competence without anxiety. They are commanding while still listening gently and sensitively to their children's viewpoints and facilitating their engagement in family decision-making. They are assertive without being overbearing or controlling. Parents set specific boundaries while still listening to the needs of their children. Both sides acknowledge rights and feelings. There is mutual respect and freedom to explore and to make mistakes. They encourage child's independence and individuality. It is important to learn to accept accountability. Misconduct is dealt with by imposing a suitable punishment or working out a solution with the child to find an effective way to fulfill desires. Garcia et al. (2019) recommended that Parental approval, behavioral control and strictness, and psychological autonomy granting are three specific components of authoritativeness that lead to balanced psychological growth and school performance in adolescence.

Children raised in such homes have higher self-esteem, are more independent in trying new things, and are more altruistic. In addition, the children learn to embrace accountability, make good decisions, deal with change, and are better prepared to succeed in a workforce that values cooperative problem solving. They are self-assured, goal-oriented, and have outstanding academic results.in high school (Doepke, Matthias, & Fabrizio, 2019). Garcia et al. (2019) found that authoritarian parenting with a high level of comfort, responsiveness, and communication resulted in the most beneficial mental, social, and cognitive growth in children and adolescents.

Permissive parenting. According to Donato and Samantha (2020), parents who are permissive are seen as more sensitive than those who are demanding. They are nontraditional and lenient, requiring no adult actions, allowing for significant self-control, and avoiding conflict. They are caring, communicative, and accepting, but they do not claim authority or impose any kind of power. Parents take a step back and let their

children benefit from the consequences of their actions. There are no clear boundaries and the child will-test the limits and will always go for more trying to find out where boundaries are. Children are taught to think for them, to resist inhibition, and to put little importance on conformity. But children are not encouraged to develop any sensitivity to other people's needs. Misbehavior is usually ignored. These parents are excessively forgiving and encourage their children to make almost all of their own decisions. These parents consult with children on family decisions, give explanation for family rules and make use of demands for responsibilities.

There are two groups of permissive parents: democratic parents and nondirective parents. Democratic parents are more attentive, active, and dedicated to their children than nondirective parents, despite their leniency.

Children educated in this manner are original and imaginative. They either have higher self-esteem, stronger social skills, or are less depressed. However, children who grow up with permissive parents have some negative consequences. They do marginally better in school during puberty, but their behavior with peers is more violent and immature. They are less likely to take responsibility and are less autonomous. Ignoring misbehavior provides little insight into what can be anticipated. Children become confused, nervous, and make bad decisions when there are no clear boundaries. Children of permissive parents have difficulty in controlling their impulses, overly dependent and demanding of adults (Ewing & Haleigh, 2020). Later research indicated that the association of permissive parenting with inactive, reliant on, non -achieving conduct is held for boys and not for girls.

Role of gender, ethnicity and family type in parenting styles. It's important to distinguish between variations in parenting style distribution and correlates in different subpopulations. While authoritarian parenting is most common in intact, middle-class European descent families, the relationship between authoritativeness and child outcomes is fairly consistent across all classes. There are several exceptions to this generalization, such as the fact that demandingness tends to be less necessary for girls than for boys' well-being (Patias et al., 2018), and in all ethnic groups studied (African, Asian, Europeans, and Americans), authoritarian parenting predicts positive psychological

outcomes and problem behavior for teenagers, but it is only correlated with academic achievement among European American adolescents and is less effective in affecting the academic achievement of Asian and African-American youths (Boonk et al., 2018).

Mowen (2018) claimed that observed ethnic variations in the correlation of parenting style with child outcomes, may be attributed to differences in social background, parenting habits, or the cultural sense of particular dimensions of parenting style.

Theories of Parenting Styles

Psychoanalytical model. The effect of the emotional relationship between the parent and child on the child's psychosexual, psychosocial, and personality growth was emphasized in the psychodynamic perspective. This model is absolutely one-way. Individual variations in the emotional relationships between parents and children would ultimately arise from differences in parental attributes, according to these theorists, and several researchers focused on attitudes as the most significant attributes (Carpani, 2021).

Many researchers in this tradition believed that evaluating parental attitudes would capture the emotional tenor of the family milieu, which dictated the parent-child relationship and affected the child's growth (Plesner, Ursula, & Emil, 2020). This change in focus from parents' actions to their attitudes presented a challenge for the researchers; however, attitudes decide and make sense for behavior, while behavior expresses attitudes. According to Symonds (1939), the child's emotional stability gradually returns to the parents' emotions, behaviors, desires, and purposes, but only when they are freely articulated to him in word and deed.

Instead of using individual behaviors to describe parenting style, specific practices were conceptually grouped into broad categories based on their ability to affect emotional processes (Vansteenkiste et al., 2020). Williams and Keith (2010) called these wide categories as molar level. These molar characteristics included autonomy, ignoring, and the view of the child as a burden, as well as strictness, the use of fear to govern, and affection gestures.

Learning model. Theorists in behavior and social learning identify parenting styles based on parental actions, but they concentrate on parental activities rather than attitudes. Early longitudinal studies on socialization used various dimensions to characterize parenting style. For Zheng (2020), these dimensions comprised acceptance/rejection and dominance/submission; and for Czyżkowska (2019), warmth /hostility and restrictiveness /permissiveness.

Then an agreement started to arise about the link among child consequences and parenting. Model children that Fletcher and Kenneth (2013) labeled as socialized, cooperative, friendly, loyal, emotionally stable and cheerful, honest, straight-forward and dependable, good citizens and good scholars, were the products of families in which parent acted in a specific way. These parents were warm, defined simple, reasonable rules while allowing the child autonomy within those boundaries, and communicated their expectations as well as the reasons for them.

The instrumental and interpersonal goals, against which parents socialize their children, as well as parent's assumptions about parenting and the nature of children, were essential determinants of parent's activities, according to both psychodynamic and social learning theorists.

Baumrind's typology. In Rezazadeh et al. (2020) conceptualization of parenting style, Parents' value and beliefs about their position as parents and the existence of children help identify naturally occurring patterns of affect, practices, and values (Kuppens, Sofie, & Eva, 2019).

Baumrind began by defining a broad parenting role, such as parental control, and then adding articulation to that single domain. Second, rather than insisting on a linear hierarchy of parental control from high to low, she distinguishes three qualitatively distinct forms of parental control: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Third, Baumrind described parenting style using a configurationally approach, arguing that the effect of any one aspect of parenting (e.g., philosophy, maturity demands, or the use of particular disciplinary techniques) is contingent on the configuration of all other aspects.

The particle configuration associated with authoritarian parenting went beyond

the question of authority to include maturity demands, communication style (both effectiveness and directionality), and nurturance (a distinction between warmth and involvement) (Scrimali & Tullio, 2018). Parents who use authority differently tend to vary on other levels as well, offering empirical and philosophical evidence for the configurational approach (Kuppens, Sofie, & Eva, 2019).

Annelies et al. (2020) clearly attempted to untie parent's conduct from children's conducts. She was able to describe parenting style as a trait of the parent rather than the parent-child relationship as a result of this. Her model represents the conviction that children affect their parents' development and thereby contribute to their own development. She also saw the socialization process as complex, believing that the parenting style used had an effect on how open children are to their parents' efforts to socialize them.

Maccoby and Martin (1983) two directional framework. This tripartite model was firmly developed in the field of child development by the early 1980s (as cited in Fitzgerald & Cairiona, 2019) and served as the framing heuristic for most discussion of parents' impact on their children's development.

According to Carter and Kirsty (2019), parenting style was better interpreted from a social learning or ethological perspective. The number and form of demands made by parents, as well as the contingency of parental reinforcement, were identified as two separate underlying processes. Demanding and responsiveness are strong in authoritative parents. Authoritarian parents have a high level of demand and a low level of responsiveness.

Maccoby and Martin identified two distinct parenting styles. In their framework, indulgent parents are characterized by a high level of responsiveness but a low level of demand. Neglecting parents are distinguished by a lack of responsiveness and demand. The neglecting trend emerges theoretically as a result of crossing the two theoretical dimensions (responsiveness and demandingness) and ecologically because it encompasses a wider spectrum of parenting than Baumrind's previous sample of mostly attentive parents.

Warmth was replaced as an organizing factor in Maccoby and Martins' (as cited in Lyell et al., 2020) model by the contingency of parents and child actions. While reciprocity of communication and the use of explanations and logic are essential characteristics that differentiate authoritative from authoritarian parenting, they specifically differentiated their discussion of parenting style. Since they do not evaluate other important distinguishing features such as restrictiveness, autonomy granting, comfort, and coercion, models that depend solely on the measurement of responsiveness and demandingness do not capture differences in the quality of control between authoritarian parents. They used quantitative differences calculated over two dimensions to convert qualitatively different forms of parental authority into a system.

Adverse Childhood Experiences

Childhood experiences that were judged to be traumatic for the developing child were described as adverse childhood experiences (Crouch et al., 2019). According to Bethell et al. (2016), ACEs are defined as experiences that comprise violence; emotional, physical or sexual abuse; deprivation, neglect, family discord and divorce; parent substance abuse and mental health problems; parental death or incarceration; and social discrimination that a child can be exposed to in their primitive years. Neglect, bullying, and household instability, such as growing up with family members who have drug use problems, psychological issues, or intimate relationship violence, are all examples of ACEs. Other ACEs include extreme economic adversity, bullying, school violence, and community violence.

In global perspective (Lancaster & Christiana, 2020) Child abuse and neglect is described as, at a minimum, any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker that results in death, severe physical or emotional injury, sexual abuse, or exploitation, or as an act or failure to act that poses an immediate potential for serious peace experienced ACEs

According to Brown (2019), abuse and neglect of children under the age of 18 is known as child maltreatment. It comprises all kinds of bodily cruelty, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, physical negligence, emotional negligence, domestic violence, family

mental illness, the family member being imprisoned, household member substance use, and parental divorce/instability, which results in actual or potential harm to the child's health, survival, development, or dignity in the context of a relationship of responsibility, trust, or power. Intimate partner abuse is occasionally classified as a form of child maltreatment. Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) have a huge effect on potential abuse and implementation of crime, as well as lifelong wellbeing.

Mental/physical/sexual assault, neglect, parental dysfunction/mental disorder, or parental loss are all examples of ACEs. There is strong evidence connecting ACEs to long-term adverse consequences in areas like psychological health (Geoffroyet et al., 2014; Jenkins et al., 2015; Lereya et al., 2013;), social functioning, workplace strength, quality of living, wellness, and overall wellbeing and danger of untimely demise (Brown et al., 2009)

Impacts of adverse childhood experiences in adolescence. Sexual or verbal abuse or neglect, family violence, drug abuse or mental disorder in the family, parental separation or divorce, having a household member imprisoned, and not being raised by both biological parents are all examples of ACEs. According to recent research, more than half (54%) of all adolescents aged 12 to 17 in the United States have been subjected to at least a few of these encounters, with more than a quarter (28%) having experienced two or more. Children from lower-income families or in less nurturing and stable communities, as well as those with special medical needs, were much more prone to experience ACEs. Furthermore, adolescents who are transsexual, homosexual, bisexual, transgender, or questioning, as well as those who are jailed or involved in the youth justice system, face greater dangers.

Trauma in childhood and adolescence has implications for adolescent health and education, including a higher probability of repeating a grade, reduced endurance, increased risk for learning and behavioral problems, suicidal ideation, and early sexual activity and pregnancy. Adolescents aged 12 to 17 who have had more than one ACE have a much higher incidence of these negative consequences. Nearly half (48%) of youth with three or more ACEs have low school commitment, 44% are unable to remain calm and monitored, and 41% have high externalizing habits. Furthermore, trauma

exposure during childhood and adolescence may have long-term damaging consequences in adulthood, such as serious illness and productivity loss, particularly when it occurs repeatedly or continuously. Extreme stress can wreak havoc on the nervous and immune systems' growth. Abused and neglected children are more likely to experience depression, alcoholism, substance addiction, high-risk sexual activity, chronic illnesses, and even suicide as adults.

Abuse, negligence, and well-established downstream health before the age of 18, as well as ACEs who have household discord and mental health issues in higher ACE ratings, help predict outcomes over the life course (Rich-Edwards et al., 2012). A wide variety of incidents that constitute childhood trauma are classified as adverse childhood experiences (ACEs). Verbal, physical, or sexual assault, as well as neglect or unstable family problems or incidents like mental illness, drug abuse, domestic violence, or incarceration, are all examples (Roy, Janal, & Roy, 2010). ACEs have been associated to hostile well-being consequences in adulthood, including depression, substance abuse, cardiovascular disease, and premature mortality (Waite, Davey, & Lynch, 2013). An elevated risk of tobacco, alcohol, and substance dependence is linked to ACEs and a higher risk of numerous negative health consequences in adults in high-income countries.

Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) have a huge effect on potential abuse and execution of crime, as well as lifelong wellbeing. ACEs are closely linked to a child's growth and a wide variety of health issues during a person's lifetime (McNutt, Carlson, Persaud, & Postmus, 2002).

The battle, flight, or freeze response floods the brain with corticotrophin-releasing hormone when a person is confronted with a stressful situation (CRH). In stressful circumstances, this is a natural and protective response. However, if a child is repeatedly subjected to ACEs, the brain develops CRH as well, resulting in the child remaining in a permanently heightened state of consciousness and unable to revert to the stabilized state. As a result, the child or adolescent is still under a lot of tension. The adolescent is unable to think rationally in this enhanced neurological condition, and learning is physiologically difficult or impossible (Tsehay et al., 2020).

ACEs have been linked to unfavorable long-term health effects, as well as overall poor physical and mental health, according to a wide body of studies (Anda et al., 2008; Brown et al., 2010; Cannon, Bonomi, Anderson, Rivara, & Thompson, 2010; Chapman et al., 2004; Chapman et al., 2011; Danese et al., 2009; Dube et al., 2009).

ACEs are widespread in the population, regardless of gender or cultural background (Wekerle & Christine, 2020). In high-income countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Finland, it was estimated that approximately 4%–16% of children were physically abused and 10% were neglected or mentally abused each year. For sexual abuse, 5% to 10% of girls and up to 5% of boys were subjected to sexual abuse during childhood, and three times this number were subjected to any kind of sexual abuse in the established countries counting New Zealand, Australia, USA, and Canada. According to a recent European Union survey, nearly one out of every three European women has encountered violence or sexual harassment, and one out of every ten women has experienced sexual violence before the age of 15. Furthermore, physical assault was the most prevalent form of ACE, affecting 18.6% of the study population from eight European countries. From Asia, there are fewer and less detailed studies on these issues. However, in China, for example, a large number of children in rural areas are forced to live apart from their parents, who are pursuing job opportunities in big cities. These children are left behind and, to some extent, ignored by their parents (Braham & Yassine, 2018).

Sectarian Prejudice

There are many definitions of prejudice but the simple and most cited one is prejudice is negative attitude towards other groups or members of other groups on the basis of its affiliation with the out group without any direct experience with it (Todd, 2014). It is to have feelings about somebody solely based upon his or her affiliation with any particular group. Prejudice is the hostility on the basis of incorrect and inflexible generalization (Eagly & Dickman, 2005).

Pistella (2018) defined prejudice as a mindset that involves negative views and feelings about a group and its members, as well as the demonstration of aggressive or

negative treatment directed at a group and its members. Prejudice can be defined as having negative attitudes towards and individual or members of group due to their membership or association with a specific group of people such as race (Nelson, 2002). Prejudice is defined as the holding of derogatory social attitudes or cognitive views, the expression of negative affect, or the showing of hostile or discriminatory behavior toward members of a group based on their membership in that group (Tejada, Luque, Rojas, & Moreno, 2011).

Prejudice has cognitive, affective, and behavioral facets, much like attitudes in general. The cognitive aspect is concerned with evaluating attitudes about the group or its members' characteristics; the affective aspect is concerned with emotional reactions; and the behavioral aspect is concerned with impulses or intentions to engage in discriminatory behavior (Duckitt, 2001). As a consequence, prejudice can be conveyed by seeing a group and its members as cold and aggressive, incomplete and weak, or negatively on both dimensions. Although personal aspects of discrimination involve feelings of inadequacy and stereotypes of incompetence, collective aspects include assumptions on whether the target community respects or violates valued norms and practices. Personal aspects refer to an individual's emotional reactions (e.g., feeling nervous awaiting an interpersonal interaction) in the effective domain, while collective aspects refer to feelings centered on the target group's role in society (e.g. feelings of collective threat related to economic competition or differences in cultural values and worldviews) (Stephan & Renfro, 2002). Approach and avoidance behaviors, as well as discrimination tendencies, are examples of behavioral tendencies. Negative approach tendencies include a broad variety of active actions, including abuse, physical aggression, and anti-locution (a mild form of hate speech). Negative resistance, neglect, withholding social support, avoiding intimacy, and maintaining social distance from a group and its members are all examples of passive conduct (Duckitt, 2001).

Types of prejudice. Klein (2018) elaborated two distinct forms of prejudice including subtle and blatant prejudice.

Subtle prejudice. Subtle Prejudice is the covert of prejudice (Villano et al., 2020). It is relatively modern and indirect form of prejudice. Prejudice can be conveyed

in a number of ways, including explicitly and directly, as well as in subtle, indirect, and secret ways. The gap or refusals of sympathy for a particular out-group, or the distortion of differences, are two examples (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Covert prejudices are made up of a set of arguments that, upon closer inspection, turn out to be identical regardless of the target group. The negative features of covert prejudice are: foolishness, lethargy and laziness, uncleanliness, bodily feebleness and mental uncertainty, delinquency, deceitfulness and craftiness. Individuals with subtle prejudice may be largely unaware of their prejudice feelings due to the distance between conventional prejudicial views and the displacement of prejudice feelings onto more abstract social and political issues (Blanton & Jaccard, 2008).

Blatant prejudice. The conventional and direct type of prejudice is blatant prejudice. Overt prejudice (open prejudice, old-fashioned racism) is described as prejudice that expresses a strongly negative generalized attitude (Villano & Passini, 2020). The victims of prejudice are often suspected of posing a danger to the in-group. They can also be conveyed by keeping an open distance from members of an out-group via personal communication. Overt prejudice also includes fault attributions, in which individuals are told that their own actions are to blame for prejudices or even persecution. Out groups are often used as scapegoats for a number of political, economic, and social issues.

These variations in style are reflected in the components of prejudice discovered in social psychological studies. In research on blatant prejudice, two elements keep cropping up (Lankester et al., 2020). The out-distance group's is the first thing to remember. Blatant racism, in its most extreme form, involves the belief in the out-genetic group's inferiority. As a result, any out-group disadvantages of society are explained away, and inequality is denied. The resistance to initiating communication with the out community is the second aspect of blatant prejudice. The emotional resistance to any intergroup sexual interaction or intermarriage is the subject of this anti-intimacy portion.

Religious and sectarian prejudice. There are many types of prejudice the prejudice on the basis of affiliation to a particular religion or sect is called the religious or sectarian prejudice respectively (Haddad & Fanar, 2020). Sectarian prejudice is

manifested in different religions such as Christianity which is second largest religion after Islam. There are many sects in Christianity; the most important are Christians Catholics, and Protestants. Division between one group and another is basically based on the basis of nature of Jesus, Because of their theologies and practices that they found to be in breach of their understanding, the jurisdiction of apostolic succession, eschatology, and papal primary protestants are distinct from the catholic church. This difference of opinion between the sects in Christianity leads towards hatred, envy, and violence even. The concept of sects also prevails in Hinduism which is based on the devotions of people to a particular God. Vaishnavism, Shaktism, and Smartism are the most well-known and have the highest followings among these sects. The sects usually concentrate on bhakti, or devotion to a single deity (Shah, 2006).

In the religion Islam, there are two main sects or decision Sunni and Shia. Between Shia and Sunni, there is strong discrimination based on religious beliefs (Mahsood, 2017). Sectarian prejudice and discrimination are increasing day by day in different Muslim countries like Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and many of the Middle East countries. In context of Pakistan the sectarian prejudice and discrimination among two religious' groups (i.e., Shia & Sunni) is a major problem which is leading towards the sectarian violence (Siddiqui, 2015). Sectarian intolerance is increasing in society and people holding prejudice opinions about another religious, ethnic, or sectarian group automatically leading to violence against the other out-groups (Javaid, 2011).

West have more researches on race and ethnicity but Increased interest in religious bigotry has resulted from the growing impact of religious fundamentalism on all aspects of politics (Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2005). After 9/11 (9Th September) the prejudice attitudes towards Muslims increased worldwide and people started perceiving people Muslims as terrorists. In many cultures around the world, narrow-minded views contribute to bigotry, discrimination, malice, and ill-will against members, or assumed members, of a religious denomination.

Prejudices are still prevalent in developed world. The results of one of the surveys showed that near 40% Americans are ready to accept on the public forum that prejudiced feelings towards Muslims and they also demand the Arab should carry their special

identification cards (Lösel et al., 2020). These negative feelings lead to crimes and even to genocide and develop different phobias for example, Islamophobia (Imran et al., 2019).

Similarly, a brief study of religious discrimination and sectarianism in Scotland was conducted, which looked at key scholarly and research studies that looked at different problems within the subject area of attitudes to religion, religion discrimination, and sectarianism. The papers covered systemic and attitudinal discrimination, as well as racism and discrimination towards and against different faith groups, such as the dispute in Scotland between catholic and protestant cultures. The findings revealed that sectarianism refers to a social context in which religious groups face systemic discrimination in their daily lives (McAspurren, 2005).

Sectarianism is deep rooted in the history of Pakistan since its independence. Many studies have been done to identify causes and roots of sectarianism in the history of Pakistan. A research has been done on history of sectarianism in Pakistan which explains the roots sectarianism in Pakistan. Sectarian fatwas issued by religious scholars and organizations were some of the precursors to sectarian violence, adding fuel to the fire of sectarian organizations' violent activities. Sectarianism, it was concluded, is an act of mobilizing one group against another for political and economic benefit by religious means. While religious relics may be used by perpetrators of sectarian violence, power struggles, political environment, cultural climate, and economic gains are the main factors that lead to sectarianism in Pakistan (Masood, 2017). This issue was again highlighted in another study which was conducted on the radicalization of Shia and Sunni identifies in Pakistan. The study revealed that radical sectarianism is a medium of religious change (not just an expression of it) and imported for that reason Sunni and Shia activists and scholars are precursors for sectarian violence in Pakistan (Akbarzadeh & Shahram, 2019).

Another study was conducted on the predictive role of religious orientation and social dominance orientation and social dominance orientation in prejudice attitudes towards members of out-groups parental prejudice on the development of gender and sectarian prejudice in adolescents were also investigated. Results revealed that there is

feedback loop between prejudice and aggression. The results also showed that the parents reported more prejudice for opposite gender and sect than adolescents (Khan, 2015).

Another study in Pakistan was conducted to study prejudice and social distance between Shias and Sunnis and explored along the demographic variables such that education and place of living. The results revealed a significant difference between the places of living such that sectarian prejudice is more prevalent in the subjects from Gilgit as compared to Islamabad (Mir, 2002).

Theories and Approaches Explaining Sectarian Prejudice

Prejudice and intergroup conflict have been the topic on which a lot of researches have been conducted in the field of psychology. These researches have put forth an abundance of theories and approaches on the causes and effects of prejudice (Bibi & Majida, 2020). The various approaches comprise of social psychological approaches, the cognitive approaches, and the personality approaches.

Personality approaches. The studies conducted on inter group conflict and prejudice have been centered on the difference in personality and in individuals (McKay & Cathy, 2018) on the concept of generalized prejudice, the dogmatization and close minded theory (Stagnaro et al., 2020), the right wing authoritarianism theory (Bizumic et al., 2018), the social conformity and though mindedness concept (Dukitt, Wagner, DuPlessius, Birum, 2002), and social dominance theory (Sidaninud & Pratto, 1999) all these theories explain prejudice. People having more aggressive tendencies tend to have more prejudice in them likewise people having close minded concepts will have more stereotypic and prejudicial attitudes. As these types of people are not easily convinced and have permanent and strong ideologies. Social dominance theory also explains the development of prejudicial attitudes very. Newer studies have focused on the relationship between and basic personality, the big five personality factors (Ekehammer & Akrani, 2003). There is an abundance of data that supports that prejudiced personality prejudice, as it was worked upon in some researches in social psychology (Turner & Reynolds, 2011).

Social psychological approaches. Prejudice and intergroup rivalry are considered personality problems by personality psychologists, but they are considered social psychological phenomena by social psychologists. The social psychological explanation for discrimination and intergroup conflict is derived from a similar source as the personality explanation. Beukeboom et al. (2015) claimed that categorization, a critical mechanism for simplifying a complex environment, is a key factor. People think in terms of group membership, classifying others into in-group and out-group, us and them, and preferring in-group members while denying or showing negative prejudice against out-group members. When a person identifies himself to a particular group, he eventually sees his group better and creates biasness towards other groups. This biasness leads to prejudice attitudes.

Supporting Allport work on the idea that categorization leads to intergroup prejudice, Tajfel (as cited in Mangum, Maruice, & Ray, 2018) gave a theory of his own by the name of social identify. Staying within the outline of social identify theory, the engagement in categorization is inspired by motivational factors and people are urged to see they're in group in a better than the other groups.

Bandura (as cited in Akers et al., 2019), in his social learning theory, describes an individual's attitude through the mutual interaction of personal factors, behavior, and environment. According to this model, man achieves understanding of his environment, observing his opinion and his decisions and finally according to his decisions. Learning theory clarified prejudice gaining as well as expansion in relations with mechanism such as imitation, reinforcement, and paired associate learning. White et al. (2020), for example, highlighted the straight transmission of parental words.

Relationship Among Parenting Styles, Adverse Childhood Experiences, and Sectarian Prejudice Tendencies

Authoritarian parenting has been related to the likelihood of child violence in research (Brosnan et al., 2020). In a group sample of parents, child abuse potential was discovered to be positively linked with aggressive parenting methods and negatively associated with responsive and reliable parenting, despite the fact that parenting style was

not explicitly assessed (Margolin et al., 2003). Low self-esteem, poor social skills, an external locus of authority, moderate academic performance, higher rates of depression, and a lack of independence and motivation are all linked to authoritarian parenting (Awong, Grusec, & Sorenson, 2008; Buboltz et al., 2007).

There is a large body of evidence linking these parenting styles to behavioral issues in children and adolescents. In common, authoritarian parenting in childhood and adolescence is linked to externalizing and internalizing issues (e.g. Steinberg et al., 2006). Permissive and authoritarian parenting, on the other hand, are also linked to externalizing and internalizing issues, such as internalized anxiety, conduct disorder, and offending behavior (Thompson et al., 2003). For instance, parent-reported authoritative parenting was associated with less disruptive behavior in a sample of 3 to 6 year olds (Querido et al., 2002).

Buliva (2019) demonstrated that children living in authoritarian homes seemed isolated, depressed, nervous, and insecure. When these children were angry, they reacted with implicit and emotional hostility (Sandstrom, 2007). Maugi (2019) was able to replicate the results, adding that girls raised in this setting appeared to be dependent and unmotivated, while boys appeared to be angry and defiant. Having grown up in an authoritarian environment influenced children's willingness to be parented, causing them to often respond violently and hostilely toward their parents (Taraban, 2018).

The majority of Western scholars characterize authoritarian parenting as a harsh and challenging style (Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009; Timpano et al., 2010). Children are disadvantaged by this nurturing style because they have no choice but to follow their parents, even though they dislike it. Authoritarian parents' children often learn to depend on their parents rather than think for themselves. They lack self-assurance and are unable to take initiative. The children's reaction has a negative effect on their cognitive, emotional, and social development.

Over-control (as manifested in the prevention of control and over-protection) and lack of acceptance (as manifested in the absence of warmth and rejection) are linked to increased anxiety and anxiety disorders in children (e.g., Erozkan, 2012; Spokas &

Heimberg, 2009; Wei & Kendall, 2014).

Adverse Childhood Experiences have also been linked to subsequent abuse, whether as a survivor, attacker, or sometimes both, in general population studies of Adverse Childhood Experiences. According to a nationally representative survey of nearly 4,000 participants in England, respondents with four or more Adverse Childhood Experiences were seven times more likely to have been a victim of violence in the previous year and eight times more likely to have committed a violent act. Those who had four or more Adverse Childhood Experiences were 14 times more likely to have been abused in the previous year in Wales, and 15 times more likely to have perpetrated it (Bellis et al., 2015).

Retrospective analyses of the background experiences of individuals who commit crimes show extremely high levels of childhood hardship. In a survey of 151 adult male offenders who were recommended for psychiatric care for nonsexual child neglect, domestic violence, sexual offending, and stalking. Reavis, Looman, Franco, and Rojas (2013) discovered that the average number of Adverse Childhood Experiences was 3.7, and that four times as many females as males in a normative study reported having four or more Adverse Childhood Experiences. Similarly, a study of almost 700 adult male sex offenders (Levenson, Willis, & Prescott, 2016) found that Adverse Childhood Experiences were found to be more common than in the general population, with the chances of emotional violence being 13 times higher and parental separation and emotional neglect happening four times more often than in the general population.

Simi et al. (2016) found considerable presence of childhood risk factors and teenage behavior issues as precursors to membership in violent militant groups in a peer-reviewed research article focused on 44 in-depth life-history interviews with former members of violent white supremacist groups. They believe that social-psychological mechanisms involving emotion and cognition directly influence the impact of risk factors on subsequent involvement in antisocial activity and criminally focused groups, including violent extremist groups.

The interaction of genetic predispositions, socializing factors, and situational

determinants may lead to the formation of intergroup attitudes (Hatemi et al., 2009; Verhust & Hatemi, 2013). Children's behaviors are heavily influenced by early socialization experiences, and also by strong adult influence (Bigler & Liben, 2007; McGlothlin & Killen, 2010). Socializing agents play a part in this process, meaning that children's intergroup attitudes are a feature of their parents' attitudes through the social transmission process (Aboud, 2008; Nesdale and Flessner, 2001). A number of studies show a clear correlation between parents' and children's racial views when it comes to ethnic discrimination (O'Bryan et al., 2004; Jaspers et al., 2008; Rodriguez-Garcia & Wagner, 2009; Dhont & Van Hiel, 2012; Dhont et al., 2013; Meeusen, 2014), while other studies discovered only a limited correspondence (Hello et al., 2004; Vittrup & Holden, 2011). A recent meta-analysis found that children's and parents' intergroup attitudes are related, with effect sizes ranging from small to moderate (Degner & Dalege, 2013).

Castelli et al. (2009) discovered that mothers' implicit prejudices predict their preschool children's racial attitudes; however, these authors only use an explicit test. Pirchio, Passiatore, and Carrus (2017) found that parental blatant and subtle bias are related to young children's prejudice in different ways, which is consistent with previous findings (e.g., Castelli et al., 2009). In reality, children's explicit prejudice appears to be irrelevant to their parents' overt or covert prejudice. It's not surprising that children's implicit racial prejudice is positively predicted by their parents' level of subtle ethnic prejudice, given the wide body of empirical evidence on dual process accounts of human cognition, affect, decision making, and behaviour (Kahneman, 2002; Strack and Deutsch, 2004). It was also revealed that an authoritarian parenting style is positively associated with parental prejudice (both overt and covert), while an authoritative parenting style is negatively associated with parental blatant prejudice. Children's implicit attitudes, on the other hand, can be affected by their parents' subtle prejudices, which are beyond their control. To conclude, the environment in which children grow up, including parental behaviors, play a role, but different aspects of implicit and explicit social cognition must also be taken into account to fully account for prejudice formation in childhood (e.g., Baron & Banaji, 2006; Castelli et al., 2009).

Parenting Styles, Adverse Childhood Experiences, and Sectarian Prejudice Tendencies: Pakistani Perspective

Indigenous studies have been conducted in relation to the present study variables. With reference to parenting styles, Sarwar (2016) examined the effect of parenting style on the creation of delinquency among Pakistani juveniles through qualitative studies. Detailed interviews with two mothers of children involved in illegal activity revealed that parents' excessive control over their children made them disobedient, and they later embraced problematic actions among themselves. The authoritative parenting style, on the other hand, is beneficial to children because it promotes a moderate parenting style. It is proposed that parents be given the chance to study positive parenting styles in order to discourage child misbehavior or criminal behavior. Another study by Talib, Abdullah, and Mansor (2011) claimed that a child's family is a sociocultural-economic arrangement that has a direct impact on not only the children's actions but also their character growth. As a result, ignorance in their parenting can lead to unintended negative outcomes, such as behavioral issues in children.

With regards to adverse childhood experiences, Haaris (2017) discovered that people who had more ACEs had more impulsivity, which led to more motor impulsivity and disrupted executive functioning. In a study conducted by Viqar (2018), Kharadar, Karachi's center and textile industry, stands out from the rest of the city because of its weak infrastructure, high levels of poverty, low maternal literacy, and socio-cultural history. Residents of Kharadar, a historic inner-city neighborhood, face both perceived and real state and non-state abuse, including social, state, and political violence.

Zahid (2020) found that social dominance orientation and perceived threat positively predict sectarian prejudice among adolescents. Empathy was found to be negatively associated with sectarian prejudice. Perception of unfair treatment also predicted sectarian prejudice. The results of study also demonstrated that sectarian prejudice tendencies tend to be high among boys.

Rationale of the Study

The aims of this study are to identify correlations parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice among adolescents. Adolescents are targeted for the research investigation because adolescence is the first and foremost representation of childhood experiences. According to Lang (2018), children who experience a parental style characterized by greater warmth, acceptance and nurturance are protected at a good pace of adjustment in their lives. Adverse childhood experiences are highly prevalent in general population all over the world (Kisser et al., 2010). Prejudice is a century old problem for many societies; social scientists are trying to investigate the predictors and causes for sectarian prejudice. Among the predictors literature highlights the social dominance orientation, perceived threats and empathy as strongest predictors for the prejudice among groups (Aboud, 2005). There is a scarce literature available on the predictors in Pakistan especially in adolescents.

Despite the fact that there is a significant body of literature on prejudice in adult populations, little is known about prejudice growth during childhood and adolescence. When it comes to the study of prejudice, adolescence is a critical and responsive developmental period. This is due to the fact that attitudes toward the other develop and crystalize over time (Kiesner et al., 2003). The majority of prejudice development theories and studies have primarily concentrated on children aged 4 to 12. From the ages of ten to twenty, little is known about prejudice, particularly in terms of growth (White et al., 2009). Adolescents therefore represent an under studied population. Present study will give insight to the factors which are more evident in producing sectarian prejudice tendencies.

Few studies have been conducted to study various aspects of sectarian prejudice and the factors responsible for predicting tendencies of behaviors. New studies can be conducted in the area of sectarian prejudice to analyze the factors that affect sectarian prejudice. Prior studies have shown that although basic understanding of parenting styles have been established but there is a need to focus on under researched aspect of parental role in determining sectarianism and discriminating attitude among adolescents. Various studies have shown multiple contradictory outcomes of adverse childhood experiences

which highlighted the need to investigate its relation in shaping certain social attitude.

Lack of examples investigating the relationship of tendencies of sectarian prejudice with parenting styles and adverse childhood experiences in Pakistan the Highlight need to examine the relationship between parenting styles and adverse childhood experiences; hence, aim of the current investigation is to examine the association between parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice.

METHOD

Chapter 2

Method

Objectives

The study's objectives were to

1. To investigate the role of parenting styles and adverse childhood experiences in developing tendencies of sectarian prejudice among adolescents.
2. To explore the role of demographics (age, gender, parental education, and birth order) in parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences, and sectarian prejudice.

Hypotheses

Based upon literature, it is assumed that:

- 1a) Authoritative parenting is negatively associated with authoritarian and permissive parenting.
- 1b) Authoritarian parenting is positively associated with permissive parenting.
- 2) Authoritative parenting is likely to be negatively associated with adverse childhood experiences, and tendencies of sectarian prejudice.
- 3) Permissive and authoritarian parenting is likely to be positively related with adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice.
- 4) Adverse childhood experiences will be positively related with tendencies of sectarian prejudice.
- 5) Boys are likely to express more authoritarian and permissive parenting and higher tendencies of sectarian prejudice as compared to girls.
- 6) Adolescents with better parental education are more likely to express more positive parenting and less experiences of adverse childhood and tendencies of sectarian prejudice.

Operational Definitions of Variables

Parenting styles. It involves a series of parenting techniques used by parents to raise their children (Horizons, 2020). In the present study parenting styles were assessed

with Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991). The scale comprised of three subscales namely authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting. High score on each subscale indicates more experience of that type of parenting.

Adverse childhood experiences. ACEs are a category of traumatic stressors that, when encountered before the age of 18, have a detrimental impact on a range of behavioural and health outcomes in adults (Brown et al., 2009). It may include economic hardships, domestic violence, spousal abuse, household drug abuse, domestic psychiatric illness, parental separation or divorce, and imprisoned household members are all examples of abuse and neglect (Danese, 2012). In the present study, this construct was measured with The Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire (Felitti et al., 1998), and high score indicates more adverse childhood experiences.

Sectarian prejudice. It is the prejudice which is based on one's affiliation to a particular sect (Brewer, 1992). In the present study, this construct was measured using Sectarian Prejudice Scale (Zahid, 2020), and high scores indicate the high levels of sectarian prejudice in the participants.

Instruments

Parental Authority Questionnaire. Buri (1991) developed Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ), and its translation in Urdu was done a National Institute of Psychology, Islamabad. According to Babree (1997), alpha coefficient reliabilities of subscales of PAQ for father range from .76 to .80, and that for mother range from .80 to .82. Alpha reliability coefficient of the overall PAQ for father was .60, and .66 for mother which is acceptable reliability. Babree conducted her research on sample of school going children, and the results were quite reliable. The targeted sample of the current research were also school going adolescents. The scale is a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Totally true) to 4 (Totally false). High score on each parenting style indicates the frequent use of that parenting style.

Sectarian Prejudice Scale. The scale was developed by Zahid (2020) and includes 18 items scale which consists of three subscales indication Personal Attribution 6 items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6). The score on this subscales ranges from 6 to 30 with high

score indicating high negative personal attribution. The second subscale is Social Distance which consists of 6 items (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12). The score on this subscale ranges from 6 to 30 with high score indicating less social contact and interaction with the out-group. The third subscale, Lack of Relatedness, having 6 items (13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18) has a score range of 6 to 30. It is a 4 point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly agree) to 4 (Strongly disagree). High score indicates lack of relatedness and connection with the out-group. The overall high score indicates high sectarian prejudice.

Adverse Childhood Experiences. The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) Questionnaire (Felitti et al., 1998) is a 10-item measure used to assess childhood trauma. It is a dichotomous scale, a value of 1 is assigned to Yes, and 2 is assigned to No. High score indicates more childhood traumas.

Demographic sheet. A comprehensive demographic sheet was created for the current study in order to obtain information for demographic variables including age, gender, education, type of school, family system, whether mother and father are alive or deceased, father and mother's education, father and mother's occupation, sect, birth order, and if the participant was the only child.

Research Design

The study used a correlational and cross-sectional research design. Survey method was used for the purpose of data collection.

Sample

The sample consisted of 200 school going adolescents currently enrolled in either 8th, 9th, or 10th grade from 14 to 16 years of age. Data was collected by visiting the secondary, and high public and private schools and academies based in Rawalpindi, and Islamabad.

Table 1

Demographics characteristics of the sample (N = 200)

Demographics	<i>f</i> (%)	Demographics	<i>f</i> (%)
Gender		Type of School	
Boys	60 (30)	Government	106 (53)
Girls	140 (70)	Private	94 (47)
Age		Family System	
Early adolescents (11-13)	70 (35)	Joint	124 (62)
Middle adolescents (14-16)	130 (65)	Nuclear	76 (38)
Education		Mother	
Grade 7 th	18 (9)	Alive	200 (100)
Grade 8 th	182 (91)	Father	
Father's Education		Alive	194 (97)
Matric	38 (19)	Deceased	6 (3)
Graduate	105 (52.5)	Father's Occupation	
Post-graduate	57 (28.5)	Employed	179 (89.5)
Mother's Education		Unemployed	21 (10.5)
Matric	55 (27.5)	Mother's Occupation	
Graduate	108 (54)	Employed	41 (20.5)
Post-graduate	37 (18.5)	Unemployed	159 (79.5)
Sect		Birth Order	
Shia	108 (54)	First	60 (30)
Sunni	92 (46)	Middle	100 (50)
Only Child			

Yes	200 (100)	Last	40 (20)
-----	-----------	------	---------

The Table illustrates that the frequency/percentage of girls is higher than boys, middle adolescents are more than early adolescents, 8th graders are the highest in number, the parents of all the participants are living together, the higher percentage of participants are enrolled in government schools, the prevalence was joint family system is more frequent, the mothers of all participants are alive whereas major percentage of fathers are alive as well, higher percentage of mothers and fathers are graduates, frequent number of fathers are employed whereas mothers are unemployed, the higher percentage of participants are Shia, and the birth order of most participants is middle.

Procedure

The potential sample of school going adolescents was approached in schools of Islamabad and Rawalpindi by visiting the schools and academies. Before the concerned representatives of the target sample start filling the questionnaires. They were told about the study's intent, the voluntary nature of participation, and their right to withdraw at any time. Their consent for participating in this research was taken. They were provided with the questionnaire booklet (consisting of informed consent form see Appendix A, demographic information sheet (see Appendix B), and the three questionnaires). All who took part in the study were told that their details would be kept private and that their privacy would be secured. After getting the booklet back, for their cooperation, they were praised.

RESULTS

Chapter 3

Results

The statistical analysis consists of descriptive and inferential statistics while in descriptive statistics includes means, standard deviation, skewness, range and Cronbach's α whereas in inferential statistics Pearson product moment correlation, regression, t test and ANOVA were included. To determine the normality of data, skewness is computed. Furthermore, t-test is computed in order to calculate the mean differences among age, gender, and sect.

Cronbach's Alpha Reliabilities and Descriptive Statistics

The Table shows psychometric properties of all the scales used in present study. Cronbach's alpha reliability was used to estimate of reliabilities of measure. Descriptive analysis including mean, standard deviation, ranges, skewness, and kurtosis of scales were used to check the distribution of score.

Table 2

Mean, Standard Deviation and Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Parenting Styles, Adverse Childhood Experiences, and Tendencies of Sectarian Prejudice (N = 200)

Scales	k	α	M	SD	$Skew$	$Kurt$	$Range$	
							Potential	Actual
Parenting Styles Questionnaire-Mothers' Form	30	.70	69.60	6.14	.89	1.75	30-120	41-103
Parenting Styles Questionnaire-Fathers' Form	30	.72	71.90	7.07	.74	1.43	30-120	42-118
Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire	8	.72	10.30	1.94	.71	-1.31	8-16	8-13
Sectarian Prejudice Scale	18	.70	39.20	5.47	.19	1.07	18-72	20-62

Note. k = no. of items; $Skew$ = Skewness; $Kurt$ = Kurtosis; PSQ = Parenting Style Questionnaire; ACEQ = Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire; SPS = Sectarian Prejudice Scale.

The Table 2 shows descriptive statistics of the scales. Results show that alpha measures of internal consistency that is alpha co-efficient of all scales fall in the range of

.60 to .72 indicating that all scales have acceptable reliability. The values of skewness and kurtosis also fall in the normal range.

Relationship Among Variables

Pearson Product Moment Correlation is conducted in order to find the direction and trend in relationships among parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences, and tendencies of sectarian prejudice.

Table 3

Correlation Among Study Variables (N = 200)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1 Parenting Style-Permissive	-	.76*	-.66*	.42*	.40**
2 Parenting Style-Authoritarian		-	-.60*	.40*	.58*
3 Parenting Style -Authoritative			-	-.36*	-.55*
4 Adverse Childhood Experiences				-	.45*
5 Sectarian Prejudice					-

* $p < .00$

The Table 2 indicates the coefficients of correlation between study variables. There is a significant positive relationship of permissive and authoritarian parenting with sectarian prejudice and adverse childhood experiences. In addition, authoritative parenting shows negative association with adverse childhood experiences and sectarian prejudice. Conversely, in relation to parenting styles, authoritative parenting shows negative association with authoritarian and permissive parenting style and authoritarian parenting shows positive association with permissive parenting style.

Table 4

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Predictors of Sectarian Prejudice Among Adolescents (N = 200)

	β	S.E	p	95% CI	
				LL	UL
Step 1					
Constant		10.80	.51	14.16	28.41
Age	.19	.64	.47	.43	2.98
Education	.07	3.01	.30	2.85	9.04
Step 2					
Constant		8.80		28.71	63.42
Constant		.23	.00	-.96	-.06
Age	-.05	1.01	.02	-6.41	-2.42
Education	-.10	.22	.00	-.64	-.24
PS- Permissive	.35	.07	.00	.15	.49
PS- Authoritarian	.40	.08	.00	-.35	-.05
PS-Authoritative	-.27	.08	.01		
Adverse Childhood Experiences	.41	.01	.00	0.12	3.40
R ²	.04	.27			
ΔR^2	.04	.25			
F	5.07	41.13			

Table 4 indicates Multiple Linear Regression. Results indicate that all of the predictor variables (authoritative, permissive, and authoritarian parenting, adverse childhood experiences) predict sectarian prejudice which is the outcome variable. Permissive, and authoritarian parenting as well as adverse childhood experiences positively predict sectarian prejudice while authoritative parenting negatively predicts sectarian prejudice,

Group Differences Across Study Variables

Gender differences. Gender differences were measured on parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences, and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Purpose of this test was to explore the role of gender in the study variables. To compare male ($n = 60$) and female ($n = 140$) participants, independent sample t -test is performed (see Table 5).

Table 5

Gender Differences Across Study Variables (N=200)

Variables	Boys (<i>n</i> = 60)		Girls (<i>n</i> = 140)		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i>		<i>Cohen's d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
PS-Permissive	43.66	8.14	40.90	6.71	2.01	.01	1.47	8.40	.40
PS -Authoritarian	40.00	10.00	38.38	4.07	3.48	.00	0.37	8.47	.30
PS-Authoritative	39.66	3.30	42.14	4.57	2.75	.01	-8.67	-1.28	.60
ACE	9.71	2.30	12.66	1.60	3.15	.00	0.10	4.26	.47
Sectarian Prejudice	42.66	3.50	40.28	4.53	3.22	.00	0.27	6.39	.59

Note. LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit; CI = Confidence Interval; PS = Parenting Style; ace = Adverse Childhood Experiences.

Table 5 presents gender differences in relation to study variables. It has been found that boys express higher perceptions of permissive parenting and authoritarian parenting while girls exhibited more perception of authoritative parenting. In addition, findings revealed that girls reported more adverse childhood experiences while boys shared higher indication of sectarian prejudice.

Difference across participants' age. Age differences are measured across parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences, and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Purpose of this test is to explore the role of age in the study variables. To compare participants in early adolescents (*n* = 70) and middle adolescents (*n* = 140), independent sample *t*-test is performed (see Table 6).

Table 6

Age Differences Across Study Variables (N=200)

Variables	Early Adolescents (n = 60)		Middle Adolescents (n = 140)		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI		<i>Cohen's d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
PS-Permissive	41.73	5.03	39.81	6.27	2.02	.04	-10.52	-1.61	.31
PS -Authoritarian	36.16	6.15	34.00	7.89	2.08	.03	-10.27	-1.39	.31
PS-Authoritative	43.92	5.32	46.03	6.49	2.14	.03	0.36	9.41	.40
ACE	14.73	2.42	11.56	2.50	2.19	.02	.52	.87	.38
Sectarian Prejudice	38.23	10.70	42.75	8.20	2.15	.03	-5.90	-.87	.30

Note. LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit; CI = Confidence Interval; PS = Parenting Style; ace = Adverse Childhood Experiences; Early Adolescents = 13-14; Middle Adolescents = 14-16;

It has been found that age plays a significant role in study variables. Permissive and authoritarian parenting as well as adverse childhood experiences is high among early adolescents, whereas middle adolescents show high tendencies of sectarian prejudice.

Difference across father's education. Differences across father's education are measured on parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences, and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Purpose of this test is to explore the role of father's education in the study variables. To compare levels of education, one way ANOVA is performed.

Table 7

One-way ANOVA on Father's Education for Study Variables (N = 200)

Variables	Undergraduate (n = 38)		Graduate (n = 105)		Post-graduate (n = 57)		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>i-j</i>	<i>D(i-j)</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>						<i>LB</i>	<i>UB</i>
PS-Permissive	44.37	8.68	42.38	10.03	40.96	9.24	10.42	.00	1 > 2, 1 > 3	2.98, 3.98	.00	4.31	10.29
PS -Authoritarian	45.81	8.69	42.81	9.54	40.42	9.45	7.95	.00	1 > 2, 1 > 3	3.45, 5.97	.00	-8.39	-6.43
PS-Authoritative	37.63	8.58	40.58	7.43	46.43	6.55	9.19	.00	1 < 3, 2 < 3	3.05, 6.25	.00	4.22	10.33
ACE	14.02	2.30	11.26	2.00	9.23	1.28	5.40	.00	1 > 2, 1 > 3	2.23, 4.76	.00	-1.88	-0.35
Sectarian Prejudice	38.84	6.16	36.41	8.07	34.94	7.90	9.42	.00	1 > 2, 1 > 3	2.12, 4.42	.00	1.05	9.89

Note. LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit; CI = Confidence Interval; PS = Parenting Style; ACE = Adverse Childhood Experiences.

Table 7 shows that significant differences are found along father's educations on study variables. It has been found that participants with minimum education level (undergraduates) report higher perception of sectarian prejudice as well as permissive parenting and authoritarian parenting. Participants with fathers who are undergraduates report adverse childhood experiences the most.

Difference across mother's education. Differences across mother's education were measured on parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences, and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Purpose of this test was to explore the role of mother's education in the study variables. To compare levels of education, one way ANOVA was performed.

Table 8

One-way ANOVA on Mother's Education for Study Variables (N = 200)

Variables	Undergraduate (n = 55)		Graduate (n = 108)		Post-graduate (n= 37)		F	p	i-j	D (i-j)	p	95% CI	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD						LB	UB
PS-Permissive	43.37	7.68	41.38	9.03	39.96	8.24	4.52	.00	1 > 2, 1 > 3	2.12, 3.95	.00	-14.11	-1.52
PS -Authoritarian	44.81	8.69	41.81	9.54	38.42	9.45	7.13	.00	1 > 2, 1 > 3	2.98, 9.77	.00	3.49	16.04
PS-Authoritative	38.63	8.58	41.58	7.43	47.43	6.55	6.04	.00	1 < 3, 2 < 3	1.98, 8.90	.00	-15.12	-2.68
ACE	14.02	2.30	12.26	2.00	10.23	1.28	8.43	.00	1 > 2, 1 > 3	2.78, 3.67	.00	.68	2.87
Sectarian Prejudice	39.84	6.16	36.41	8.07	34.94	7.90	15.23	.00	1 > 2, 1 > 3	2.34, 5.12	.00	-14.73	-5.73

Note. LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit; CI = Confidence Interval; PS = Parenting Style; ACE = Adverse Childhood Experiences.

Table 8 presents difference across mother's education along study variables. It has been found that participants having mothers with minimum education (undergraduates) report higher perceptions of sectarian prejudice, permissive parenting as well as authoritarian parenting. They also report adverse childhood experiences the most.

Mean difference across birth order. Differences across birth order are measured on parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences, and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Purpose of this test is to explore the role of birth order in relation with the study variables.

Table 9

One-way ANOVA on Birth Order for Study Variables (N = 200)

Variables	First (<i>n</i> = 60)		Middle (<i>n</i> = 100)		Last (<i>n</i> = 40)		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>i-j</i>	<i>D (i-j)</i>	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>						<i>LB</i>	<i>UB</i>
PS-Permissive	30.60	7.47	33.52	8.28	44.60	5.57	13.64	.00	1<3, 2<3	13.21, 11.08	.00	5.13	17.02
PS -Authoritarian	46.90	4.78	43.46	6.04	33.26	9.68	11.86	.00	1>2, 1>3	3.23, 13.63	.00	6.07	21.19
PS-Authoritative	30.98	9.76	40.00	6.68	33.30	8.14	17.78	.00	1<2, 2>3	13.02, 6.92	.00	7.20	18.83
ACE	10.05	2.60	11.18	1.99	12.65	1.38	7.76	.00	1<3, 2<3	1.47, 1.21	.00	.52	2.41
Sectarian Prejudice	38.58	10.18	33.86	9.71	30.50	7.57	6.67	.00	1>2, 1>3	5.02, 8.21	.00	.41	9.63

Note. LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit; CI = Confidence Interval; PS = Parenting Style; ACE = adverse childhood experiences

Table 9 shows that significant differences are found along birth orders on study variables. Last born adolescents report more experiences of permissive parenting, more adverse childhood experiences and high tendencies of sectarian prejudice whereas adolescents who were middle born expressed more perception of authoritative parenting, while first born reflected higher perception of authoritarian parenting.

DISCUSSION

Chapter 4

Discussion

The aim of this study was find out relationship between parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice among adolescents. The role of several demographic variables with study variables was also explored among adolescents.

To evaluate the internal reliability of the measures, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for all of the scales and subscales. Alpha reliabilities of measures of Parenting Styles, and Sectarian Prejudice were high, whereas the Adverse Childhood Experience Scale was also reported to be good. Alpha reliabilities of scales were overall satisfactory.

Findings show that authoritative parenting is negatively associated with adverse childhood experiences while authoritarian and permissive parenting styles are positively related with adverse childhood experiences. The results imply that adolescents with parents who use permissive and authoritarian parenting style experience adverse childhood experiences the most and adolescents with authoritative parents report less adverse childhood experiences. According Pinguart, Martin, and Kauser (2018), in childhood and adolescence, authoritative parenting is linked to internalizing and externalizing issues. According to research, children who have parents who follow an authoritative style by setting strict limits while keeping a warm and open stance are less depressed (Hadad et al., 2020). Children raised in authoritative families have a higher sense of self-worth, more independence to try new things, and are more altruistic. In addition, the children learn to embrace accountability, make good decisions, cope with change, and are better prepared to succeed in a workforce that values cooperative problem solving. They are confident; achievement oriented and shows superior academic performance in high class (Segrin et al., 2019).

According to Holt and Emily (2019), neglectful parenting may be contrasted with permissive parenting, which leads to a lack of control. Given the prevalence of neglect in families that engage in physical assault, permissive parenting styles are likely to be linked to the risk of abuse. Neglected children have the worst outcomes in a variety of areas,

including lack of self-control and civic conscience, low self-reliance and social competence, poor school competence, antisocial conduct and delinquency, anxiety, depression, and behavior problems (Hoeve et al., 2008). Numerous studies have shown that excessively permissive parents are more likely to have relationships with their children that are less than ideal for their emotional and cognitive growth (Amato & Fowler, 2002; Cuevas et al., 2014).

According to Chahal and Zohra (2019), child abuse potential ratings, which is a type of adverse childhood experience, are linked to authoritarian parenting. Margolin et al. (2005) discovered a link between oppressive parenting and the likelihood of child abuse. Parents who are inattentive, aggressive, cold, or excessively lenient with their children are more likely to have relationships with them that are less than desirable for their emotional and cognitive growth (Amato & Fowler, 2002; Cuevas et al., 2014). Excessive worry and anxiety disorders in childhood are due to over-control (as reflected in the avoidance of autonomy and over-protection) and a lack of understanding (as reflected in the disappearance of comfort and disapproval) (e.g., Erozkhan, 2012; Spokas & Heimberg, 2009; Wei & Kendall, 2014). Authoritarian parenting was also linked to internalized symptoms like anxiety, depression, and somatic disorders, according to Alizadeh et al. (2011).

Results further revealed that authoritative parenting is negatively associated with sectarian prejudice; whereas permissive parenting and authoritarian parenting are positively associated with sectarian prejudice. According to Asher (2006), Adolescents raised in authoritative homes were more self-assured, responsible, and less likely to indulge in drug abuse or delinquent conduct. According to research, families with an authoritarian mentality have an oppressive and submissive atmosphere with rigid rules and punishment. As a result, it was stressed that parents' oppressive actions and guidelines were successful in preventing children from exhibiting violent behavior (Özgür et al., 2011). Thomas (2004) found that children whose parents used a harsh parenting style (a hallmark of authoritarian parenting) are more likely to be aggressive. Authoritarian leadership has been linked to negative behavioral outcomes such as aggressive behavior, poor emotional functioning, depression, and low self-confidence

(Barnes, 2002; Beyers & Goossens, 2003; Pychyl, Coplan, & Reid, 2002; Scales, 2000). As discussed in the discussion of differential association, parents who are more permissive and indulgent appear to raise children who are more affected by their negative associates and delinquent social groups. Low levels of parental monitoring has been related to higher incidence of juvenile conduct, which is also associated with negligent or detached parenting (Jacobson & Crocket, 2000).

Retrospective analyses of the background experiences of individuals who commit crimes show extremely high levels of childhood hardship. An analysis of nearly adult male sex offenders (Levenson, Willis, & Prescott, 2016) revealed that the odds of emotional violence, parental separation, and emotional neglect were significantly higher than in the general population, with emotional abuse, parental separation, and emotional neglect occurring significantly more often than in the general sample.

Gender differences revealed that boys express higher perceptions of permissive parenting and authoritarian parenting while girls exhibited more perception of authoritative parenting. In addition, findings revealed that girls reported more adverse childhood experiences while boys shared higher indication of sectarian prejudice. Notably, Kausar and Shafique (2008) found that Female adolescent perceptions of their fathers' authority were more positive. According to a study, authoritarian parenting, especially physical punishment, is mainly used for boys, whereas girls are given more justification. There is also evidence of gender disparities in ACE exposure, especially sexual assault, with females being significantly more likely to report this event than males (Cavanaugh, Petras, & Martins, 2015; McAnee, Shevlin, Murphy, & Houston, 2019; Roxburgh & MacArthur, 2014; Schilling, Aseltine, & Gore, 2007; Strine et al., 2012). Females are also more likely than males to be diagnosed with PTSD and affective disorders, according to research (Altemus, Sarvaiya, & Neill Epperson, 2014). Males consistently commit more crimes than females, according to surveys of overall crime rates (Olf, 2017).

It has been found that Last born adolescents reported more experiences of permissive parenting, more adverse childhood experiences and high tendencies of sectarian prejudice whereas adolescents who were middle born expressed more

perception of authoritarian parenting, while first born reflected higher perception of authoritative parenting. According to Singh (2020), parents frequently disregard their youngest children's needs due to fatigue from all of their emotional and physical commitment in raising their older children, who become more psychologically overlooked than those who are deprived. Barclay, Hällsten, & Myrskylä (2017) reported that parents were more likely to put unreasonable demands, high expectations, and unfulfilled dreams on their firstborn children, assuming (or hoping) that their children would live up to them. Parents spent more time with their firstborn children, and when they had second born children, they started to change and distinguish their behavior; for example, they became more lenient and flexible, perhaps as a result of the experience they had acquired with the firstborn child.

Difference across parental education revealed that adolescents who have highly educated parents reflect higher perceptions of authoritative parenting and less experience of adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. According to Teti and Candelaria (2002), parents with a higher education exhibited a constructive authoritative style. Child maltreatment (emotional, physical, and sexual abuse; physical or emotional neglect) and household dysfunction are more prevalent among children of less qualified mothers, according to Lotte et al. 2020 (for example, violence between parents, parental separation and parental substance misuse, mental illness or criminal behavior).

Limitations and Suggestions

Like any scientific research, present research also has some weaknesses. Therefore, before interpreting the findings of present research following limitations should be considered which are discussed for future studies.

1. The present study was employing cross-sectional quantitative measures for the present study. However, qualitative and longitudinal study should be carried out to explore the phenomena of sectarian prejudice.
2. This study is helpful for the future researchers by regarding the suggestions and limitations of the study.

3. Self-report measures were used for data collection; it may be possible that participants may have not reported accurately because of social desirability. Therefore, multi-informant data or qualitative techniques of data collection could also be taken in future studies.
4. Mediation and moderation analysis was not done which can be done in future research.
5. The data size was small and only collected from students residing in Islamabad and Rawalpindi hence, to increase external validity large and data from diverse settings can be included.
6. Questionnaire booklet was lengthy and time consuming, boredom may have also affected the findings of present research. So, short version of the instruments could be used in the future.
7. Random sampling technique can be used in the future to obtain more generalizable results can be obtained.

Implications

On the basis of findings, following are a few theoretical and practical implications of the present research.

1. This study will be helpful for research purposes as it will add to the existing knowledge of the variables being studied.
2. This study is helpful for the future researchers, the suggestions and limitations of the present study can be catered in the future.
3. This study is beneficial for understanding the variation related gender, age, birth order, parental education and other demographic variables of the study among adolescents.
4. The present study will be helpful for conceptual understanding of the role of parenting styles and adverse childhood experiences in sectarian prejudice.

Conclusion

The study was conducted to expose the anticipated role of parenting styles along with adverse childhood experiences on the tendencies of sectarian prejudice among

adolescents. Results showed consistency with the previous available literature. Results showed that authoritative parenting style negatively relates with authoritarian and permissive parenting while authoritarian parenting style was positively related with permissive parenting style. Permissive and authoritarian parenting style positively related with adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Authoritative parenting style was negatively related with adverse childhood experiences and tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Adverse childhood experiences positively related with adverse tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Gender differences revealed that authoritarian and permissive parenting as well as tendencies of sectarian prejudice was high among boys, whereas girls reported more adverse childhood experiences and authoritative parenting was high among them as well. Permissive and authoritarian parenting as well as adverse childhood experiences was high among early adolescents, whereas middle adolescents reported high tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Adolescents with fathers who were less educated parents expressed more adverse childhood experiences, and show the highest tendencies of sectarian prejudice. Permissive and authoritarian parenting was high among the participants whose parents were undergraduates. Authoritative parenting was high among adolescents whose parents were more educated. Permissive parenting was high among last born children, authoritarian parenting was high among middle born, and authoritative parenting was high among first born children. Adverse childhood experiences and sectarian prejudice was high among last born.

REFERENCES

References

- Akbarzadeh, S. (2019). The Blurred Line between State Identity and Realpolitik. *Routledge handbook of international relations in the Middle East*, 1.
- Amato, P. R., & Fowler, F. (2002). Parenting practices, child adjustment, and family diversity. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(3), 703-716.
- Atalla, M. (2020). *Caregiver-Adolescent Agreement About Parental Warmth Predicts Youth Behavioural Outcomes* (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University).
- Awong, T., Grusec, J. E., & Sorenson, A. (2008). Respect-based control and anger as determinants of children's socio-emotional development. *Social development*, 17(4), 941-959.
- Ayhan, F., & Özkan, B. (2016). Domestic violence impact on adolescents Aile içi şiddetin ergenler üzerindeki etkisi. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(3), 3753-3767.
- Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). The development of implicit attitudes: evidence of race evaluations from ages 6, 10 and adulthood. *Psychol. Sci.* 17, 53–58.
- Bellis, M. A., Ashton, K., Hughes, K., Ford, K. J., Bishop, J., & Paranjothy, S. (2016). *Adverse childhood experiences and their impact on health-harming behaviours in the Welsh adult population*. Public Health Wales NHS Trust.
- Bellis, M. A., Hughes, K., Leckenby, N., Hardcastle, K. A., Perkins, C. & Lowey, H. (2014) Measuring mortality and the burden of adult disease associated with

adverse childhood experiences in England: a national survey. *Journal of Public Health, 37*, 3, 445–54

Bethell, C., Gombojav, N., Solloway, M., & Wissow, L. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences, resilience and mindfulness-based approaches: common denominator issues for children with emotional, mental, or behavioral problems. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics, 25*(2), 139-156.

Beukeboom, C. J., & Burgers, C. (2019). How stereotypes are shared through language: a review and introduction of the asocial categories and stereotypes communication (SCSC) framework. *Review of Communication Research, 7*, 1-37.

Bibi, M. (2020). *A constructivist grounded theory analysis of how counselling psychologists experience anti-Muslim prejudice* (Doctoral dissertation, London Metropolitan University).

Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (2006). A developmental intergroup theory of social stereotypes and prejudice. *Advances in Child Development and Behaviour, 34*, 39-89.

Bizumic, B., & Duckitt, J. (2018). Investigating right wing authoritarianism with a very short authoritarianism scale. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 6*(1), 129-150.

Blanton, H., & Jaccard, J. (2008). Unconscious racism: A concept in pursuit of a measure. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34*, 277–297

- Bonnaire, C., Liddle, H. A., Har, A., Nielsen, P. & Phan, O. (2019). Why and how to include parents in the treatment of adolescents presenting internet gaming disorder? *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 8(2), 201-212.
- Boonk, L., Gijsselaers, H. J., Ritzen, H., & Brand-Gruwel, S. (2018). A review of the relationship between parental involvement indicators and academic achievement. *Educational Research Review*, 24(3), 10-30.
- Brosnan, T., Kolubinski, D. C., & Spada, M. M. (2020). Parenting styles and metacognitions as predictors of cannabis use. *Addictive Behaviour Reports*, 11, 100259.
- Brown, D. W., Anda, R. F., Tiemeier, H., Felitti, V. J., Edwards, V. J., Croft, J. B. & Giles, W. H. (2009) Adverse childhood experiences and the risk of premature mortality. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 37, 5, 389–96.
- Buboltz, W. C., Griffith-Ross, D. A., Marsiglia, C. S., & Walczyk, J. J. (2007). Impact of parenting styles and locus of control on emerging adults. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 1(1), 34-50.
- Buliva, J. K., Maragia, S. N., & Poipoi, M. W. (2019). Influence of Authoritarian Parenting Style on Forms of Delinquent Behaviour among Secondary School Students in Butere Sub-County, Kenya.
- Carnes, Patrick J. "Betrayal Bond, Revised: Breaking Free of Exploitive Relationships." Hci, 2018.

- Carter, Kirsty. *The relationship between childhood attachment, parenting styles and social development in autism spectrum disorder*. MS thesis. Faculty of Humanities, 2019.
- Castelli, L., Zogmaister, C., & Tomelleri, S. (2009). The transmission of racial attitudes within the family. *Dev. Psychol.* 45, 586–591. doi: 10.1037/a0014619
- Crouch, E., Radcliff, E., Brown, M., & Hung, P. (2019). Exploring the association between parenting stress and a child's exposure to adverse childhood experiences (ACEs). *Children and Youth Services Review*, 102, 186-192.
- Cuevas, K., Deater-Deckard, K., Kim-Spoon, J., Watson, A. J., Morasch, K. C., & Bell, M. A. (2014). What's mom got to do with it? Contributions of maternal executive function and caregiving to the development of executive function across early childhood. *Developmental Science*, 17(2), 224-238.
- Chung, G., Lanier, P., & Wong, P. Y. J. (2020). Mediating effects of parental stress on harsh parenting and parent-child relationship during coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic in Singapore. *Journal of family violence*, 1-12.
- Czyżkowska, A., Kłym, M., & Ciecuch, J. (2019). Polish adaptation of the Parents as Social Context Questionnaire (PASCQ). Towards a synthesis of parental relationship models. *Psychologia Wychowawcza*, 12(2), 89-105.
- Debowska, A., Boduszek, D., & Willmott, D. (2018). Psychosocial correlates of attitudes toward male sexual violence in a sample of financial crime, property crime, general violent, and homicide offenders. *Sexual Abuse*, 30(6), 705-727.

- Dhont, K., & Van Hiel, A. (2012). Intergroup contact buffers against the intergenerational transmission of authoritarianism and racial prejudice. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*(2), 231-234.
- Diener, E. (2009). Subjective well-being. *The science of Well-Being*, 11-58.
- Doepke, Matthias, & Fabrizio Z. (2019). *Love, money, and parenting: How economics explains the way we raise our kids*. Princeton University Press,
- Doepke, Matthias, and Fabrizio Zilibotti. *Love, money, and parenting: How economics explains the way we raise our kids*. Princeton University Press, 2019.
- Donato, Nicole Samantha. *A Phenomenological Exploration of Academic Entitlement on the Community College Adjunct Instructor-Student Relationship*. Diss. Northcentral University, 2020.
- Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual process cognitive – motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 33(2), 41-113. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Durrani, H. (2016). Attitudes of Undergraduates towards Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Context: A Case Study of SBK Women's University Quetta, Pakistan. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 7*(4), 167-172.
- Eagly, A. H., & Diekmann, A. B. (2005). What is the problem? Prejudice as an attitude-in-context. *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*, 19-35.

- Ekehammar, B., & Akrami, N. (2003). The relation between personality and prejudice: A variable- and a person-centred approach. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, 449-464.
- Erozkan, A. (2012). Examination of Relationship between Anxiety Sensitivity and Parenting Styles in Adolescents. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 12*(1), 52-57.
- Ewing, H. (2020). A Retrospective Study: Investigating the Role of Childhood Experience and Parenting Style in the Development of Narcissism.
- Fitzgerald, C. M. (2019). Re-imagining primary school children's citizenship participation (Doctoral dissertation, National University of Ireland Maynooth).
- Garcia, F., Serra, E., Garcia, O. F., Martinez, I., & Cruise, E. (2019). A third emerging stage for the current digital society? Optimal parenting styles in Spain, the United States, Germany, and Brazil. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(13), 2333-2341.
- Garcia, O. F., & Serra, E. (2019). Raising children with poor school performance: Parenting styles and short-and long-term consequences for adolescent and adult development. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(7), 1089-1092.
- Geoffroy, M. C., Gunnell, D., & Power, C. (2014) Prenatal and childhood antecedents of suicide: 50-year follow-up of the 1958 British Birth Cohort Study. *Psychological Medicine, 44*, 1245–56

- 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.
- Hadad, S., Meishar-Tal, H., & Blau, I. (2020). The parents' tale: Why parents resist the educational use of smartphones at schools? *Computers and Education*, 157, 103984.
- Haddad, F. (2020). Understanding 'Sectarianism': Sunni-Shi'a Relations in the Modern Arab World. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Hatemi, P. K., Funk, C., Maes, H., Silberg, J., Medland, S., Martin, N., & Eaves, L. (2009). Genetic influences on social attitudes over the life course. *Journal of Politics*, 71(3), 1141-56.
- Hello, E., Scheepers, P., Vermulst, A., & Gerris, J. R. (2004). Association between educational attainment and ethnic distance in young adults: Socialization by schools or parents? *Acta Sociological*, 47(3), 253-275.
- Herndon, J. (2014). Teaching with Tables: A Case Study Investigating Affective and Psychomotor Responses in High School Students and Teachers.
- Hock, R. S., Mendelson, T., Surkan, P. J., Bass, J. K., Bradshaw, C. P., & Hindin, M. J. (2018). Parenting styles and emerging adult depressive symptoms in Cebu, the Philippines. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 55(2), 242-260.

- Hoeve, M., Blokland, A., Dubas, J. S., Loeber, R., Gerris, J. R., & Van der Laan, P. H. (2008). Trajectories of delinquency and parenting styles. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *36*(2), 223-235.
- Holman, D. M., Ports, K. A., Buchanan, N. D., Hawkins, N. A., Merrick, M. T., Metzler, M., & Trivers, K. F. (2016). The association between adverse childhood experiences and risk of cancer in adulthood: a systematic review of the literature. *Pediatrics*, *138*(Supplement 1), S81-S91.
- Holt, E. (2019). *'Not so much 'after landscape' as 'before landscape'': Figurative Experimentation in the Works of Claudia Rankine and Mary McIntyre* (Doctoral dissertation, Trinity College Dublin. School of English. Discipline of English).
- Kahneman, D. (2002). Maps of bounded rationality: a perspective on intuitive judgment and choice. *Nobel Prize Lecture*, *8*(2), 351–401.
- Klein, C., Lühr, M., & Streib, H. (2018). Extant empirical research on religiosity and prejudice. In *Xenosophia and Religion. Biographical and Statistical Paths for a Culture of Welcome*, *12*(2), 23-84.
- Kuppens, S., & Ceulemans, E. (2019). Parenting styles: A closer look at a well-known concept. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *28*(1), 168-181.
- Lankester, L. A., & Alexopoulos, T. (2020). From diversity ideologies to the expression of stereotypes: Insights into the cognitive regulation of prejudice within the cultural-ecological context of French Laïcité. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(2), 22-35.

- Lehr, C. A., Tan, C. S., & Ysseldyke, J. (2009). Alternative schools: A synthesis of state-level policy and research. *Remedial and Special Education, 30*(1), 19-32.
- Lereya, S. T., Winsper, C., Heron, J., Lewis, G., Gunnell, D., Fisher, H. L., & Wolke, D. (2013). Being bullied during childhood and the prospective pathways to self-harm in late adolescence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 52*(6), 608-618.
- Levenson, J. S., Willis, G. M., & Prescott, D. S. (2015). Adverse childhood experiences in the lives of female sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse, 27*(3), 258-283.
- Levine, S. L., Werner, K. M., Capaldi, J. S., & Milyavskaya, M. (2017). Let's play the blame game: The distinct effects of personal standards and self-critical perfectionism on attributions of success and failure during goal pursuit. *Journal of Research in Personality, 71*, 57-66.
- Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 483– 496
- Llorens, S., Schaufeli, W., Bakker, A., & Salanova, M. (2007). Does a positive gain spiral of resources, efficacy beliefs and engagement exist? Computers in human behavior, *23*(1), 825-841.
- Lösel, F., Bender, D., Jugl, I., & King, S. (2020). Resilience against political and religious extremism, radicalization, and related violence: A systematic review of studies on protective factors. *Understanding Recruitment to Organized Crime and Terrorism, 12*(2), 55-84.

- Lu, Yu, et al. (2020). How does family communication relate to adolescent dating violence and externalizing behaviors? The role of parent-adolescent risk communication and attitudes toward violence in a Nicaraguan sample. *Health Communication, 3*(1), 1-10.
- Lyell, K. M., Coyle, S., Malecki, C. K., & Santuzzi, A. M. (2020). Parent and peer social support compensation and internalizing problems in adolescence. *Journal of School Psychology, 83*(4), 25-49.
- Mangum, M., & Block, R. (2018). Social identity theory and public opinion towards immigration. *Social Sciences, 7*(3), 41.
- Margolin, G. & Gordis, E. B. (2003). Co-occurrence between marital aggression and parents' child abuse potential: The impact of cumulative stress. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 243-258.
- Maugi, T. M. (2019). *Relationship between Parenting Practices and Behavior Outcomes among Students in Public Secondary Schools in Tharaka Nithi County, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, Chuka University).
- McGothlin, H., & Killen, M. (2010). How social experience is related to children's intergroup attitudes, US: *European Journal of Social Psychology Eur. J. Soc. Psychol, 40*, 625-634.
- McKay, C. (2018). THE value of contact: Unpacking Allport's contact theory to support inclusive education. *Palaestra, 32*(1).

- Meeusen, C., & Dhont, K. (2015). Parent-child similarity in common and specific components of prejudice: The role of ideological attitudes and political discussion. *European Journal of Personality, 29*(6), 585-598.
- Milburn, T. J., Doppler, J., Holmes, C. A., Portolan, S., Rotter, S., & Rabl, P. (2015). General description of quasiadiabatic dynamical phenomena near exceptional points. *Physical Review A, 92*(5), 052124.
- Mowen, T. J., & Schroeder, R. D. (2018). Maternal parenting style and delinquency by race and the moderating effect of structural disadvantage. *Youth and Society, 50*(2), 139-159.
- Nesdale, D., & Flesser, D. (2001). Social identity and the development of children's group attitudes. *Child development, 72*(2), 506-517.
- O'Bryan, M., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. N. (2004). Intergenerational transmission of prejudice, sex role stereotyping, and intolerance. *Adolescence, 39*(155).
- Özgür, G., Yörükoğlu, G., & Baysan Arabacı, L. (2011). Lise öğrencilerinin şiddet algıları, şiddet eğilim düzeyleri ve etkileyen faktörler. *Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Dergisi, 2*(2), 53-60.
- Pang, W., Lu, Y., Long, H., Wang, Q., & Lin, L. (2020). Three-generational families: Are they beneficial to Chinese children's creativity? *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 35*(3), 100623-100629.

- Perez, N. M., Jennings, W. G., & Baglivio, M. T. (2018). A path to serious, violent, chronic delinquency: The harmful aftermath of adverse childhood experiences. *Crime and Delinquency, 64*(1), 3-25.
- Pinquart, M., & Kauser, R. (2018). Do the associations of parenting styles with behavior problems and academic achievement vary by culture? Results from a meta-analysis. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 24*(1), 75.
- Pirchio, S., Passiatore, Y., Carrus, G., & Taeschner, T. (2019). Children's interethnic relationships in multiethnic primary school: Results of an inclusive language learning intervention on children with native and immigrant background in Italy. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 34*(1), 225-238.
- Pistella, J., Tanzilli, A., Ioverno, S., Lingiardi, V., & Baiocco, R. (2018). Sexism and attitudes toward same-sex parenting in a sample of heterosexuals and sexual minorities: The mediation effect of sexual stigma. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 15*(2), 139-150.
- Ponti, Lucia, & Martina Smorti. The roles of parental attachment and sibling relationships on life satisfaction in emerging adults. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships 36.6* (2019): 1747-1763.
- Primus, M. A. (2018). Parental warmth and physical punishment and their associations with children's social and academic skills in Trinidad and Tobago.
- Querido, J. G., Warner, T. D., & Eyberg, S. M. (2002). Parenting styles and child behavior in African American families of preschool children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 31*(2), 272-277.

- Reavis, J. A., Looman, J., Franco, K. A., & Rojas, B. (2013). Adverse childhood experiences and adult criminality: How long must we live before we possess our own lives? *The Permanente Journal*, *17*(2), 44-48.
- Reimers, F., & Schleicher, A. (2020). Schooling disrupted, schooling rethought. How the Covid-19 pandemic is changing education. *Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris*.
- Reynolds, K. J., Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (2012). Prejudice, social identity and social change: Resolving the Allportian problematic. *Beyond Prejudice: Extending the Social Psychology of Conflict, Inequality and Social Change*, 48-69.
- Rezazadeh, Z., Hossein Sabet, F., & Sohrabi, F. (2020). Predicting Adolescents' Resiliency Rate Based on Parenting Styles Mediated by the Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction. *International Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *14*(3), 136-142.
- Rodríguez-García, J. M., & Wagner, U. (2009). Learning to be prejudiced: A test of unidirectional and bidirectional models of parent-offspring socialization. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *33*(6), 516-523.
- Rutland, A., Killen, M., & Abrams, D. (2010). A new social-cognitive developmental perspective on prejudice: The interplay between morality and group identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*(3), 279-291.

- Sandstrom, M. J. (2007). A link between mothers' disciplinary strategies and children's relational aggression. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 25(3), 399-407.
- Sarwar, S. (2016). Influence of parenting style on children's behaviour. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 3, 222–249
- Segrin, C., & Flora, J. (2019). Fostering social and emotional intelligence: What are the best current strategies in parenting? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(3), 12439-12444.
- Sh, A. (2011). Relationship between Parenting Style and Children's Behavior Problems. Department of Human Development & Family Studies. *Journal of Asian Social Science*, 12, 195-200.
- Shah, A. M. (2006). Sects and Hindu social structure. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 40, 209-248. doi:10.1177/006996670604000203.
- Stagnaro, M. N., & Rand, D. G. (2020). The Coevolution of Religious Belief and Intuitive Cognitive Style via Individual-Level Selection. *The Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology and Religion* (p. 153). Oxford University Press, USA.
- Steinberg, L., Blatt-Eisengart, I., & Cauffman, E. (2006). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful homes: A replication in a sample of serious juvenile offenders. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16(1), 47-58.

- Steptoe, A., Marteau, T., Fonagy, P., & Abel, K. (2019). ACEs: Evidence, gaps, evaluation and future priorities. *Social Policy and Society*, 18(3), 415-424.
- Stone, G., Buehler, C., & Barber, B. K. (2002). *Interparental conflict, parental psychological control, and youth problem behavior*. American Psychological Association.
- Strack, F., & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and impulsive determinants of social behavior. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 8, 220–247. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0803_1
- Talib, M. B. A., Abdullah, R., & Mansor, M. (2011). Relationship between parenting style and children's behavior problems. *Asian Social Science*, 7(12), p195.
- Taraban, L., & Shaw, D. S. (2018). Parenting in context: Revisiting Belsky's classic process of parenting model in early childhood. *Developmental Review*, 48, 55-81.
- Thompson, A., Hollis, C., & Richards, D. (2003). Authoritarian parenting attitudes as a risk for conduct problems. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 12(2), 84-91.
- Timpano, K. R., Keough, M. E., Mahaffey, B., Schmidt, N. B., & Abramowitz, J. (2010). Parenting and obsessive-compulsive symptoms: Implications of authoritarian parenting. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 24(3), 151-164.
- Tiron, E. (2018). The Bio-Psycho-Socio-Cultural Development of the Adults. *Buletinul Institutului Politehnic din Iași secția Științe Socio-Umane*, 64(3-4), 9-25.

- Todd, A. R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2014). Perspective-taking as a strategy for improving intergroup relations: Evidence, mechanisms, and qualifications. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 8(7), 374-387.
- Verhulst, B., & Hatemi, P. K. (2013). Gene-environment interplay in twin models. *Political Analysis*, 21(3), 368.
- Viqar, S., 2018. 'We are your brothers, we will know where you are at all times': risk, violence and positionality in Karachi. *Contemp. Soc. Sci.* 13, 386–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2017.1418526>
- Villano, P., & Passini, S. (2020). Italian version of the RIVEC Prejudice Scale. *BPA-Applied Psychology Bulletin (Bollettino di Psicologia Applicata)*, 67(284).
- Vittrup, B., & Holden, G. W. (2011). Exploring the impact of educational television and parent–child discussions on children's racial attitudes. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 11(1), 82-104.
- Wei, C., & Kendall, P. C. (2014). Child perceived parenting behaviour: Childhood anxiety and related symptoms. *Child and Family Behaviour Therapy*, 36(1), 1-18.
- White, F. A., Borinca, I., Vezzali, L., Reynolds, K. J., Blomster Lyshol, J. K., Verrelli, S., & Falomir-Pichastor, J. M. (2020). Beyond direct contact: The theoretical and societal relevance of indirect contact for improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 12(2), 30-36.

Zheng, L. (2020). *Upbringing Chinese Children in Migration: How Chinese Immigrants Re-Formulate Their Parenting in the 21st Century* (Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University).

APPENDICES

Appendix A**Informed Consent**

I am Nawaz Amanat, student of MSc. at National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. I am conducting a research for partial fulfillment of my MSc. degree. Aim of this research is to study the parenting styles, adverse childhood experiences and the tendencies of sectarian prejudice among adolescents.

Participation in this research project is voluntary. I request you to participate in my research and share honestly about your experiences and thoughts. I understand that sharing your personal opinion and experience with anyone is very hard, but your participation will help us a lot in the scientific understanding of the phenomenon. If you find some questions that you really do not want to answer, you can leave but sharing true and honest information is important for us so that we could know the real experiences.

If you decide to participate in this research, you are given a questionnaire booklet on which you can share your experiences and opinions. This will take only 10 to 15 minutes of your precious time. I request you that once you volunteer to participate, then kindly respond to all the statements of the questionnaires. There are no right or wrong answers. Nevertheless, if some statement is not clear to you, you can ask for clarification. Thank you for reading this information sheet.

Please sign below if you have read and decided to participate in this research study.

Signature of Respondent

Regards

Nawaz Amanat

National Institute of Psychology

Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad

Email; nawazamanat@gmail.com

Appendix-B

Demographic Information

Please provide the following information:

Age: _____ (Approximate Years)

Gender: Boy Girl

Education: 6th Grade 7th Grade 8th Grade

Type of School: Government Private

Family System: Joint Nuclear

Mother: Alive Dead

Father: Alive Dead

Parents living together: Yes No

Father's education: _____

Father's occupation: Employed Unemployed Retired

Mother's education: _____

Mother occupation: Employed Unemployed Retired

Birth order: _____

Appendix-C

Scale-1

مندرجہ ذیل بیانات کو غور سے پڑھیں۔ اور جس حد تک آپ کو صحیح لگیں ان کا اظہار روئے گئے پیمانے کی مدد سے کریں۔

نمبر شمار	بیانات	بالکل صحیح	کسی حد تک صحیح	کسی حد تک غلط	بالکل غلط
1	میری امی کے خیال میں گھر میں بچوں کو بھی اپنی مرضی کرنے کا اتنا ہی اختیار ہونا چاہیے جتنا کہ والدین کو۔				
2	میری امی کے خیال میں گھر میں بچوں سے ان کی بہتری کے لیے کچھ کام زبردستی بھی کروانا چاہیے۔				
3	میری امی چاہتی ہیں کہ میں بغیر کوئی سوال کیے ان کی کہنے پر فوری عمل کروں۔				
4	میری امی گھر کے کسی معاملے سے متعلق فیصلہ کرنے کے بعد اس کی وجوہات بھی بتاتی ہیں۔				
5	جب بھی گھر میں کوئی پابندی اور اصول مجھ کو سنا سب لگے تو میری امی میری بات اور مشوروں کو سن لیتی ہیں۔				
6	میری امی کے خیال میں بچوں کو اس بات کی آزادی ہونی چاہیے کہ وہ پانے لے جو چاہیں اور اس پر عمل کرنا چاہے والدین اس سے اتفاق کریں یا نہ کریں۔				
7	میری امی اس بات کی اجازت نہیں دیتیں کہ میں ان کے کیے ہوئے فیصلوں کے خلاف بولوں۔				
8	میری امی گھر میں بچوں سے متعلق معاملات کے فیصلے سوچ سمجھ کر اور اچھے طریقے سے کرتی ہیں۔				
9	میری امی کا خیال ہے کہ والدین کو بچوں کی تربیت سختی سے کام لیتے ہوئے کرنی چاہیے۔				
10	میری امی یہ نہیں سمجھتیں کہ مجھے اصول صرف اس لیے مان لینے چاہیے کہ وہ بڑوں نے بنائے ہیں۔				
11	یہ جانتے ہوئے بھی کہ میری امی مجھ سے کیا چاہتی ہیں پھر بھی اگر مجھے کوئی بات ٹھیک نہ لگے تو میں آزادی سے ان سے اس متعلق بات کر سکتی ہوں۔				
12	میری امی کا خیال ہے کہ عقلمند والدین کو بہت شروع میں بچوں کو یہ بتا دینا چاہیے کہ گھر میں کس کا حکم چلے گا۔				
13	میری امی بہت کم بتاتی ہیں کہ مجھے مختلف کام کیسے کرنے ہیں۔				
14	میری امی اکثر وہی فیصلہ کرتی ہیں جو کہ گھر میں ہم بچوں کی مرضی ہو۔				
15	میری امی ہمیشہ مختلف کام کرنے کے طریقے بہت اچھے سے بتاتی اور سمجھاتی ہیں۔				
16	جب میں امی کی بات نہ مانوں تو وہ بہت ناراض ہو جاتی ہیں۔				
17	میری امی کا خیال ہے کہ اگر والدین اپنے بچوں کے خیالات، فیصلوں اور معاملات پر پابندی مانگیں تو معاشرے کے بہت سے مسائل ختم ہو سکتے ہیں۔				
18	میری امی مجھے بتاتی ہیں کہ مجھے کیا کرنا چاہیے اگر میں ایسا نہ کر سکوں تو مجھے سزا دیتی ہیں۔				
19	میری امی مجھے میرے زیادہ تر معاملات میں خود فیصلہ کرنے دیتی ہیں۔				
20	میری امی فیصلہ کرتے وقت ہمارے رائے کو اہمیت دیتی ہیں لیکن صرف ہماری مرضی پر فیصلہ نہیں کرتیں۔				
21	میری امی یہ ذمہ داری نہیں لیتیں کہ وہ مجھے بتائیں کہ مختلف کام کیسے کرنے ہیں۔				
22	میری امی بچوں کے معاملات کے بارے میں ایک خاص رویہ رکھتی ہیں مگر کبھی کبھی بچوں کی مرضی کی مطابقت بھی تبدیل کر دیتی ہیں۔				

نمبر شمار	بیانات	بالکل صحیح	کسی حد تک صحیح	کسی حد تک غلط	بالکل غلط
23	میری امی مجھے بتاتی ہیں کہ مجھے کیا کرنا چاہیے اور چاہتی ہیں کہ میں ان کی باتوں پر عمل کروں لیکن وہ میری بات بھی سن لیتی ہیں کہ میں ان کے کاموں کو کیسے کرنا چاہتی ہوں۔				
24	میری امی مجھے اجازت دیتی ہیں کہ گھر کے معاملات میں اپنے رائے دوں اور اپنے بارے میں خود بھی فیصلہ کروں۔				
25	میری امی کا خیال ہے کہ معاشرے کے بہت سے مسائل حل ہو جائیں اگر والدین بچوں کی غلطیوں پر ان کے ساتھ سختی سے پیش آئیں۔				
26	میری امی اکثر مجھے بتاتی ہیں کہ وہ مجھ سے کیا چاہتی ہیں اور میں کس طرح ان کی خواہش کو پورا کر سکتی/سکتا ہوں۔				
27	میری امی مجھے مشورے دیتی ہیں لیکن اگر مجھے ان کی بات ٹھیک نہ لگے تو وہ میری بات بھی سمجھتی ہیں۔				
28	میری امی گھر میں بچوں کے معاملات کے بارے میں ہدایات نہیں دیتیں۔				
29	مجھے پتہ ہے کہ میری امی چاہتی ہیں کہ میں ان کی ہر بات مانوں کیونکہ وہ مجھ سے بڑی ہیں۔				
30	اگر مجھے امی کے کسی فیصلے پر دکھ پہنچے تو وہ میری بات سن لیتی ہیں اور اگر وہ غلطی پر ہوں تو اپنی غلطی مان بھی لیتی ہیں۔				

مندرجہ ذیل بیانات کو غور سے پڑھیں۔ اور جس حد تک آپ کو صحیح لگیں ان کا اظہار دینے کے لئے بیان کی مدد سے کریں۔

نمبر شمار	بیانات	بالکل صحیح	کسی حد تک صحیح	کسی حد تک غلط	بالکل غلط
1	میرے ابو کے خیال میں گھر میں بچوں کو بھی اپنی مرضی کرنے کا اتنا ہی اختیار دینا چاہیے جتنا کہ والدین کو۔				
2	میرے ابو کے خیال میں گھر میں بچوں سے ان کی بہتری کے لیے کچھ کام زبردستی بھی کروانا چاہیے۔				
3	میرے ابو چاہتے ہیں کہ میں بغیر کوئی سوال کیے ان کی کہنے پر فوری عمل کروں۔				
4	میرے ابو گھر کے کسی معاملے سے متعلق فیصلہ کرنے کے بعد اس کی وجوہات بھی بتاتے ہیں۔				
5	جب بھی گھر میں کوئی پابندی اور اصول مجھ کو مناسب لگے تو میری ابو میری بات اور مشوروں کو سن لیتے ہیں۔				
6	میرے ابو کے خیال میں بچوں کو اس بات کی آزادی ہونی چاہیے کہ وہ اپنے لیے جو چاہیں اور اس پر عمل کرنا چاہے والدین اس سے اتفاق کریں یا نہ کریں۔				
7	میرے ابو اس بات کی اجازت نہیں دیتے کہ میں ان کے کیے ہوئے فیصلوں کے خلاف بولوں۔				
8	میرے ابو گھر میں بچوں سے متعلق معاملات کے فیصلے سوچ بچھ کر اور اچھے طریقے سے کرتے ہیں۔				
9	میرے ابو کا خیال ہے کہ والدین کو بچوں کی تربیت سختی سے کام لیتے ہوئے کرنی چاہیے۔				
10	میرے ابو یہ نہیں سمجھتے کہ مجھے اصول صرف اس لیے مان لینے چاہیے کہ وہ بڑوں نے بنائے ہیں۔				
11	یہ جانتے ہوئے بھی کہ میرے ابو مجھ سے کیا چاہتے ہیں پھر بھی اگر مجھے کوئی بات ٹھیک نہ لگے تو میں آزادی سے ان سے اس متعلق بات کر سکتا/سکتی ہوں۔				
12	میرے ابو کا خیال ہے کہ عقلمند والدین کو بہت شروع میں بچوں کو یہ بتا دینا چاہیے کہ گھر میں کس کا حکم چلے گا۔				
13	میرے ابو بہت کم بتاتے ہیں کہ مجھے مختلف کام کیسے کرنے ہیں۔				
14	میرے ابو اکثر وہی فیصلہ کرتے ہیں جو کہ گھر میں ہم بچوں کی مرضی ہو۔				
15	میرے ابو ہمیشہ مختلف کام کرنے کے طریقے بہت اچھے سے بتاتے اور سمجھاتے ہیں۔				
16	جب میں ابو کی بات نہ مانوں تو وہ بہت راض ہو جاتے ہیں۔				
17	میرے ابو کا خیال ہے کہ اگر والدین اپنے بچوں کے خیالات، فیصلوں اور معاملات پر پابندی مانگنا نہیں تو معاشرے کے بہت سے مسائل ختم ہو سکتے ہیں۔				
18	میرے ابو مجھے بتاتے ہیں کہ مجھے کیا کرنا چاہیے اگر میں ایسا نہ کر سکوں تو مجھے سزا دیتے ہیں۔				
19	میرے ابو مجھے ہر سے زیادہ معاملات میں خود فیصلہ کرنے دیتے ہیں۔				
20	میرے ابو فیصلہ کرتے وقت ہماری رائے کو اہمیت دیتے ہیں لیکن صرف ہماری مرضی پر فیصلہ نہیں کرتے۔				
21	میرے ابو بڑی ذمہ داری نہیں لیتے کہ وہ مجھے بتائیں کہ مختلف کام کیسے کرنے ہیں۔				
22	میرے ابو بچوں کے معاملات کے بارے میں ایک خاص رویہ رکھتے ہیں مگر کبھی کبھی بچوں کی مرضی کی مطابق بھی تہدیل کر دیتے ہیں۔				

نمبر شمار	بیانات	بالکل صحیح	کسی حد تک صحیح	کسی حد تک غلط	بالکل غلط
23	میرے ابو مجھے بتاتے ہیں کہ مجھے کیا کرنا چاہیے اور چاہتے ہیں کہ میں ان کی باتوں پر عمل کروں لیکن وہ میری بات بھی سُن لیتے ہیں کہ میں ان کے کاموں کو کیسے کرنا چاہتی ہوں۔				
24	میرے ابو مجھے اجازت دیتے ہیں کہ گھر کے معاملات میں اپنے رائے دوں اور اپنے بارے میں خود بھی فیصلہ کروں۔				
25	میرے ابو کا خیال ہے کہ معاشرے کے بہت سے مسائل حل ہو جائیں اگر والدین بچوں کی غلطیوں پر ان کے ساتھ سختی سے پیش آئیں۔				
26	میرے ابو اکثر مجھے بتاتے ہیں کہ وہ مجھ سے کیا چاہتے ہیں اور میں کس طرح ان کی خواہش کو پورا کر سکتی/سکتا ہوں۔				
27	میرے ابو مجھے مشورے دیتے ہیں لیکن اگر مجھے ان کی بات ٹھیک نہ لگے تو وہ میری بات بھی سمجھتے ہیں۔				
28	میرے ابو گھر میں بچوں کے معاملات کے بارے میں ہدایات نہیں دیتے۔				
29	مجھے پتہ ہے کہ میرے ابو چاہتے ہیں کہ میں ان کی ہر بات مانوں کیونکہ وہ مجھ سے بڑے ہیں۔				
30	اگر مجھے ابو کے کسی فیصلے پر دکھ پہنچے تو وہ میری بات سُن لیتے ہیں اور اگر وہ غلطی پر ہوں تو اپنی غلطی مان بھی لیتے ہیں۔				

Appendix-D

Scale 2

مندرجہ ذیل بیانات کو غور سے پڑھیں۔ اور جس حد تک آپ صحیح لگیں ان کا اظہار دیئے گئے پیمانے کی مدد سے کریں۔

نمبر شمار	بیانات	ہاں	نہیں
1	کیا والدین یا گھر کے کسی دوسرے بالغ شخص نے آپ کی قسم کھائی، آپ نے نفرت کا اظہار کیا، آپ کی توہین کی / برا بھلا کہا، آپ کو نیچا محسوس کروا یا یا آپ کو رسوا کیا؟		
2	کیا والدین یا گھر کے کسی دوسرے بالغ شخص نے آپ کو دھکا دیا، پکڑا، تھپڑ مارا، یا کوئی چیز آپ کی طرف پھینکی؟		
3	کیا آپ نے اکثر ایسا محسوس کیا کہ آپ کے پاس کھانے کے لیے کافی نہیں ہے، گندے کپڑے پہننے پڑتے ہیں۔ اور آپ کی حفاظت کے لیے کوئی ہے؟		
4	کیا آپ کے والدین کبھی الگ ہو گئے تھے؟		
5	کیا آپ کی والدہ یا سوتیلی ماں نے اکثر آپ کو دھکا دیا، زور سے پکڑا یا تھپڑ مارا؟		
6	کیا آپ کسی کے ساتھ رہتے ہیں۔ جو شراب نوشی یا سٹریٹ منشیات استعمال کرتا ہے؟		
7	کیا گھر کا کوئی فرد پریشن کا شکار تھا، یا گھر کے کسی فرد نے خودکشی کو کوشش کی تھی؟		
8	کیا گھر کا کوئی فرد کبھی جیل گیا تھا؟		

Appendix-E

Scale 3

نمبر شمار	بیانات	بالکل متفق	متفق	غیر متفق	بالکل غیر متفق
	میر سے نزدیک زیادہ تر (دوسرے سالک کے لوگ)				
1	شخصی خرابیوں کے مالک ہوتے ہیں۔				
2	دائرہ اسلام سے باہر ہوتے ہیں۔				
3	نا پاک ہوتے ہیں۔				
4	نادان اور کم عقل ہوتے ہیں۔				
5	غلط بیان ہوتے ہیں۔				
6	باطل کا ساتھ دیتے ہیں۔				
	میں شعیبہ/سنی کے/کی				
7	ساتھ میل جول پسند نہیں کرتا/کرتی ہوں۔				
8	ساتھ برابری کی بنیاد پر رشتہ پسند نہیں کرتا۔				
9	ساتھ ایک ہی علاقے میں رہنا پسند نہیں کرتا۔				
10	گھر کا کھانا پسند نہیں کرتا۔				
11	کسی بھی گروہ سے روادار رکھنا پسند نہیں کرتا۔				
12	ساتھ قریبی دوستی رکھنا پسند نہیں کرتا				
	میں شعیبہ/سنی کے/کی کو				
13	اپنے جیسا انسان نہیں سمجھتا/سمجھتی ہوں۔				
14	اپنا اچھا دوست نہیں سمجھتا/سمجھتی ہوں۔				
15	وفا دار نہیں سمجھتا/سمجھتی۔				
16	کبھی بھی کو میا بی کو نہیں سراہتا/سراہتی ہوں۔				
17	ساتھ ہونے والی ما انصافی کو برا نہیں سمجھتا/سمجھتی ہوں۔				
18	قابل بھروسہ نہیں سمجھتا/سمجھتی ہوں۔				