IMPACT OF PARENTING STYLE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE IN ADOLESCENTS

Kumar Ujwal[1], Vikrant Jha[2]

[1]Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Psychology, University of Delhi, Delhi, India.
[2]Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Religion is a set of organized beliefs, practices, and systems that most often relate to belief and worship of a controlling force such as a personal god or another supernatural being. While this is a basic definition, there are many different understandings of what religion is and not all religions are centred on a belief in a god, gods, or supernatural forces. The aim of the present study is to understand the impact of parenting style on the development of prejudice relating to religion among adolescents. Prejudice is an assumption or an opinion about someone simply based on that person's membership to a particular group. For example, people can be prejudiced against someone else of a different ethnicity, gender, or religion. Religion is a major influence on the lives of many parents, and therefore their belief system also plays very important role in the inculcation of prejudice in children. Nevertheless, influence of parenting style on prejudice development in adolescents is a very poorly researched area. In this study data was collected from 200 subjects which includes pairs of 100 parent and child. Data was gathered by using Religious discrimination scale developed by Allen et al., 2020, which is a 5-point Likert scale and included 11 items. Parenting style Questionnaire scale modified version based on work of Robinson et al., 1995 was used to understand the parenting style adopted by parents and its role in religious prejudice. Results indicate that parents and Adolescents religious prejudice correlate positively to some extent. Parents' religious prejudice explains adolescents prejudice significantly but the predicted variance is lower and practicing a particular parenting style by parents to higher level have no effect on their religious prejudice and also to their child religious prejudice.

KEYWORD: *Religion, Parenting style, Religious prejudice, Prejudice.*

INTRODUCTION

Modern theorists describe religion as a cultural phenomenon which can be defined by the principles of science. However, in order to better understand the concept of religion many scholars from diverse field such as philosophers, psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists devised disparate methods and approaches to comprehend various aspects of religion. People all around the world are well aware of the term religion, but it becomes very difficult to give a well define definition of religion because there are many components of religion which combine to form a broad perspective of religion.

Bias is a term that inculcates various intergroup orientations such as beliefs about the thoughts and attitudes of other groups or even single person on the basis of their group membership. This leads to unfair evaluative, affective or behavioral responses to groups and their members which takes the form of prejudice (biased attitudes), discrimination (unfair treatment) and stereotype (overgeneralized beliefs). Both prejudice and stereotypes inculcate intra individual processes and can be explicit (overt or intentional) or implicit (Spontaneous or automatic). Bias does not only involve beliefs about other groups that is out-groups but also leads to comparison of in-group position with out-group position. People contemplate that prejudice, stereotype and discrimination are same but their functions in social context tend to differ. Stereotypes are generally considered as a belief system shared by a group whereas prejudice refers to attitude held by in-group towards the members of out-group and discrimination generally refers to action carried towards the members of out-group in response to the prejudice and stereotypes

The idea that intergroup contact can lead to positive intergroup contact and reduce prejudice between groups was corroborated by Sociologist Robins Williams (1947) and social psychologist Gordon Allport (1954). A large number of cross-sectional, longitudinal, and experimental studies have construed about the significant negative relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice which is described as a positive contact effect. (Pettigrew et al. 2011; Pettigrew and Troop 2006). The contact hypothesis given by Allport is considered to be the most popular theories of prejudice reduction. According to Intergroup contact theory the main reason for negative attitudes arises due to reduce positive contact between groups (Allport,1954, Pettigrew,1998). Categorization of groups into in-group and out group can automatically lead to social exclusion and stigmatization. Therefore, Allport articulated four necessary conditions for prejudice reduction: Common goals, cooperation, equal status between groups and institutional support. Earlier researches encapsulated that positive intergroup contact play important role in reducing negative attitudes toward individuals with disabilities, mental health issues, racial/ethnic minorities, sexual minorities and more (Davies, Troop, Aron, Pettigrew, & Wright,2011; Pettigrew & Troop,2006).There are many reconciliation programs and activities are carried out in conflict regions to establish the contact between in-group and out group in order to improve relationship between the groups.

THEORETICAL UNDERSTANDING
Frustration-Aggression Theory
The frustration-aggression theory was proposed by Dollard et al. (1939). This theory encapsulates that frustration always leads to aggression and aggression is the result of frustration. Therefore, it has been articulated that ethnocentrism is the result of frustration in the social environment. According to frustration-aggression theory, aggression is always instigated by the frustration and displacement of aggression does not take place towards the real source of frustration but always takes place towards the inferior or weaker target. Ethnic   minorities because of their subservient position in the society becomes the target of aggression.

Relative Deprivation Theory
Gurr (1970) and Runciman (1966) propounded the theory of Relative Deprivation. This Theory states that people become rebellious and unsatisfied when they perceive discrepancy between what they deserved and currently what they are getting. This gap between the expectations and accomplishment is the major force behind the violence that takes place in the society. The study by Tripathi and Srivastava (1981) found fraternal deprivation more among Muslim populations. This feeling of fraternal deprivation arises due to lack of job opportunities, support from the police, political freedom etc. This made Muslim population more hostile towards Hindu population.

Realistic Group Conflict Theory
According to Realistic Group Conflict Theory, competition for limited resources is the result of all the prejudices and biases between in-group and out group and tend to reduce intergroup contact.   Muzafir Sheriff played pivotal role in the development of Realistic group conflict theory and was pioneer in the development of many studies relating to intergroup hostility and prejudice. In the Indian context, realistic group conflict theory can be understood in the context of Babri Masjid/Ram Janam Bhoomi case where the conflict took place over a small area of land for which Hindus and Muslims fought for many years.

Social Identity Theory
In order to understand social identity theory, Henri Tajfel a popular social psychologist gave a theory called social identity theory. Tajfel stated that mere toss of a group coin can categorize the people into two groups and division of the people into two or more can automatically leads to in-group favoritism and hostility towards out group. Individuals with a particular group tend develop positive social identity when there is favorable social comparison between in-group and out group. These two processes of social comparison and social categorization combine to form a perception of social stereotype towards the members of out-group. The in-group members tend to held favorable stereotypes towards the members of their own group and unfavorable stereotypes towards the members of out-group and this forms the base of social identity theory. A study conducted by Hussain (1984) elucidate that both Hindus (N=60) and Muslims (N=70) described the in-group in positive way such as higher in affiliation and out-group in

negative way such as higher in aggression. Khan (1988) observed that Hindus tend to held pessimistic, disparaging images of Muslims which inculcates images relating to their physical appearance and their tendency to readily divorce their wives in order to gratify their sexual desires. Whereas, Muslims described Hindus as inferior entity who are money greedy and also charged high rates of interest, and were dishonest, unreliable, and jealous. Khan and Arora (1989) in their study found that Muslims held positive stereotypes of other religious minorities such as Sikhs and Christians but were irresolute towards Hindus. But Muslims were also ambivalent towards the self-stereotyping of their own group. They consider themselves as quick-witted and more pious as compared to people belonging to other religious groups. But on the other hand, they also perceive themselves as conservative, lazy and submissive. This explanation of oneself is the result of blemish self-esteem which has formed due to the devaluation of one's own group. This tendency to devaluate their own group is found to be more prevalent amongst ethnic minorities.

Self-Categorization Theory

Self-categorization theory is just an extension and refinement of the social identity theory. According to Turner self-categorization Theory, people categorize themselves as members of different groups. For example, if a person categorizes himself as a Hindu, he will see himself to be similar to other people who are Hindus and different from people belong to other religious groups such as Muslims, Christians and Sikhs.

Norm Violation Theory

Turner and Killian (1957) focused their work primarily on collective behavior. According to them crowd is an extreme form of the group and all the rules and regulations that control conformity to group norms also control collective behavior. The difference between the crowd and group is that the crowd as opposed to the group has no tradition and formal organization. The emergence of norms, therefore, takes place in crowd situations because all individuals within the crowd take distinctive actions and because of their uniqueness all

While studying the group norms from the perspective of intergroup behavior, deRidder and Tripathi formulated a question regarding what would happen when a member of one group contravenes the norm of another group. For example, a Hindu doctor makes obscene gestures towards a Muslim nurse. How does the Muslim community react? Does it demand that the doctor should apologies, ignore the incident, demand the transfer of the doctor, insult Hindu doctors in a similar fashion, or beat up the erring doctor.

Development of Religious Identity and Intergroup Attitudes

The development of individual identity is considered as a continuous process which involves interaction between individuals and their surroundings (Erikson,1963;1968). The formation of identity begins during teenage years and tend to proceed throughout the life and during the identity development process all the individuals are disposed to social influences (Erikson,1963;1968).The whole process of identity development inculcates two types of needs: the need to maintain individual uniqueness and the need to belong to a group (Brewer 1991).Therefore from the childhood days interactions with others play an paramount role in determining our belief system and how we interact with others. According to Marcia identity development is a process of personal exploration and commitment. In the initial days a search related to values and goals takes place, and following extended exploration, the appropriate identity is finally attained (Marcia,1980). On the other hand, social identity theory given by Tajfel & Turner states that identity develops in relation to social belonging within a group, which means that the strongly we relate to our social group, the more our social identity will be.

There are numerous studies that have been conducted in the west elucidates about development of ethnic attitudes in very early years of life. But when we talk about the development of intergroup attitudes and religious social identity in the Indian context, there are only few studies available in India relating to this idea.

Singh (1985) with his associates conducted large number of studies in Indian context on development of ethnic attitudes. The samples in the study were school going students who belong to the age group of 4-15 and were part of four major religious groups that are most dominant in the country. The major religious groups in the study included Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian. These all school going students were part of the study that tried to study the formation religious attitudes in Indian context. The findings of the study uncovered very intriguing details that all four major religious groups in the country showed similar patterns of religious identity development. According to this

study, identity development start during early years of childhood. Because of this early formation of religious identity, many children start to show preference for their own religion by the age of 4 or 5 years. Therefore, by the time they reach the age of 8-9 years, identity is fully crystallized and ethnocentrism is well established. Mishra and Bano (2003) conducted their study on the Hindu and Muslim children of Varanasi to understand the development of social identity and prejudice within these children. They collected data from children of both religious groups ranging from 3 to 12 years. They also took interviews from the mother of Hindu and Muslim children in order to study the role of socialization in development of ethnic attitude among children. Their study found very intriguing thing that the children from both religious groups (Hindu and Muslim) at an early age of 3-4 years became aware of their own religious identity as well as the religious identity of people belonging to the other religious groups. At this stage categorization of people into different religious groups takes place. Children may describe people with similar religious identity as in-group and describe people with different religious identity as out-group. Their study found that 100 % Muslim children became aware of their religious identity by the age of 3-4 children but this was not true for the Hindu children because according to their study only 60% of Hindu children by the age of 3-4 years became aware of their religious identity. So around 4 to 5 years of age children tend to develop clear preference for the religious group they belong and till the time they reach the age of 8-9 years, a clear out-group bias got established. Similar findings relating to the development of religious identity found in another study by Bano and Mishra (2009). They again found that children belonging to Hindu and Muslim religious group became aware of their own group as well as other group at an early age of 3-4 years. Children belonging to both the religious group by this age had already grasped the words and concepts to eloquently describe the members of other religious groups. There is preference for own group at this early age which is marked by the clear cut us-them distinction. Children describe the members of their own religion as "us" and members of other religion as "them". The understanding related to the categorisation of the groups into in-group and out-group showed considerable variation among children of different age groups. The children who are young and in the age group of 3-6 years made distinction between the in-group and out-group on the basis of external features such as on the basis of the dresses that the people wear. On the other hand, children who are little bit older and in the age group of 7-12 years made distinction between the out-group and in-group on the basis internal features such as people religious beliefs and practices that they follow. To develop a deeper understanding of the reasons that lead to early formation of in-group and out-group categorisation within the minds of the children, Hassan (1983,1984) correlated the three factors parental behaviour, authoritarianism and prejudice. He collected data from Hindu and Muslim students who are in 10th and 11th grade and he also collected data from their parents also. His study concluded that development of ethnic identities and prejudice takes place at a very early age and religious groups who are in minorities their ethnic identity because of their minority position in the society tend to become more strengthened. More importantly, his study also found that parental behaviour plays very pertinent role in the development of ethnic attitude and prejudice attitude among children. The process of development of intergroup attitude continues throughout the life and tend to get much more elaborated with increasing age. Mohsin (1984) also conducted study on the development of religious identity and prejudice among college going students in Bihar and Odisha. He found that college going students of Odisha and Bihar showed higher degree of ethnocentrism and prejudice. Similar finding was also found in the study of Majeed and Ghosh (1981). They found in their study that children belonging to both Hindu and Muslim religion evaluated in-group and out-group in different ways. Children of both the religious group described their own group in more positive way as compared to the out-group.

OBJECTIVES
1. To study the relation between parent and Adolescent religious prejudice.
2. To assess the parents religious prejudice as predictor of Adolescents religious prejudice.
3. To study the difference of religious prejudice in parents and Adolescents on parents preferred parenting style.

HYPOTHESES
H_a1: There is significant correlation between parents and Children religious prejudice.
H_a2: Parents religious prejudice significantly predicts adolescent's religious prejudice.
H_a3: Parents and adolescents religious prejudice will differ on parents preferred parenting style.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

In this study data was collected from 200 participants, participants consisted of 100 parent-child pair. The age range of children was 15-18 years and in their development period of adolescents. Data was collected via online and face to face mode.

Instruments

Modified version Parenting practices questionnaire was used bases on Robison, et al., 1995. It consist three types of parenting styles Authoritative (13 items), Authoritarian (13 items) and Permissive parenting style (4 items). The score ranges from 1 (never) to 6 (always). The scores of items in each parenting style category was summed and divided by number of items in each corresponding category and then the highest mean score was referred as preferred parenting practice style. The overall cronbach alpha of scale is 0.75.

RDS (Religious Discrimination scale) was used to assess religious prejudice and discrimination developed by G.E.Kawika Allen, Kenneth T. wang, Scott Richards, Mason Ming and Han Na Suh in 2020. It consists of 11 items 5-point Likert scale having three dimensions Perceived prejudice, Closet Symptoms and Negative labels. Coefficient estimates were near to .80.

Procedure

The researchers approached to the participants via online mode and face to face mode and build rapport with them after that researchers took their consent to participate in the study and administered the questionnaires. The parents were provided parenting practices questionnaire and Religious discrimination questionnaire while children were provided only religious discrimination questionnaire.   Data was collected and scored according to the manual and analysed by using SPSS version 27.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: *Represents the correlation between Parents and Adolescents Religious Prejudice (N=100).*

Variable	Parents Religious Prejudice (r)	P value
Adolescents Religious Prejudice	.352**	.002

**significant at .01 level   of significance, r is value of correlation

In this above table, correlation between Parents and adolescents religious prejudice was found to be .352 at .01   level of significance (2-tailed), which indicates that there is significant weak positive correlation between religious prejudice of parents and children. From result it could be said that there is some sort of connection between the development of parents and children religious prejudice. Hence H_01 hypothesis supports this study.

Table 2: Represents the simple linear regression analysis for variable (Parents Religious prejudice) predicting adolescent's religious prejudice (N=100).

Model	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F(1,98)	B	β	t	p
Adolescents Religious prejudice [b]	.352[a]	.124	.115	13.826	.333	.352	3.71	.000**

**significant at   .01 level of significance.
Predictor: (Constant), Parents Religious Prejudice.
Dependent Variable: Adolescents Religious prejudice.

Linear regression was applied with Adolescents religious prejudice as the dependent variable in order to see the variance depicted by Parents religious prejudice taken as predictor, $F(1,98)$=13.826, p= .001, R^2= .124. The result indicates that Parents religious prejudice explains 12.4% of variance to Adolescents religious prejudice. Hence H_02 hypothesis being supported in this study, 12.4% of variance also reflects that Parents religious prejudice influence adolescents religious prejudice to some extent.

Table 3: *Represents the Mean and SD of Parents and Adolescents religious prejudice on different types of parenting style practiced by parents (N=100).*

Parenting styles		Parents prejudice	Religious		Adolescents Prejudice	Religious
		Mean	SD		Mean	SD
Authoritative style	Parenting	33.54	10.49		33.73	8.58
Authoritarian style	Parenting	34.45	8.30		33.25	9.85
Permissive style	Parenting	33.00	9.08		34.04	7.30

Table 4: *Represents the one way ANOVA for Parents and Adolescents religious prejudice on different parenting styles practiced by parents*
(Authoritative Parenting style, Authoritarian Parenting style and Permissive Parenting style).

Variable	Sources of variance	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	P-value
Parents Religious Prejudice	Between Groups	34.071	2	17.035	.195	.823
	Within Groups	8469.089	97	87.310		
	Total	8503.16	99			
Adolescents Religious Prejudice	Between Groups	10.036	2	5.018	.064	.938
	Within Groups	7615.754	97	78.513		
	Total	7625.79	99			

** significant at .01 level of significance.

Table 3 and 4   representing the difference of parents-adolescents religious prejudice on different type of parenting styles practiced by parents. Parents religious prejudice do not vary in terms of parenting style $F(2,97)$=.195, p=.823 as well as adolescents religious prejudice do not differ on different type of parenting styles. Hence H_03 have been not supported in this study.

CONCLUSIONS

From the results following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The parents and Adolescents religious prejudice correlate positively to some extent.
2. Parents' religious prejudice explains adolescents prejudice significantly but the predicted variance is lower.
3. Practicing a particular parenting style by parents to higher level have no effect on their religious prejudice and also to their child religious prejudice.

REFERENCES

1. Aboud, F. E. (1988). Children and prejudice. London, UK: Blackwell.
2. Aboud, F. E., & Amato, M. (2002). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), Blackwell handbook in social psychology: Intergroup processes (Vol. 4, pp. 65–85). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
3. Aboud, F. E., & Doyle, A. B. (1996). Parental and peer influences on children's racial attitudes. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20, 371–383. doi:10.1080/01650250444000018.
4. Acock, A. C. (1984). Parents and their children: The study of inter-generational influence. Sociology and Social Research, 68, 151–171.
5. Acock, A. C., & Bengtson, V. L. (1978). On the relative influence of mothers and fathers: A covariance analysis of political and religious socialization. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 4, 519–530.doi:10.2307/350932
6. Allen, K., Fuller, K.T. (2018). Religious Discrimination Scale: Development and Initial Psychometric Evalutation.
7. Allport, G. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
8. Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
9. Bao, W. N., Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D. R., & Conger, R. D. (1999). Perceived parental acceptance as a moderator of religious transmission among adolescent boys and girls. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61, 362–374. doi:10.2307/353754
10. Bell, R. Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. Psychological Review, 2, 81–95. doi:10.1037/h0025583
11. Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. Psychological Bulletin, 107,238–246. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238.
12. Chandra,B. (1984).Communalism in modern India. New Delhi: Vikas.
13. Dubey, J. (1985).Relationships between needs and reactions to frustration among scheduled caste. Journal of Psychological Researches,29 (2),69-72.
14. Hutnik, N.(2004) ''An Intergroup Perspective of Ethnic Minority Identity', in Psychology in India Revisited: Developments in the Discipline , Volume 3 , ed. J. Pandey. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
15. Robinson,C., Mandleco,B.,Olsen,S.F., & Hart,C.H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and Permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. Psychological Reports, 77, 819-830.
16. Sheridan, L. P. (2006). Islamophobia Pre- and Post-September 11th, 2001. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21(3), 317–336.
17. Tripathi, R.C., Sinha, Y. (2014). Psychology Development and Social Policy in India. Springer India.