

Abstract

There is empirical evidence that parents are a primary context influencing the development of prejudice in their children. This research extends that body of work to identify specific ways parents socialize prejudice towards the Muslim community. The current study thereby provides an original contribution by identifying important parenting processes that increase Islamophobic attitudes in offspring. Baumrind's parenting styles framework and Rohner's theory of Parental Acceptance-Rejection provided the theoretical foundation for the study. Participants were recruited using Amazon Mechanical Turk and data was collected via a Qualtrics survey. The sample consisted of 302 late adolescents (18-25) residing in the United States. 151 participants answered questions on maternal parenting and 151 participants answered questions on paternal parenting. Findings demonstrate that parental rejection, authoritarian parenting, and parental anti-Muslim discourse by both mothers and fathers impact offspring Islamophobia. Findings also indicate that some of that influence is explained through the increased aggression that results from rejection and authoritarian parenting. In addition, the current study employed a principal components analysis in order to assess the latent structure of Islamophobia as a construct and to further clarify the nature of the Islamophobia construct. The results highlight the central role of parenting in the development of prejudice and suggest important avenues for future research and intervention.

Keywords: development of prejudice, parenting, aggression, Islamophobia, parenting styles, authoritarian parenting, parental acceptance-rejection

PARENTAL DETERMINANTS OF ISLAMOPHOBIC ATTITUDES IN OFFSPRING

by

Sanum Shafi

B.A. SUNY Binghamton, 2015

M.S. Syracuse University, 2020

Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Human Development and Family Science.

Syracuse University

August 2023

Copyright © Sanum Shafi 2023

All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want to thank my doctoral advisor, Dr. Matthew Mulvaney for his feedback, guidance, and support throughout this entire process. I also want to thank everyone on my committee, Dr. Ambika Krishnakumar, Dr. Mara Sapon-Shevin, and especially Dr. Gabriel “Joey” Merrin for meeting with me and providing me with all the tools that I needed in order to complete my dissertation. I really appreciate all your help. It has made me a better writer and researcher.

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	1 - 25
2	Conceptualization of Islamophobia	1 - 6
3	Theoretical Framework	21 - 23
4	Hypotheses	25
5	Methods	25 - 33
6	Results	33 - 44
7	Discussion	44 - 62
8	Future Directions	62 - 68
9	Tables	69 - 86
10	Appendices	
	A – Recruitment Script	87
	B – Informed Consent	88 - 89
	C – Survey	90 - 126
	D – Debriefing	127
11	References	128 - 145

Parental Determinants of Islamophobic Attitudes in Offspring

According to the Pew Research Center (2021), Muslims account for approximately 24% of the global population and 1.1% of the U.S. population. There are approximately 1.8 billion Muslims in the world, 3.5 million of which currently reside in the United States (Pew Research Center, 2015; 2017). In March 2021, the Human Rights Council from the United Nations released a report stating that Islamophobia had reached “epidemic proportions” worldwide (United Nations, 2021). Findings showed that Muslim communities around the globe faced widespread stigmatization and discrimination from non-Muslim members of society (United Nations, 2021; Uenal et al., 2020; Zempi, 2020). According to a January 2016 survey, about half of Americans (49%) think at least “some” U.S. Muslims are anti-American, greater than the share who say “just a few” or “none” are anti-American (Pew Research Center, 2016). Moreover, sociological research shows that American views on this question have become much more partisan in the last 14 years (Pew Research Center, 2016; United Nations, 2021). Yet, while there is empirical evidence that prejudice develops early in childhood (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011; Rodriguez-Garcia & Wagner, 2009), not as much is known or understood about the ways in which children may be socialized to develop prejudicial attitudes towards Muslims or the religion of Islam (Ciftci, 2012; Dekker, 2020; Pal & Wellman, 2020). In fact, despite the prevalence of Islamophobia around the globe, an unanimously agreed-upon conceptualization of the term does not exist (Uenal et al., 2016; 2020).

Definition of Islamophobia

Past research on Islamophobia has largely used the term to refer to negative attitudes towards Muslims and the religion of Islam (Uenal, 2016; Uenal et al., 2020). However, this conceptualization has led several measures of Islamophobia to conflate items pertaining to a social group (i.e., Muslims) with items pertaining to a religious concept (i.e., Islam; Imhoff &

Recker, 2012; Lee et al., 2009) and has therefore garnered much criticism (Cheng, 2015; Bangstad, 2016; Hafez, 2018; Uenal et al., 2020). Further complicating matters is that researchers studying Islamophobia tend to measure the construct using dissimilar scales and items, many of which have not been cross-culturally validated (Bleich, 2011; Lee et al., 2013). Scholars have noted that such a one-dimensional conceptualization of the term (i.e., as a scale encompassing both attitudes towards Muslims and attitudes towards Islam) raises the following question: which is the central focus of Islamophobia; Muslims as adherents of Islam or Islam as a religion? (Hafez, 2018; Imhoff & Recker, 2012).

The etymology of the term itself implies “fear of Islam”, however, researchers have debated the etymology and semantics of the terminology for years (Bangstad, 2016; Hafez, 2018; Imhoff & Recker, 2012; Uenal et al., 2020). Some have argued that the term is a misnomer because Western hostility is typically directed towards Muslims (an ethno-religious community) and not towards the practices and tenets of Islam (Cheng, 2015). Others have criticized the term for conflating attitudes of prejudice with secular critiques of Muslim practices (Imhoff & Recker, 2012). Occasionally, scholars have introduced alternative words into the lexicon such as “Islamoprejudice” (i.e., prejudiced views of Islam; Imhoff & Recker, 2012) and “Muslimophobia” (i.e., racism which targets cultures, lifestyles, and physical appearances of Muslims, thus making it analogous to antisemitism, Erdenir, 2010). However, even the etymology of the term ‘antisemitic’ has been criticized for its definitional components as some scholars have argued that the broader category of ‘Semite’ should also include the Palestinian people, and not solely focus on the Jewish community (Hochberg, 2020). In 2006, Salaita proposed the terminology “anti-Arab racism” as a replacement for Islamophobia, stating that the former made Arab people the focal point of Western hostility and ire and was thus, more

accurate. Salaita (2006) points out that Arab people are far from a cultural monolith. Indeed, there are religious differences, cultural differences, geographic differences, and clear political differences amongst Arab people. However, it is evident that in the wake of 9/11, Arab Americans have been homogenized into a distinct and singular hyper visible outgroup. Despite such arguments in support of its utilization, the terminology “anti-Arab racism” has not gained widespread usage in academic circles the way the term Islamophobia has.

For historical context, the neologism “Islamophobia” originated in 1910 during the French colonization of Algeria, during which time the French army committed atrocities against the Algerian people, the vast majority of whom were Muslim (Allen, 2010; Hafez, 2018). According to Buehler (2011), the term first appeared in print in 1991. Pivotaly, in 1997, a research institute in the United Kingdom named the *Runnymede Trust*, published a report titled: “*Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All*” and included the following as the first terminological definition of Islamophobia: “holding closed views of Islam” (Hafez, 2018; Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia, 1997). According to the U.K. report, these views involved perceiving Muslims and the religion of Islam as:

1. a single monolithic bloc, static and unresponsive to new realities. 2. separate and other—(a) not having any aims or values in common with other cultures, (b) not affected by [other cultures], and (c) not influencing [other cultures]. 3. inferior to the West—barbaric, irrational, primitive, or sexist. 4. violent, aggressive, threatening, supportive of terrorism, or engaged in “a clash of civilizations.” 5. a political ideology, used for political or military advantage. (p. 213; Hafez, 2018).

After its publication, the term ‘Islamophobia’ became widespread in the press, the media, and academic texts. However, the definition itself is limited. For one, it does not acknowledge or

account for the presence of Islamophobia in non-Western contexts. Research shows that Islamophobia is on an unprecedented rise in Asian countries (Mehdi, 2017; Lan & Navera, 2022). With the rise of Hindu nationalism in India, the rate of anti-Muslim violence in the country has increased (Mehdi, 2017). Many nationalists view Muslims as “outsiders” and even Muslims born and raised in India are not accepted as Indians.

In addition, the definition provided by the Runnymede Trust does not include the potentiality that Islamophobia originates as a form of racism against a people, a view that is prevalent in modern Islamophobia research. According to Taras (2013), Islamophobia has less to do with religious beliefs and more to do with race and racism. This is because Islam as a religion is “culturalized and racialized” by both its adherents (i.e., Muslims) and its antagonists (i.e., Islamophobes). Other scholars have supported these claims, asserting that Islamophobia is rooted in a type of racism that targets expressions of being Muslim and perceptions of “Muslimness” (Erdenir, 2010; Salaita, 2006). It is possible that, even in non-Western contexts, Islamophobia originates as a view of racial superiority. For one, Muslims in China have been subjected to discrimination and violence by the Chinese government (Lan & Navera, 2022; Luqiu & Yang, 2018; Ma, 2019). Thus, there may be some underlying component that highlights racial superiority in attitudes towards Muslims.

Hafez (2018) proposed that three different “schools of thought” can be identified in Islamophobia studies, the first investigates Islamophobia in the context of prejudice, the second investigates Islamophobia through the lens of racialization, and the third investigates Islamophobia in the context of decoloniality. As Hafez (2018) writes, the prejudice approach to Islamophobia functions through “homogenization” and the viewpoint that Islam is inferior, and Muslims as a people are “monolithic”. Some findings support the notion that across cultural

contexts Islamophobic attitudes originate from intergroup anxiety (Uenal et al., 2020) or pervasive misconceptions about Islam (Haque, Tubbs, Kahumoku-Fessler, & Brown, 2019). However, the racialization approach has adopted the postcolonial perspective and uses Islamophobia as an umbrella term for anti-Muslim racism whilst taking into consideration Western power structures and systematic discrimination. The decoloniality approach contributes to the second approach by offering a global perspective beyond the Western world and also by incorporating class distinctions, ethnic studies, and gender studies.

A study conducted in California involving students enrolled in public and private schools found that Muslim adolescents routinely faced verbal assaults, specifically those referencing bombs or calling American Muslim students “terrorists” (Council on American-Islamic Relations, California, 2015). Microaggressions seem to be experienced more by young Muslim girls than boys, as they are more easily identifiable from afar if they wear a hijab (Elkassem et al., 2018). This kind of otherization (i.e., the singling out of Muslim people due to physical appearances and negative community stereotypes) further supports the notion that Islamophobia may originate as a form of targeted racism towards an ethno-religious community. However, this remains an understudied area in Islamophobia research.

Research does support the notion that cultural variation exists. Quantitative results from a mixed-methods study in the United States showed that Islamophobia in the U.S. was most likely associated with pervasive misconceptions about Islam (Haque et al., 2019), which fall in line with negative stereotypes (Ciftci, 2012). However, surveys of public sentiment in the United Kingdom (i.e., England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland) and France show that the average non-Muslim person appears to view Muslim members of society as both a real and symbolic threat to their way of life (Croucher, 2013; Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011; Zempi,

2020). On the other hand, findings showed that the average person in Germany does not share this sentiment towards Muslims and does not view Muslims to be either a real or a symbolic threat to the “German way of life” (Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011). One study even found that non-Western Muslim-majority nations, such as Malaysia or Nigeria, portray a negative image of Islam in the media by utilizing conflict frames and negative tones (Hassan & Azmi, 2021). However, while Islamophobia is present across cultural contexts, the structure and determinants may be quite different.

Measuring Islamophobia in Research

Measurements of Islamophobia continue to be adapted and developed over time (Lee et al., 2013; Hopkins & Shook, 2017; Uenal et al., 2020). In 2013, one study conducted a psychometric evaluation of Islamophobia measures to better understand fear-related attitudes towards Muslims (Lee et al., 2013). These researchers deconstructed Islamophobia into subcomponents of cognitive facets of fear-related attitudes and affective-behavioral facets of fear-related attitudes. In 2017, a different team of researchers created a new Islamophobia measurement by deconstructing the terminology into subcomponents of affect and concern (Hopkins & Shook, 2017). Then in 2020, another team of researchers published a new measurement that, assessed whether Islamophobic attitudes were primarily based on fear from a perceived threat or reactive anger that is linked with fear and even differentiated between “psychologically distinct components” of Islamophobia such as: anti-Muslim prejudice, anti-Islam sentiment, and conspiracy beliefs (Uenal et al., 2020). Indeed, the field of research on Islamophobia is evolving rapidly. However, there is still not a consensus on how best to measure the construct. From the literature, it appears that four primary components of Islamophobia exist: anti-Islam sentiment, anti-Muslim racism, conspiracy beliefs, and intergroup anxiety. Anti-Islam

sentiment refers to prejudice towards the religion of Islam. Anti-Muslim racism refers to the racism suffered by individuals with Arab characteristics, such as the racial profiling experienced by members of the Sikh community in the wake of 9/11. Conspiracy beliefs refer to the perceived threat of terrorist attacks. Intergroup anxiety refers to ambiguous feelings of discomfort towards an outgroup as opposed to feelings of outright malice and hatred. However, more research is needed to understand the latent structure of Islamophobia and whether these subcomponents exist within the overall construct. The current study improves upon past conceptualizations by conducting a principal components analysis on Islamophobia to clarify which subcomponents exist within the construct and how these subcomponents may interrelate. The purpose of this is to advance the field of Islamophobia research, which has yet to come to a consensus on how best to conceptualize the construct.

Islamophobia in the Broader Cultural Context

Past research in the field has taken a macro-perspective, primarily focusing on the way media coverage spreads anti-Muslim rhetoric and perpetuates anti-Muslim sentiment in society (Bakali, 2016; Ciftci, 2012; Pal & Wellman 2020; Uenal et al., 2020). Research shows that in the West, newscast terms such as ‘terror’ and ‘terrorism’ are regularly affiliated with people who are Muslim (Bakali, 2016). There is also a tendency for non-Muslims to link the religion of Islam to threats of terrorism (Schmuck et al., 2018). Schmuck et al. (2018) suggested that non-Muslims who watched this type of news coverage had developed mental images of Muslim perpetrators as “unfamiliar, threatening characters”, and non-Muslim victims of terrorism as “good, familiar characters” (Schmuck et al., 2018). This type of media attention can lead to anti-Muslim bias that is ideologically driven because media consumers learn to empathize with people who are not Muslim and fear people who happen to be Muslim (Lee et al., 2013).

Studies also show that public sentiment towards Muslims can change under the influence of current events such as terrorist attacks (Haque et al., 2019). In the United States, anti-Muslim sentiment increased dramatically after the events of 9/11 (Bakali, 2016; Perry, 2013). Bakali (2016) wrote that in the post-9/11 context, anti-Muslim sentiment centered on the idea of Muslims being a threat to peaceful Western nations. Findings from another study suggested that in a post-9/11 world, the surveillance practices of Western states led to Muslim members of society becoming “hyper-visible” to non-Muslims and by consequence, this hypervisibility situated Muslims as both an outgroup and scapegoats (Perry, 2013). Thus, in the wake of terrorist attacks, non-Muslim members of Western society began to perceive political, economic, and social aspects of their culture to be incompatible with the “Muslim ideology” (Croucher, 2013; Schmuck et al., 2018). Since past literature on the development of Islamophobia primarily focused on the effect media coverage has on societal attitudes (Bakali, 2016; Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011; Love, 2015), there is a need for further research on the influence of the home environment, especially the influence of parenting behaviors. While it is certainly the case that Islamophobia is affected by multiple factors, for the current study, a specific focus on parents is emphasized. This is because of the important role that parents play in the development of intergroup attitudes as evidenced by the available literature on the topic.

Parenting Behaviors and the Development of Offspring Prejudice

There is empirical evidence that parents have a strong influence on the development of prejudice in their children (Meeusen & Dhont, 2015; Miklikowska, 2016;2017; O’Bryan, Fishbein, & Ritchey; 2004). Findings show that children’s attitudes towards outgroups can be “inherited” from their parents (Miklikowska, Bohman, & Titzmann, 2019). This is because a child’s home environment is their primary environment for socialization (De Neve, 2015;

Sinclair, Dunn, & Lowery, 2005) and during the childrearing process, parents try to transmit their values, belief systems, and social attitudes to their children in an attempt to shape fundamental aspects of the child's identity (Degner & Dalege, 2013). In some families, this childrearing process includes the transmission of prejudice from parent to child (Meeusen & Dhont, 2015; Rodríguez-García & Wagner, 2009). A substantial body of research demonstrates that prejudice emerges in early childhood, around 2-4 years of age (Aboud, 1988;2005; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011; Rodríguez-García & Wagner, 2009).

Pioneering research in the field of child prejudice presented the idea that paternal influence on child socialization was greater than maternal influence (Acock & Bengtson, 1978). In the late 1970s, social scientists argued that fathers played an instrumental role both within the family dynamic and outside of the household (as the primary breadwinner). Subsequent studies demonstrated the importance of maternal influence and investment on child socialization (Cabrera et al., 2011). More recently, findings support the notion that mothers have a significant level of influence on child socialization due to their increased involvement in childcare (Mendo-Lázaro et al., 2019). However, these findings were primarily on childhood socialization and thus, not focused on offspring Islamophobia.

Empirical evidence suggests that there are gender differences in prejudicial attitudes and intergroup conflict (Goldstein, 2003; McDonald, Navarrete, & Van Vugt, 2012). One study found that men are more likely to perpetrate intergroup conflict and intergroup aggression (i.e., a type of aggression intended to harm another person who is a member of an outgroup; Navarrete, McDonald, Molina, & Sidanius, 2010). Researchers have proposed that this may be because men and women respond to general threats very differently (i.e., traditionally, men tend to approach threats and women tend to avoid them; Goldstein, 2003). Supplemental findings show that men

are far more likely to exhibit preferences for “group-based systems of social hierarchy” in comparison to women (McDonald, Navarrete, & Van Vugt, 2012). Another study found that men are more likely to display explicit racial prejudice in comparison to women (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2003). However, results from this same study suggested that women scored higher in implicit prejudice in comparison to men. While there is rich literature supporting the notion that men are more likely to display prejudice than women, further research needs to be conducted to better understand whether mothers and fathers are both influential in the development of offspring Islamophobia regardless of parent gender.

Parental Rejection and the Development of Offspring Prejudice

Studies have demonstrated that levels of adolescent hostility can differ depending on whether the child perceives themselves to be accepted by their parents or rejected by them (Akse et al., 2004; Hale et al., 2005). According to Rohner (1986; 2004) both parental acceptance and parental rejection form the warmth dimension of parenting. The warmth dimension of parenting involves the quality of the affectional bond between parents and their children, as well as the specific behaviors (e.g., the physical, verbal, and symbolic behaviors) that parents use to express these feelings to their children (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). The warmth dimension is a continuum which can encompass every individual’s personal relationship with their parents and critically, parental acceptance marks one end of this continuum while parental rejection marks the other end. Parental acceptance is conceptualized as the love (i.e., warmth, affection, care, comfort, concern, nurturance, and support) that children can experience from their parents and other caregivers (Rohner, 2004). Parental rejection is conceptualized as the absence of love, warmth, or affection, from parents to their children. The parental acceptance-rejection construct also consists of four subcomponents: (1) warmth and affection (or coldness and lack of affection,

when reverse-scored), (2) hostility and aggression, (3) indifference and neglect, and (4) undifferentiated rejection. Parental acceptance-rejection is a pancultural phenomenon and is associated with a host of outcomes. Findings demonstrate a clear association between parental criticism and rejection and socio-emotional adjustment in adolescents (Mendo-Lázaro et al., 2019) and there is empirical evidence that, for many children, perceived parental rejection is the driving force of adolescent aggression (Akse et al., 2004; Hale et al., 2005).

According to Rohner (1986; 2004), when children perceive themselves to be rejected by their parents, they enter adulthood with hostility and aggression towards society. One study on early and middle adolescents suggested that perceived parental rejection was associated with aggression in most combined personality types and gender groups (Akse et al., 2004). Another study on Dutch junior high and high school students found that perceived parental rejection, mediated through adolescent depression, explained aggressive behaviors in offspring, as tested by a mediation model (Hale et al., 2005). A third study confirmed these findings stating that perceived parental rejection has negative outcomes for the psychological and social adjustment of adolescents, such as the development of externalizing behaviors such as hyperactivity, disobedience, and aggression (Gracia, Lila, & Musitu, 2005). In addition to this, a longitudinal study on children's perceptions of parental acceptance (including 1,315 children) found that all forms of parental aggression were associated with externalizing and internalizing behaviors in children (Rothenberg et al, 2021). Thus, research on this topic strongly supports the perspective that offspring who perceive themselves to be rejected by their parents tend to be more: hostile, aggressive, passive-aggressive, or to have problems with the management of hostility and aggression; when compared to their counterparts (Akse et al., 2004; Gracia, Lila, & Musitu, 2005; Hale et al., 2005; Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005).

Conversely, empirical evidence from both meta-analytic studies and longitudinal studies indicates that parental acceptance (i.e., warmth and kindness) is associated with better child psychological adjustment, and decreased child externalizing and internalizing problems (Rothenberg et al, 2021). This means that when parents were kind to their offspring and treated them with love and acceptance, these adolescents were less likely to display aggressive behaviors. Finally, while some researchers have made attempts to compare the influences of maternal acceptance-rejection and paternal acceptance–rejection, findings suggest that both types are of equal importance and lead to similar outcomes in offspring (Ali, Khaleque, & Rohner, 2015). Regardless of whether the perceived parental acceptance was from the mother or the father, children were less likely to display aggressive behaviors and social hostility. Likewise, regardless of whether the perceived parental rejection was from the mother or the father, children were more likely to display aggressive behaviors and social hostility.

Authoritarian Parenting and the Development of Offspring Prejudice

Parenting style is an additional dimension which contributes to offspring prejudice (Darling and Steinberg, 1996). There is strong evidence to support the premise that prejudiced people are more likely to be raised in authoritarian environments (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Degner & Dalege, 2013; Gelfand et al., 2011). Less prejudiced people report receiving more love from their parents and more easily expressed disagreement in the household without fear of retaliation or parental rejection (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). More recent findings show that parental behavior which focuses on harsh discipline and “unquestioned authority” can create a familial atmosphere that leads to the acquisition of a “hierarchical view” of social relations along with hatred that may become fixed on minority groups at a later period (Degner & Dalege, 2013). Harsh discipline is an essential

attribute of the authoritarian parenting style (Baumrind, 1971; Buri, 1991; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019).

Research suggests that children in early childhood are particularly vulnerable to authoritarian parenting tactics because of the framing of the world in absolutes (i.e., the framing of actions as “right” or “wrong”, and behavior as “good” or “bad”; Nesdale, 2001). This kind of rigidity in thinking leads to the classification of behaviors as “good” or “bad” and eventually to the classification of people as “good” or “bad” (Nesdale, 2001). Research shows that authoritarian parenting leads to a household environment where rigidity in thinking is encouraged and conformist behavior is expected (Degner & Dalege, 2013; Hassan, 1987). This is exacerbated by the fact that children in early childhood view their home and their parents as a safe haven (i.e., the ultimate “good”; Degner & Dalege, 2013; Knafo & Schwartz, 2003; Nesdale, 2001). Consequently, any person or group of people who make the parents angry or fearful will be viewed as the “ultimate bad”. Therefore, as a result of the harsh discipline instated in the home, both seminal and recent findings suggest children may be primed to dislike outgroups based on the biases of their parents (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Hassan, 1987, Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019).

There is also evidence that parents teach their children which out-groups to avoid in order to keep their children safe from harm (Allport, 1954; Nesdale, 2001; Rydgren, 2004). Research supports the idea that the socialization to hate or dislike an “established enemy” is driven, in part, by the demand that offspring identify with the parents and the society that the parents represent (Degner & Dalege, 2013; Parens, 2012; Rodriguez-Garcia & Wagner, 2009). Therefore, Islamophobic attitudes in childhood may emerge as a consequence of parents attempting to keep their children safe from harm (Allport, 1954; Nesdale, 2001; Rydgren, 2004) and of children

establishing fundamental aspects of their own identity (Bao et al., 1999; Dolinska, Jarzabek, & Dolinski, 2020; Parens, 2012). However, research on the origins of Islamophobic attitudes do not typically focus on parent-to-child interactions.

Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse and the Development of Offspring Islamophobia

Findings demonstrate that regular and routine interaction with parents give children ample opportunities to observe and imitate their parents' attitudes and behaviors (Wachs, Görzig, Wright, Schubarth, & Bilz, 2020). There is evidence that children actively learn parental prejudice through the facilitation of discussion that makes a scapegoat of minorities (Degner & Dalege 2013; Lee et al., 2013; Meeusen & Dhont, 2015). Research also suggests that for the child to acquire the parent's attitudes and beliefs, communication between the parent and the child must be strong and consistent. This is because weak and inconsistent communication could lead to the distortion of views (Nesdale, 2001; Hardin & Conley, 2001). In families where parents are more explicit and less ambivalent in their attitudes, children are more likely to adopt their beliefs because they are more likely to perceive their beliefs with accuracy (Knafo & Schwartz, 2003). Thus, it is likely that for offspring to acquire Islamophobic attitudes from their parents, the parents must actively communicate Islamophobic sentiment to their offspring. Thus, an important component in the development of offspring Islamophobia that has not been studied before, is parental anti-Muslim discourse.

It is possible that parents begin to highlight potential threats that the Muslim community may pose to their child. There are several types of statements that parents could make which would show their children that they do not like or trust people in the Muslim community. An example of anti-Muslim discourse would be the support of one religion or belief system (i.e., Atheism, Hinduism, Christianity, or Judaism, etc.) and dismissive attitudes about the religion of

Islam. According to the framework of integrated threat theory, prejudice towards an outgroup develops due to different types of perceived threats (Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan, Ybarra, & Morrison, 2009). These threats are categorized as: realistic, symbolic, negative stereotypes, and intergroup anxiety. To non-Muslims, realistic threat exists in the form of terrorist attacks. Symbolic threats are frightening due to cultural differences in worldview (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). An example of a symbolic threat would be if non-Muslims felt as if they were being dishonored, disrespected, or dehumanized by the Muslim community. Negative stereotypes arise from misinformation and lack of education (Stephan, Ybarra, & Morrison, 2009) and intergroup anxiety refers to fear experienced by non-Muslims in the process of interacting with Muslims (Croucher, 2013). Therefore, it is likely that during the childrearing process, parents with Islamophobic attitudes communicate potential threats to their offspring via anti-Muslim discourse which facilitates the development of offspring Islamophobia.

Associations with Parental Behaviors and Offspring Aggression

Empirical evidence also supports the notion that parents have an influence on the development of offspring aggression (Parens, 2012). Aggression can be defined as any behavior where there is the intention of hurting someone, something, or oneself (Coie & Dodge, 1998). The results of a meta-analysis (assessing over 1,000,000 children) suggested that greater parental aggression (including harsh discipline, psychological control, and authoritarian parenting) predicted increased externalizing behaviors (i.e., physical, and relational aggression) in children (Pinquart, 2017a). A longitudinal study found a stable correlation between the quality of the child's parental attachment and the child's aggression profile (Parens, 2012). The results of another meta-analysis (assessing over 700,000 children) suggested that greater parental aggression (including harsh discipline, psychological control, and authoritarian parenting) also

predicted increased internalizing behaviors in adolescents (Pinquart, 2017b). An additional study comprising high school students linked children's bullying involvement to aggressive parental disciplinary techniques (Gómez-Ortiz, Romera, and Ortega-Ruiz, 2016). This suggests that parents who display parental aggression and harsh discipline towards their offspring increase the risk of adolescent involvement in peer aggression and bullying (Gómez-Ortiz, Romera, and Ortega-Ruiz, 2016). These findings indicate that parents who display aggression towards their children are increasing the likelihood of their children displaying aggression towards other people (Pinquart, 2017a, Pinquart, 2017b, Rothenberg et al, 2021).

It is important to note that there is wide individual variation in outcomes from parental aggression (Miller, Pedersen, Earleywine, & Pollock, 2003). Results from a meta-analysis on aggression provide evidence that people who are subject to aggression but unable to retaliate against the person who hurt them, are most likely to display their own aggression toward an innocent third party (Marcus-Newhall, Pedersen, Carlson, & Miller, 2000). Findings suggest that when children are raised in strict, authoritarian homes, they may be unwilling to argue or fight back out of fear or powerlessness (Degner & Dalege, 2013; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019; O'Bryan, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2004). This kind of internalized resentment and negative affect can increase offspring aggression (Ali, Khaleque, Rohner, 2015; Rohner, 2004).

Associations with Aggressive Behaviors and Offspring Prejudice

Critically, research has also found a link between offspring aggression and the development of prejudicial attitudes (Parens, 2012). Findings suggest that aggression has a direct impact on the development of offspring prejudice because high levels of accumulated hostility can transform into social aggression and prejudice outside of the home (Parens, 2012).

Additionally, childrearing that is harsh or psychologically or emotionally abusive tends to

generate high levels of aggression, hostility, and “hate” in offspring (Parens, 2012). In other words, children and adolescents internalize their aggression and are likely to disseminate these negative feelings towards outgroups. This was confirmed by the results of a meta-analysis (assessing 13,406 children from 16 different countries) which found that parental aggression was positively correlated with offspring aggression (Khaleque, 2017). It was also found that parental aggression was positively correlated with children’s likelihood of harboring hostility towards society and developing a negative worldview (Khaleque, 2017). Piumatti and Mosso (2017) also found associations between endorsements of aggression and prejudicial views in adolescents. That is, participants higher in individual endorsements of aggression significantly reported higher levels of prejudice and lower levels of tolerance for ethnic out-groups (Piumatti and Mosso 2017).

Additional Processes Beyond Parents Responsible for Facilitating Islamophobic Attitudes

High School Representation of Muslims and Having Muslim Friends

Research suggests that adolescents often conform to the intergroup attitudes modeled by their peer group (Paluck, 2011). Findings also demonstrate that there is greater tolerance among people with diversified social networks and among those who participate in diversified social settings such as metropolitan areas (Cote & Erikson, 2009). A multilevel analysis of Swedish adolescents revealed that youth from ethnically diverse classrooms were less affected by their parents’ prejudice than youth from less diverse classrooms (Miklikowska, Bohman, & Titzmann, 2019). These findings suggested that for adolescents raised by prejudiced parents, peer group and classroom diversity could offset some of the negative effects of parental bias. In other words,

peer groups could moderate prejudicial attitudes in adolescents even when these same adolescents were raised by prejudiced parents.

In fact, research has shown that even slight contact opportunities in schools foster a decrease in prejudice (Dekker, Brouwer & Colic-Peisker, 2019; Dekker, 2020; Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). Results from a meta-analysis showed that exposure to an outgroup could diminish feelings of anxiety towards the outgroup in question (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). There is also empirical evidence to suggest that individuals are less likely to be Islamophobic if they have positive contact with people who are Muslim (Dekker, Brouwer & Colic-Peisker, 2019; Dekker, 2020). This means that positive exposure to Muslim people and even Muslim traditions can promote tolerance. According to Cote and Erikson (2009), people become more tolerant of minority outgroups in part because they have learned more about the minority group in question. Therefore, it is possible that if offspring attend high schools with a high representation of Muslim students that they would be less likely to be Islamophobic, even if they have parents who are Islamophobic. However, if offspring have Islamophobic parents and attend schools with a high representation of other religious groups (i.e., Christian students, Jewish students, etc.) but have very few contact opportunities with peers who happen to be Muslim, they would perhaps be more likely to conform to their parents' prejudice.

Research also shows that the development of cross-racial friendships seems to be a significant determinant for reducing racial prejudice (Killen, Luken Raz, & Graham, 2021). For this reason, cross-cultural friendships likely have important implications for Islamophobia as well. For example, if children with Islamophobic parents were to make friendships with Muslim peers at school, this would likely offset the effects of their parent's biases. Therefore, the presence of Muslim friends can help to diminish (and even curb) the development of

Islamophobic attitudes in adolescents. An important component of the current research proposal will be to investigate whether high school representation of Muslims or having a Muslim friend in childhood can offset the development of Islamophobia in adolescents with Islamophobic parents.

Finally, it must be acknowledged that all forms of bias and prejudice are intersectional. Thus, it is likely that Islamophobia is embedded in bias and discrimination towards other marginalized communities. In fact, U.S. statistics support this argument. In the wake of 9/11, members of the Sikh community experienced the largest incidence of hate crimes and racial profiling (Ahluwalia, 2011), despite the fact that Sikhism is a separate religion from Islam. It is markedly difficult to disentangle one form of prejudice from another. Having said this, for the purposes of the current study, the focus will be on the development of Islamophobia alone.

Additional Controls

Gender, Race/Ethnicity

There is evidence that men are more likely to display explicit racial prejudice in comparison to women (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2003). However, results from this same study suggested that women scored higher in implicit prejudice in comparison to men.

Parental Divorce

Research suggests that stressful life events such as parental divorce can lead to aggressive behaviors in adolescents (Adofo & Etsey, 2016; Spigelman, Spigelman, & Englesson, 1991; Zakhour et al., 2021). However, other research studies have disputed these claims (Ajaegbu, Nkwocha, Mbagwu, & Chinedu, 2016; Stapleton, 2009). Spigelman, Spigelman, & Englesson (1991) once found that sons of divorced parents were more likely to display aggressive behaviors

when compared to daughters of divorced parents. A meta-analysis (based on data from over 81,000 people) suggested that parental divorce had “broad negative consequences” for quality of life in offspring, with outcomes ranging from poor physical health and poor psychological wellbeing, although the effect sizes for these findings were considered weak (Amato & Keith, 1991). Recently, a cross-sectional study of 1,810 adolescents confirmed that offspring with divorced parents were significantly more likely to display physical and verbal aggression as well as anger and hostility when compared to children with nonseparated parents (Zakhour et al., 2021).

Religion and Religiosity

The influence of both religious identity and religiosity are especially pertinent to the current analysis as the outgroup in question (i.e., Muslim members of society) are followers of a specific religion (i.e., Islam). Therefore, people who are Islamophobic may very well prescribe to either a different religion or no religion at all. Pal and Wellman (2020) found that at least amongst Christians, religious fundamentalism and perceived threats influenced the formation of Islamophobic attitudes. However, it is unclear how anti-Muslim sentiment may be different amongst various religious groups. More generalized findings in child prejudice found that even amongst children in school, religious individuals favor their ingroup more so than religious outgroups (Dunham, Srinivasan, Dotsch, & Barner, 2013). Another study found that religious background had a stronger influence on adults' religion-based social preferences than children's religion-based social preferences (Heiphetz, Spelke, & Young, 2015). In any case, there is some evidence that religiosity may be a contributing factor to the development of prejudice (Shen et al., 2013; Shepperd et al., 2019). However, further research needs to be conducted in this area.

Research Questions

These are the main research questions being investigated in the current paper:

1. What are the subcomponents that constitute the conceptual makeup of Islamophobia as a construct?
2. What are the parenting processes that facilitate the development of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring?
3. What factors are responsible for individual differences in the development of Islamophobia?

Theoretical Framework | Overview

Parenting styles theory and parental acceptance-rejection theory provide the theoretical foundation for the proposed research analysis. There is empirical evidence which shows that children actively learn parental predispositions through parenting behaviors (Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Meeusen & Dhont, 2015; Miklikowska, 2016;2017). Baumrind's parenting styles are representative of how parents interact with their children and her classification scheme regarding parenting prototypes includes the concepts of authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and rejecting styles of parenting. For this reason, the parenting styles framework pairs well with Rohner's parental acceptance-rejection theory which postulates that children need a specific form of positive response (i.e., "parental acceptance") from their parents in order to be emotionally well-adjusted in adulthood relationships. Both Baumrind's view of parenting styles and the theory of parental acceptance-rejection are grounded in the view that parental warmth and behavioral control have long term implications for a lifespan development (Rothenberg et al, 2021). In-depth explanations regarding the applicability of each framework to the current study of developmental Islamophobia are discussed below.

Parenting Styles Framework

According to Baumrind's parenting styles framework, there are four classifications of parenting behaviors: authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and uninvolved (Baumrind, 1971; Buri, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Each classification exhibits varying degrees of "parental support" and "parental demandingness". The former refers to the amount of affection and warmth a parent provides to a child, and the latter refers to the degree a parent controls a child's behavior. The current analysis will focus on the authoritarian parenting style only. This is because there is evidence to support the idea that prejudiced children are more likely to be raised in authoritarian households (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Degner & Dalege, 2013; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019; Meeusen & Dhont, 2015).

Seminal research shows that unprejudiced people received more love from their parents and more easily expressed disagreement without fear of retaliation or "loss of love" (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) and recent findings show that parental behavior which focuses on psychological control and harsh punishment, together with "unquestioned authority", can create a familial atmosphere that leads to the acquisition of a "hierarchical view" of social relations along with hatred that may become fixed on minority groups at a later period (Degner & Dalege, 2013). Psychological control, harsh punishment, and "unquestioned authority" are essential attributes of the authoritarian parenting style (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). According to Baumrind (1971), authoritarian parents display low levels of parental support and high levels of parental demandingness. Research shows that harsh discipline is an essential attribute of the authoritarian parenting style, and that this tactic is primarily how authoritarian parents display "demandingness" (Duriez & Soenens, 2009). Using this framework, it is postulated that authoritarian parenting predicts increased Islamophobic attitudes in offspring.

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory

According to Rohner (1986; 2004) both parental acceptance and parental rejection form the warmth dimension of parenting. This dimension comprises the quality of the affectional bond between parent and child, as well as the specific parenting behaviors that are used to express feelings of affection to the child (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). Parental acceptance is conceptualized as the love (i.e., warmth, affection, care, comfort, concern, nurturance, and support) that children can experience from their parents and this construct marks one end of the continuum. Parental rejection is conceptualized as the absence of love, warmth, or affection, from parents to their children and this construct marks the other end of the continuum (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). There is empirical evidence that, for many children, perceived parental rejection is the driving force of adolescent aggression (Akse et al., 2004; Hale et al., 2005). According to Rohner (1986; 2004), when children perceive themselves to be rejected by their parents, they enter adulthood with hostility and aggression towards society. Findings from several different studies demonstrate that offspring who perceive themselves to be rejected from their parents tend to be more: hostile, aggressive, passive-aggressive, or to have problems with the management of hostility and aggression; when compared to their counterparts: offspring who perceive themselves to be accepted from their parents (Akse et al., 2004; Gracia, Lila, & Musitu, 2005; Hale et al., 2005; Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). Research has also found associations between endorsements of aggression and prejudicial views in adolescents (Piumatti & Mosso, 2017).

Unanswered Questions

There are several limitations to the field of research regarding the development of Islamophobia, and therefore, several directions for future research. Both the conceptualization of Islamophobia and the terminology itself has been heavily contested in academic circles for being

unidimensional (Bangstad, 2016; Hafez, 2018; Imhoff & Recker, 2012; Uenal et al., 2020). Researchers studying Islamophobia tend to measure the construct using dissimilar scales and items (Bleich, 2011). The current study will improve upon past conceptualizations by gathering data with three Islamophobia measures and conducting a principal components analysis to better assess any existing subcomponents in the construct of Islamophobia.

Another limitation in the field is that past literature on the development of Islamophobia does not focus on childhood acquisition, but instead focuses on the effect media coverage has on societal attitudes (Bakali, 2016; Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011; Love, 2015). Even the meta-analyses that have been conducted in the areas of child prejudice only focus on prejudice in general, and not on anti-Muslim prejudice, specifically. This is because there are, to date, not enough individual studies which focus on the development of Islamophobic attitudes in children or adolescents. And while Parental Acceptance-Rejection is a pancultural phenomenon, this construct has primarily been studied in the context of childhood aggression, not in the context of developmental Islamophobia. To that end, the current study provides an original contribution by assessing the origins of Islamophobic attitudes from a developmental perspective and it is the first to investigate Parental Acceptance-Rejection as a determinant of offspring Islamophobia.

Current Study

An analysis of past research makes it evident that the following parenting processes may predict the development of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring: parental rejection (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005), authoritarian parenting (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019; Rodriguez-Garcia & Wagner, 2009), offspring aggression (Pinquart, 2017a; Pinquart, 2017b; Piumatti & Mosso, 2017), and parental anti-Muslim discourse. Conversely, the following parenting processes may offset or protect against the development of Islamophobic attitudes in

offspring: parental acceptance (Rohner, 2004), high school representation of Muslims, and having friends who are Muslim (Dekker, 2020; Miklikowska, Bohman, & Titzmann, 2019; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011).

DIRECT HYPOTHESES:

1. Parental Rejection uniquely predicts increased Offspring Islamophobia.
2. Authoritarian Parenting uniquely predicts increased Offspring Islamophobia.
3. Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse uniquely predicts increased Offspring Islamophobia.
4. Parental Support of Muslims uniquely predicts decreased Offspring Islamophobia.
5. Peer Group Support of Muslims uniquely predicts decreased Offspring Islamophobia.

INDIRECT HYPOTHESES:

6. Aggression will indirectly affect the relationship between Parental Rejection and Offspring Islamophobia.
7. Aggression will indirectly affect the relationship between Authoritarian Parenting and Offspring Islamophobia.

MODERATING HYPOTHESIS:

8. High School Representation of Muslims will moderate the relationship between Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse and Offspring Islamophobia.

Methods

Procedures

Participants were recruited online via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Amazon MTurk is a popular crowdsourcing platform that has been used in research studies dating back to 2012 (Cheung, Burns, Sinclair, 2017). Participants on Amazon MTurk can access a list of jobs (including surveys) that can be completed for pay. This platform enables researchers to recruit

large populations of willing participants for behavioral science research. Findings show that Amazon MTurk is advantageous to researchers because the platform can be used to collect high-quality data at an inexpensive cost (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). Additional findings demonstrated that MTurk offered more diverse samples than the average college student subject pool, primarily because on-campus samples tended to be racially and ethnically homogenous (Chandler et al., 2019).

Information regarding the study was posted in the task description on the MTurk website. The consent form and recruitment letter were presented at the beginning of the task published on MTurk. All forms and measures were provided in the English language. After participants reviewed the information regarding the survey and agreed to participate, they completed a Qualtrics survey and received compensation through the MTurk site. The estimated time to complete the survey was 15 minutes. Participants received \$3.00 through MTurk within 3 days of their completion of the survey. This rate is higher than the estimated median hourly wage on Amazon MTurk, which is \$2.83 per hour (Difallah, Filatova, & Ipeirotis, 2018).

In addition to several demographic questions (i.e., gender identity, race/ethnicity, religious identification, level of religiosity, and parental divorce), participants were asked various questions regarding observed parenting behaviors. They were also asked about parent-child discussions regarding Muslims, as well as personal traits of aggression, hostility, and their own attitudes towards Muslim people. After completing the survey, participants received debriefing statements which included the main research objectives of the study (i.e., to better understand the development of Islamophobic attitudes in adolescence). The debriefing statement also stated that participants had the right to contact the researcher directly if they wished to withdraw from the

study, or if they had any additional questions or concerns. The researcher's contact information was listed at the end of the debriefing statement for the convenience of the participants.

Participants

Participants consisted of 303 young adults (ages 18-25) residing in the United States. Descriptive statistics for demographic variables are displayed in Table 1. 98.3% of the sample consisted of adults aged 22 years old or younger, and none of the participants were younger than 18 years. Only two individuals were 23 years old, one was 24 years old, and two were 25 years old. 63.7% (193) of the participants were Female and 36.3% (110) were Male. The majority of the sample was Caucasian (89.8%; 272), Christian (95%; 288), had a family configuration that consisted of one mother/one father (96%, 289), and did not have divorced parents (86.5%, 262). For additional demographic information, see Tables 1,2 and 3.

Measures

Demographic and Control Variables. A number of demographic and contextual features were assessed with the questionnaire items. Participants were asked about their age, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, where they were born, how many siblings they had, birth order, whether or not they were part of a blended family dynamic, their religious affiliation, their level of religiosity, their religious attendance, political leanings, employment status, education and military status, family configuration, and whether or not their parents had divorced at any time during their childhood. Additionally, participants were asked to describe how well three major religions (i.e., Christianity, Judaism, and Islam) were represented in the student bodies of their high schools. In order to identify whether the participants had Muslim friends growing up, they were directly asked whether or not they had Muslim friends growing up.

Efficiency Design. An efficiency design was implemented for responses on Authoritarian Parenting and Parental Acceptance-Rejection. In the Qualtrics survey, items for these two constructs were carved into two sets, one for responses on mothers and the other for responses on fathers. Each participant was assigned one of the sets. When filling out demographic information, participants were asked if they had regular contact with their mother growing up (with the only possible responses being “yes” or “no”) and/or regular contact with their father growing up (with the only possible responses being “yes” or “no”). If participants had regular contact with their father growing up, they were assigned a set of items pertaining to paternal behavior. Once paternal data was collected from at least 150 participants, then only maternal data was collected from the rest of the sample. Participants were asked to answer questions about the same caregiver for the entirety of the survey. None of the participants provided data on both parents. In the current study, 151 participants answered the survey with responses describing their mother’s parenting and 151 participants answered the survey with responses describing their father’s parenting. 1 participant did not have regular contact with either parent and for this reason, was asked no further parenting questions in the survey.

Islamophobic Attitudes. In the current study, three existing Islamophobia measures were administered with the intention of improving upon past conceptualizations of the Islamophobia construct and identifying the shared features of the measure. These three measures were the Tripartite Islamophobia Scale (TIS, Uenal et al., 2020), the Intergroup Anxiety Towards Muslims Scale (IATS, Hopkins & Shook, 2017), and the Islamophobia Scale (IS, Lee, Gibbons, Thompson, & Timani, 2009). Each of these measures conceptualized the construct using different subcomponents. For all measures, high scores indicated high levels of Islamophobic attitudes. The combined Islamophobia scale was subjected to a principal components analysis in

order to better investigate which subcomponents existed in the conceptual makeup of Islamophobia. Cronbach's alpha for the aggregate Islamophobia scale (with 41 items) was .98.

1. The Tripartite Islamophobia Scale (TIS)

This scale measures three subcomponents of Islamophobia: anti-Muslim prejudice (5 items), anti-Islamic sentiment (5 items), and conspiracy beliefs (4 items). Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with 14 statements concerning Muslim people and the religion of Islam using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (definitely false) to 5 (definitely true) with higher scores indicating stronger Islamophobic attitudes. Examples of items include "*Muslims are not trustworthy*" and "*Islam is a sexist religion*". The Tripartite Islamophobia Scale was tested in five different cultural contexts and results indicate "full scalar invariance" and excellent construct validity (Uenal et al., 2020). Cronbach's alpha for the Tripartite Islamophobia Scale was .96.

2. The Intergroup Anxiety Towards Muslims Scale (IATMS)

This scale measures two subcomponents of Islamophobia: affect (6 items) and concern (5 items). Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with 11 statements concerning Muslim people and the religion of Islam rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) with higher scores indicating stronger Islamophobic attitudes. Examples of items include "*I worry about my safety when interacting with Muslims*" and "*I have little experience interacting with Muslims and that makes me feel nervous*". The Intergroup Anxiety Towards Muslims Scale demonstrates good convergent and divergent validity and adequate test-retest reliability (Hopkins & Shook, 2017). Cronbach's alpha for the Intergroup Anxiety Towards Muslims Scale was .96.

3. The Islamophobia Scale (IS)

This scale measures two subcomponents of Islamophobia: cognitive facets of fear-related attitudes (8 items) and affective-behavioral facets of fear-related attitudes (8 items). Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with 16 statements concerning Muslim people and the religion of Islam rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) with higher scores indicating stronger Islamophobic attitudes. Examples of items include “*If I could, I would avoid contact with Muslims*” and “*Islam is anti-American*”. The Islamophobia Scale demonstrates acceptable psychometric properties of construct validity and test-retest reliability (Lee, Gibbons, Thompson, & Timani, 2009). Cronbach’s alpha for the Islamophobia Scale was .97.

Authoritarian Parenting. Authoritarian parenting was measured by a subscale (i.e., the “authoritarian” scale) of the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ, Buri, 1991). Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with 10 statements concerning the disciplinary techniques of their primary caregiver rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) with higher scores indicating higher levels of authoritarian parenting behaviors. An efficiency design was implemented for this measure in order to collect data on mothers from half of the sample, and data on fathers from the other half of the sample. Items for the measure were carved into two sets and each participant was randomly assigned to answer survey questions on their mother or survey questions on their father. The survey statements were exactly the same for both genders. Examples of items include “*My mother felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family*” or “*As I was growing up my father let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn’t meet those expectations, he punished me*”. The Parental Authority Questionnaire has good criterion related

validity and good test-retest reliability (Buri 1991; Gafoor & Kurukkan, 2014). Cronbach's alpha for the authoritarian parenting scale allocated to responses on mothers was .84. Cronbach's alpha for the authoritarian parenting scale allocated to responses on fathers was .89.

Parental Rejection. Parental Rejection was measured by the standard Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ, Rohner, 1986;2004). The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire measures adult children's perceptions of the degree to which they experienced acceptance or rejection by their primary caregiver in childhood. The measure includes four subscales of parental acceptance and parental rejection: warmth and affection (20 items), hostility and aggression (15 items), indifference and neglect (15 items), and undifferentiated rejection (10 items). Participants were asked to read 60 statements on parenting behaviors and report whether they experienced a primary caregiver engaging in each stated behavior with a rating on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (almost always true) to 4 (almost never true) with higher scores indicating increased parental rejection and lower scores indicating parental acceptance. An efficiency design was implemented for this measure in order to collect data on mothers from half of the sample, and data on fathers from the other half of the sample. Items for the measure were carved into two sets and each participant was randomly assigned to answer survey questions on their mother or survey questions on their father. The survey statements were exactly the same for both genders. Examples of items include "*My mother...said nice things about me*" and "*My father...paid no attention to me*". The PARQ scale demonstrates good construct validity and good test-retest reliability (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). Cronbach's alpha for the parental acceptance-rejection scale allocated to responses on mothers was .96. Cronbach's alpha for the parental acceptance-rejection scale allocated to responses on fathers was also .96.

Offspring Aggression. Offspring Aggression was measured by the Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ, Buss & Perry, 1992). The Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire measures four subcomponents of aggressive behavior such as: physical aggression (9 items), verbal aggression (5 items), anger (7 items), and hostility (8 items). Participants were asked to answer 29 statements concerning manifestations of aggressive behavior with a 5-point Likert scale rating ranging from 1 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 5 (extremely characteristic) with higher scores indicating increased aggression and hostility. Examples of items include “*Some of my friends think I am a hothead*” and “*I sometimes feel that people are laughing at me behind my back*”. Analyses on the BPAQ scale indicate good construct validity and adequate test-retest reliability (Harris, 1995). Cronbach’s alpha for the Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire was .91.

Parental Support of Muslims. Parental Support of Muslims was measured by a self-constructed questionnaire titled the Parental Support of Muslims Scale. Participants were asked to report how supportive their parents would be regarding specific situations (6 statements) concerning Muslim people on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very unsupportive) to 5 (very supportive) with higher scores indicating stronger support of Muslim people. Examples of items include “*How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you married someone who was Muslim?*” and “*How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you raised your children to be Muslim*”. The scale was subjected to factor analysis in order to determine if items were loading together in the intended manner. Cronbach’s alpha for the Parental Support of Muslims Scale was .89.

Peer Group Support of Muslims. Peer Group Support of Muslims was measured by a self-constructed questionnaire titled the Peer Group Support of Muslims Scale. Participants were

asked to report how supportive their peers would be regarding specific situations (5 statements) concerning Muslim people on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very unsupportive) to 5 (very supportive) with higher scores indicating stronger support of Muslim people. Examples of items include “*How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you dated someone who was Muslim?*” and “*How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you married someone who was Muslim?*”. The scale was subjected to factor analysis in order to determine if items were loading together in the intended manner. Cronbach’s alpha for the Peer Group Support of Muslims Scale was .82.

Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse. Parental anti-Muslim discourse was measured by a self-constructed questionnaire titled the Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse Scale. Participants were asked to report how often their parents communicated to them 5 statements concerning Muslim people and the religion of Islam rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) with higher scores indicating stronger parental anti-Muslim discourse. Examples of items include “*How frequently did your parents indicate that Muslims were a dangerous people?*” and “*How frequently did your parents disparage the religion of Islam?*”. The scale was subjected to factor analysis in order to determine if items were loading together in the intended manner. Cronbach’s alpha for the Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse Scale was .89.

Results

Completed surveys from each participant were entered into the latest version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and visually inspected for any inconsistent reporting. Hierarchical regression analyses were utilized to address the research questions. This approach examined the proposed associations while controlling for a wide array of potential explanatory confounding variables. Exclude cases pairwise was used to account for missing data.

Data Analysis Plan

There were three different types of data analyses conducted for the study. First, the factor structure of the Islamophobia scale was examined to better investigate which subcomponents existed in the conceptual makeup of Islamophobia. Next, bivariate associations between the variables were assessed to better understand the correlations between parenting behaviors, offspring aggression, and the development of offspring Islamophobia. Finally, regression models were used to control key variables in order to test the unique associations of parental rejection and authoritarian parenting on offspring aggression and offspring Islamophobia.

Principal Components Analysis

Principal components analysis was performed in order to ensure that the items for the scales were loading in the expected manner. Direct oblimin rotation was used in order to determine the number of factors representing the different variables and to understand which items were loading to which factor. Analyses were run to test for heteroscedasticity and multivariate normality. Tolerance statistics were run to test for multicollinearity in the models. To check for normality and any outliers, histograms were run to assess the characteristics of the distribution of the variables.

Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse

The 5 items of the Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse scale were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) using the latest version of SPSS. Prior to performing PCA, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .85, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1974) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation

matrix. Principal components analysis revealed the presence of one component with an Eigenvalue exceeding 1, explaining 70% of the variance in the overall construct. An inspection of the screeplot revealed a clear break after the first component. Direct oblimin rotation was unsuccessful due to the single factor nature of the construct.

Islamophobia

The 41 items of the Islamophobia scale were subjected to principal components analysis using the latest version of Mplus. Univariate descriptive statistics were examined for normality; no variables demonstrated significant skew or kurtosis. Models were fit using maximum likelihood estimation to handle missing data. Four latent variables were specified (anti-Islam sentiment, anti-Muslim racism, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes / conspiracy beliefs). Model fit was determined through the comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI; close fit = 0.95–0.99, acceptable fit = 0.90–0.95, Bentler and Bonnet, 1980) and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; close fit = 0.06–0.01, acceptable fit = 0.08–0.06; Browne and Cudeck, 1993). With the current study, the CFA model achieved good fit. Specifically, the four-factor model indicated a good fit for predicting Islamophobic attitudes in offspring $X^2 (n = 303) = 1614.57$, CFI = 0.93, TLI = 0.93, RMSEA = .06, CI90 = .056 - .064. However, the correlations between the components were unusually high. Thus, discriminant validity was very weak. See Table 9.

As the model suggested that neither of these four subcomponents (i.e., anti-Islam prejudice, anti-Muslim racism, intergroup anxiety, and conspiracy beliefs) were different from each other, it was decided to retain a single-factor model for further analysis. Model fit was determined through the comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI; close fit = 0.95–0.99, acceptable fit = 0.90–0.95, Bentler and Bonnet, 1980) and root mean square error of

approximation (RMSEA; close fit = 0.06–0.01, acceptable fit = 0.08–0.06; Browne and Cudeck, 1993). With the current study, the new CFA model achieved good fit. That is, the single-factor model indicated a good fit for predicting Islamophobic attitudes in offspring X^2 ($n = 303$) = 1949.96, CFI = 0.90, TLI = 0.90, RMSEA = .07, CI90 = .067 - .072. The decision was made to use the single factor model for subsequent analyses. The single factor was conceptualized as anti-Muslim racism. See Table 10.

Bivariate Correlations

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were investigated in order to identify the patterns of covariations among the control, predictor, and outcome measures. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions on normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. As a first step in examining the relationship among the collective set of variables, correlation matrices were constructed. One correlation matrix included maternal variables (i.e., maternal rejection and maternal authoritarian parenting), and the second correlation matrix included paternal variables (i.e., paternal rejection and paternal authoritarian parenting). The correlation matrix with maternal variables can be seen in Table 5. The correlation matrix with paternal variables can be seen in Table 6.

Key Findings

In both matrices, there was a strong, positive correlation between parental anti-Muslim discourse and Islamophobia, with high levels of parental discourse against Muslims associated with high levels of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring. There was also a strong, positive correlation between offspring aggression and Islamophobia, with high levels of offspring aggression associated with high levels of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring. Regarding maternal data, there was a strong, positive correlation between maternal rejection and

Islamophobia, with high levels of maternal rejection associated with high levels of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring. There was also a moderate, positive correlation between maternal authoritarian parenting and Islamophobia, with high levels of maternal authoritarian parenting associated with high levels of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring. Regarding paternal data, there was a strong, positive correlation between paternal rejection and Islamophobia, with high levels of paternal rejection associated with high levels of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring. There was also a strong, positive correlation between paternal authoritarian parenting and Islamophobia, with high levels of paternal authoritarian parenting associated with high levels of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring.

Variables Removed

The following variables will not be in the multivariate regression models because they were not significantly correlated with the construct of Islamophobia in the bivariate correlation matrices: Peer Group Support of Muslim and Parental Support of Muslims.

Regression Analyses

Five different hierarchical regression analyses were completed for this project. The first regression analysis tested the predictive ability of maternal variables on offspring aggression. The second regression analysis tested the predictive ability of paternal variables on offspring aggression. The third analysis tested the predictive ability of offspring aggression on Islamophobic attitudes. The fourth analysis tested the predictive ability of maternal variables and parental anti-Muslim discourse on Islamophobic attitudes. The fifth and final regression analysis tested the predictive ability of paternal variables and parental anti-Muslim discourse on Islamophobic attitudes. For each of the aforementioned analyses, preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and

homoscedasticity. Control variables for all five analyses were the following: race/ethnicity, gender identity, parental divorce, religious identification, level of religiosity, representation of Muslim students in high school, and having Muslim friends growing up.

Maternal Rejection, Authoritarianism, and Offspring Aggression

In the first analysis, hierarchical multiple regression was used to test whether maternal rejection and maternal authoritarian parenting predicted offspring aggression, after controlling for shared associations with the control variables. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table 11. Aggression was first regressed on race/ethnicity, gender identity, parental divorce, religious identification, religiosity, representation of Muslims in high school, and having Muslim friends growing up in Step 1, explaining 20.2% of the variance in offspring aggression, $\Delta R^2 = .20$, F change (7, 140) = 5.05, $p < .001$. Only religious identification and representation of Muslims in high school were statistically significant. In step 2, aggression was regressed simultaneously on the controls and maternal rejection and maternal authoritarian parenting. The two parenting variables explained an additional 24.8% of the variance in offspring aggression beyond the controls, $\Delta R^2 = .25$, F change (2, 138) = 31.07, $p < .001$. Both maternal rejection and maternal authoritarian parenting were statistically significant. In the final model, religious identification and representation of Muslims in high school were also statistically significant.

Paternal Rejection, Authoritarianism, and Offspring Aggression

In the second analysis, hierarchical multiple regression was used to test the unique associations of paternal rejection and paternal authoritarian parenting with offspring aggression, after controlling for shared associations with the control variables. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table 12. Aggression was first regressed on race/ethnicity, gender identity, parental divorce, religious identification, religiosity, representation of Muslims in high school, and having

Muslim friends growing up in Step 1, explaining 20.2% of the variance in offspring aggression, $\Delta R^2 = .20$, F change (7, 141) = 5.08, $p < .001$. Only religious identification and representation of Muslims in high school were statistically significant. In step 2, aggression was regressed simultaneously on the controls and paternal rejection and paternal authoritarian parenting. The two parenting variables explained an additional 29.7% of the variance in offspring aggression beyond the controls, $\Delta R^2 = .30$, F change (2, 139) = 41.21, $p < .001$. Both paternal rejection and paternal authoritarian parenting were statistically significant. In the final model, representation of Muslims in high school was also statistically significant.

Offspring Aggression and Islamophobic Attitudes

In the third analysis, hierarchical multiple regression was used to test whether offspring aggression predicted offspring Islamophobia after controlling for shared associations with the control variables. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table 13. Islamophobia was first regressed on race/ethnicity, gender identity, parental divorce, religious identification, religiosity, representation of Muslims in high school, and having Muslim friends growing up in Step 1, explaining 12% of the variance in Islamophobia, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, F change (7, 287) = 5.58, $p < .001$. Only religious identification, representation of Muslims in high school, and having Muslim friend growing up were statistically significant. In step 2, Islamophobia was regressed simultaneously on the controls and aggression. The entry of aggression explained an additional 22.1% of the variance in Islamophobic attitudes beyond the controls, $\Delta R^2 = .22$, F change (1, 286) = 95.99, $p < .001$. In the final model, offspring aggression, religious identification, and having Muslim friend growing up were statistically significant. Gender identity was also statistically significant although it was not significant in the first model.

Maternal Rejection, Authoritarianism, Anti-Muslim Discourse, and Islamophobia

In the fourth analysis, hierarchical multiple regression was used to test whether parental anti-Muslim discourse predicted offspring Islamophobia, after controlling for shared associations with maternal rejection, maternal authoritarianism, and the control variables. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table 14. Islamophobia was first regressed on race/ethnicity, gender identity, parental divorce, religious identification, religiosity, representation of Muslims in high school, and having Muslim friends growing up in Step 1, explaining 12% of the variance in offspring Islamophobia, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, F change (7, 140) = 2.72, $p < .05$. Only religious identification and representation of Muslims in high school were statistically significant. In step 2, Islamophobia was regressed simultaneously on the controls, maternal rejection, and maternal authoritarianism. The entry of the maternal variables explained an additional 28.9% of the variance in Islamophobic attitudes beyond the controls, $\Delta R^2 = .29$, F change (2, 138) = 33.74, $p < .001$. Both maternal rejection and authoritarianism were statistically significant. Religious identification was also statistically significant. In step 3, Islamophobia was simultaneously regressed on the controls, the maternal variables, and parental anti-Muslim discourse. The discourse variable explained an additional 18.3% of the variance in Islamophobia, beyond the controls and maternal variables, $\Delta R^2 = .18$, F change (1, 137) = 61.30, $p < .001$. In the final model, only parental anti-Muslim discourse and maternal rejection were statistically significant.

Paternal Rejection, Authoritarianism, Anti-Muslim Discourse, and Islamophobia

In the fifth analysis, hierarchical multiple regression was used to test whether parental anti-Muslim discourse predicted offspring Islamophobia, after controlling for shared associations with paternal rejection, paternal authoritarianism, and the control variables. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table 15. Islamophobia was first regressed on race/ethnicity, gender identity, parental divorce, religious identification, religiosity, representation of Muslims in high

school, and having Muslim friends growing up in Step 1, explaining 12% of the variance in offspring Islamophobia, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, F change (7, 141) = 2.74, $p < .05$. Only religious identification and representation of Muslims in high school were statistically significant. In step 2, Islamophobia was regressed simultaneously on the controls, paternal rejection, and paternal authoritarianism. The entry of the paternal variables explained an additional 40% of the variance in Islamophobia beyond the controls, $\Delta R^2 = .40$, F change (2, 139) = 59.07, $p < .001$. Both paternal rejection and authoritarianism were statistically significant. Gender identity was also statistically significant, although it was not significant in the first model. In step 3, Islamophobia was simultaneously regressed on the controls, the paternal variables, and parental anti-Muslim discourse. The discourse variable explained an additional 12% of the variance in Islamophobia, beyond the controls, and the paternal variables, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, F change (1, 138) = 46.04, $p < .001$. In the final model, parental anti-Muslim discourse, paternal rejection, paternal authoritarian parenting, and gender identity were statistically significant.

Aggression Explaining the Association between Parental Rejection and Offspring

Islamophobia

Two separate analyses were conducted on the indirect effects of offspring aggression on the association between parental rejection and offspring Islamophobia. Both tests were run using the PROCESS macro installed in SPSS. In the first analysis, maternal rejection was entered as the predictor variable. In the second analysis, paternal rejection was entered as the predictor variable. In both analyses offspring Islamophobia was entered as the outcome variable, with aggression entered as the mediating variable. Background variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, parental divorce, religion, religiosity, high school representation of Muslims, and having Muslim friends) were included as covariates in each analysis. The results are summarized in Tables 16

and 17, including path coefficients (B), standard errors, and confidence intervals. Estimations for total effect, direct, and indirect effects of maternal and paternal rejection on offspring Islamophobia are provided. The magnitude of indirect effect demonstrated the amount of mediation effect through the mediator, and the associated Confidence Interval does not include 0. Thus, there is a significant indirect effect of offspring aggression on offspring Islamophobia through parental rejection (either maternal or paternal). The mediator accounts for 37% of the total effect that maternal rejection has on offspring Islamophobia and 42% of the total effect that paternal rejection has on offspring Islamophobia. Therefore, the hypothesis that aggression explains the association between parental rejection and Islamophobia attitudes in offspring was supported by both analyses.

Aggression Explaining the Association between Authoritarian Parenting and Offspring Islamophobia

Two separate analyses were conducted on the indirect effects of offspring aggression on the association between authoritarian parenting and offspring Islamophobia. Both tests were run using the PROCESS macro installed in SPSS. In the first analysis, maternal authoritarianism was entered as the predictor variable. In the second analysis, paternal authoritarianism was entered as the predictor variable. In both analyses offspring Islamophobia was entered as the outcome variable, with aggression entered as the mediating variable. Background variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, parental divorce, religion, religiosity, high school representation of Muslims, and having Muslim friends) were included as covariates in the analyses. The results are summarized in Tables 18 and 19, including path coefficients (B), standard errors, and confidence intervals. Estimations for total effect, direct, and indirect effects of maternal and paternal authoritarianism on offspring Islamophobia are provided. The magnitude of indirect effect demonstrated the

amount of mediation effect through the mediator, and the associated Confidence Interval does not include 0. Thus, there is a significant indirect effect of offspring aggression on offspring Islamophobia through parental rejection (either maternal or paternal). The mediator accounts for 39% of the total effect that maternal authoritarianism has on offspring Islamophobia and 44% of the total effect that paternal authoritarianism has on offspring Islamophobia. Therefore, the hypothesis that aggression explains the association between authoritarian parenting and Islamophobia attitudes in offspring was supported by the analysis.

High School Representation of Muslims Moderating Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse and Offspring Islamophobia.

To test the final hypothesis that high school representation of Muslims moderates the association between parental anti-Muslim discourse and offspring Islamophobia, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to explore the association between parental anti-Muslim discourse and offspring Islamophobia and the moderating effect of high school representation of Muslims. In the first model, Islamophobia was regressed on the controls (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, parental divorce, religion, religiosity, high school representation of Muslims, and having Muslim friends). In the second model, offspring Islamophobia was regressed on the controls and parental anti-Muslim discourse and high school representation of Muslims (which is a product of the standardized coefficients of both parental anti-Muslim discourse and high school representation of Muslims). Results are presented in Table 20. The first step of the model was significant, $F(6, 288) = 4.95, p < .001$. Religion (Christian Identity vs non-Christian Identity) was very strongly associated with offspring Islamophobia. That is, identifying as Christian is associated with higher rates of offspring Islamophobia. In the second step, parental anti-Muslim discourse, high school representation of Muslims, and the interaction

term were entered, which significantly increase the variance accounted for in offspring Islamophobia, and the model remained significant, $\Delta R^2 = 0.55$, F change (9, 285) = 41.23, $p < .001$. Religion (or Christian identity) remained a significant predictor of Islamophobia. Additionally, Gender (or Female Identity vs non-Female identity) became a significant predictor of offspring Islamophobia in the second model. Both parental anti-Muslim discourse and high school representation of Muslims uniquely predicted Islamophobic attitudes in offspring. However, the interaction between parental anti-Muslim discourse and high school representation of Muslims was not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that high school representation of Muslims moderates the association between parental anti-Muslim discourse and offspring Islamophobia was not supported by the analysis.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to advance the field of Islamophobia research by first, conducting a principal components analysis on the construct itself, and second, by testing the associations between parenting behaviors, offspring aggression, and offspring Islamophobia. Since past literature on the development of anti-Muslim prejudice primarily focuses on the effect media coverage has on societal attitudes (Bakali, 2016; Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011; Love, 2015), there was a need for family science research on the parental determinants of Islamophobia.

Key Summary

Analysis of the Islamophobia Construct

Over a decade ago, Bleich (2011) commented that there was no widely accepted definition of Islamophobia that allowed for researchers to conduct a systematic “comparative and causal analysis”. This study conducted a comparative analysis on three different Islamophobia

measures in order to better understand the construct. *The Tripartite Islamophobia Scale* measured three subcomponents of Islamophobia: anti-Muslim prejudice, anti-Islamic sentiment, and conspiracy beliefs (Uenal et al., 2020). *The Intergroup Anxiety Towards Muslims Scale* measured affect and concern (Hopkins & Shook, 2017). The *Islamophobia Scale* measured cognitive facets of fear-related attitudes and affective-behavioral facets of fear-related attitudes (Lee et al., 2013). After collecting data using multiple measures of Islamophobia, an analysis was conducted on the overall construct. Findings from the analysis suggested that Islamophobia has one overarching factor instead of multiple subcomponents. As a number of scholars have criticized past conceptualizations of Islamophobia for being unidimensional (Hafez, 2018; Imhoff & Recker, 2012), it is clear that further work needs to occur in order to understand the complex structure of Islamophobia.

The finding that Islamophobia as a construct has a unidimensional factor structure supports the theory put forth by some scholars that Islamophobia is a form of racism (Erdenir, 2010; Salaita, 2006). However, there is also the likelihood that the homogeneity of the current study sample influenced the responses to the Islamophobia measures. The majority of the sample was Christian, Caucasian, Female, and raised in a two-parent household with both their mother and father. If there were indeed nuances in the conceptualization of Islamophobia as a construct, the study sample being largely homogenous may have biased the results towards a single dimension. More diverse samples may have illuminated more complexity in the factor structure of the construct. Past research shows that there is cultural variation in the development of anti-Muslim sentiment (Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011; Haque et al., 2019). Certain findings do show that there are nuances to Islamophobia and these nuances should be investigated further in future research (Lee et al., 2013; Zempi, 2020). Thus, there is still a need for further research on

a more diverse pool of participants before more generalizable conclusions can be drawn regarding the structural variation of Islamophobia as a construct.

In addition to the homogeneity of the participant pool, it is also possible that methodological limitations in the current study, such as shared item bias, may have accounted for the lack of structural variation in the Islamophobia construct. Shared item bias would refer to a lack of variation between the different items measuring Islamophobia within the three different subscales. Indeed, due to the high degree of covariance between the four-factor model, it is possible that shared item bias may have accounted for the unidimensionality of the Islamophobia construct. While it is true that multiple measures of Islamophobia were utilized in order to strengthen the measure of the final construct, there is a possibility that all 41 items in the combined scale may have asked similar questions and thus led to overlapping data. In the future, it may be beneficial to only ask specific questions from each subscale in order to ensure that the questions asked are varied and the data gathered is also varied. Another way to reduce shared item bias in the future would be to randomize the order of items in the item responses. This may lead to more response variation, and thus, illuminate more structural variation in the conceptual makeup of Islamophobia.

Parental Rejection Predicts Offspring Islamophobia

A key finding of the study is that parental rejection is a unique predictor of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring. According to the theory of parental acceptance-rejection developed by Ronald Rohner, parental acceptance and parental rejection are two components which together form the warmth dimension of parenting (Rohner, 1975). Findings demonstrate that both parental acceptance and parental rejection have consistent effects on the personality development of children across cultural contexts and that parental rejection specifically, has detrimental effects

on the personality functioning of adults who were rejected as children (Rohner, 1975). Parental acceptance is conceptualized as the love (i.e., warmth, affection, care, comfort, concern, nurturance, and support) that children can experience from their parents and this construct marks the low end of the continuum. Parental rejection is conceptualized as the absence of love, warmth, or affection, from parents to their children and this construct marks the high end of the continuum (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2005). Indeed, one study found that parental rejection was associated with children developing negative perspectives of the outside world (i.e., viewing the world as ‘out to get them’), which in turn led them to evaluate other people as “bad, unreliable, threatening and ugly” (Epli, Batık, Çabuker, & Çelik, 2021).

The current study was the first to investigate parental rejection as a determinant of offspring prejudice. These findings contribute to the growing literature on both the origins of Islamophobia and the broader field of developmental prejudice. Past research in the field had only focused on the association between parental rejection and offspring aggression with findings suggesting that children were more likely to display aggressive behaviors and social hostility when they perceived themselves to be rejected by their parents (Rohner, 2004). Therefore, this study has advanced the field of both parental acceptance-rejection and offspring Islamophobia by finding a strong association between parental rejection and the development of Islamophobia in offspring. These results add to the extensive body of literature demonstrating profound effects of rejection and the negative outcomes that result from such parenting contexts.

Results from this study also showed that *both* parents are influential in determining offspring Islamophobia. That is, both maternal and paternal rejection were found to be unique predictors of Islamophobic attitudes. This finding demonstrates that parental rejection is influential in determining prejudicial attitudes regardless of parent gender and also falls in line

with past research in the field of child prejudice. A meta-analysis (on 131 different studies and on over 45,000 parent-child dyads) found that for parents and children, intergroup attitudes were significantly related with small to moderate effect sizes but that children were no more similar to their mother than they were to their father (Degner & Dalege, 2013). Additionally, this analysis did not find any indication that girls and boys differed in their similarity to their parents. Results in a different study demonstrated that even after taking into account relevant background variables such as: parental education, and the gender of the child, that a significant association in prejudice still existed between the child and both of the parents (Duriez & Soenens, 2009). Therefore, the results do not suggest that either parent is more influential than the other via the outcomes of rejection-based processes or that either child is more susceptible to influence based on parental rejection (Degner & Dalege, 2013; Duriez & Soenens, 2009).

Authoritarian Parenting Predicts Offspring Islamophobia

This study found that paternal authoritarian parenting was a unique predictor of offspring Islamophobia. However, maternal authoritarian parenting was not found to be a unique predictor of the variable, although there was a trend indicating the possibility. With increased power in the analyses, it is likely that maternal authoritarian parenting would also have been found to be a unique predictor of Islamophobic attitudes. The results of the regression analysis with paternal authoritarian parenting and offspring Islamophobia being significant lend support to this possibility. Moreover, due to the extent of existing literature in support of the association between authoritarianism and offspring prejudice, it is likely that a larger sample size is needed to investigate the importance of maternal authoritarianism on offspring Islamophobia (Duriez & Soenens, 2009; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019; Hassan, 1987).

That is, both seminal and recent findings support the notion that prejudiced children are likely to be raised in authoritarian households (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Degner & Dalege, 2013). Findings demonstrate that parents who raised their children with a more authoritarian attitude and displayed behavior patterns that were comparable to authoritarian parenting were more likely to raise children who identified with reactionary ideologies (Fraley, 2012). In authoritarian households, children are reluctant to upset their parents and their behavior is contingent on what will gain the parents approval (Duriez & Soenens, 2009; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019; Hassan, 1987). In households where parents are authoritarian, parental love, and parental approval is deemed conditional (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Duriez & Soenens, 2009). Additionally, children who are raised in authoritarian households and who disobey their parents suffer consequences, such as harsh discipline (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). It is through harsh discipline that children in early childhood are socially conditioned to follow the parents' orders (Duriez & Soenens, 2009; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019). Children will not talk back and challenge the parent's authority out of fear of losing the parent's love and affection (O'Bryan, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2004). Even if children raised in authoritarian homes disagree with what the parent is saying, they may be unwilling to argue with the parent (Degner & Dalege, 2013; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019).

Research also suggests that younger children are particularly vulnerable to authoritarian parenting tactics because of the framing of the world in absolutes (i.e., the framing of actions as "right" and "wrong", and behavior as "good" or "bad"; Nesdale, 2001). Authoritarian parenting leads to a household environment where rigidity in thinking is encouraged and conformist behavior is expected (Hassan, 1987). This kind of rigidity in thinking lends itself to the classification of behaviors as "good" or "bad" and eventually to the classification of people as

“good” or “bad” (Nesdale, 2001). This is exacerbated by the fact that children in early childhood view their home and their parents as a safe haven (i.e., the ultimate “good”; Degner & Dalege, 2013; Knafo & Schwartz, 2003; Nesdale, 2001). Consequently, any person or group of people who make the parents angry or fearful (for example, Muslims) may be perceived as the “ultimate bad”. Taking into consideration all of this empirical evidence, it is predicted that authoritarian parenting facilitates the transmission of Islamophobic attitudes from parent to child, even in the maternal context.

However, it is also possible that authoritarian parenting is simply more influential when enacted by fathers as opposed to mothers. Research shows that traditionally, mothers have been the primary caregivers and the primary managers of household affairs (Bornstein and Putnick, 2016). Thus, authoritarian parenting and harsh discipline when enacted by mothers may not have the same associative factors as paternal authoritarianism. That is to say, mothers who utilize authoritarian parenting tactics in order to discipline their children, may still be nurturing to their children in other ways, such as by cooking them meals every day, helping them with their homework, or organizing their play dates. It is possible that authoritarian mothers, while strict, may still be very caring and loving. In contrast to this, fathers who utilize authoritarian parenting tactics may not be as involved in other aspects of the child’s life. In this way, paternal authoritarianism may lead to higher levels of internalized hostility and thus increased levels of social hostility. Although there is a need for further research in this area before such conclusions may be firmly drawn,

Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse Predicts Offspring Islamophobia

This study was the first to use and test the construct of parental anti-Muslim discourse. This is an original construct that was found to be a unique and strong predictor in the

development of offspring Islamophobia. The measure created for this construct asked participants questions such as “*How frequently did your parents indicate that the religion of Islam was dangerous?*” and “*How frequently did your parents indicate that you should be afraid of Muslims?*”. Research around child socialization demonstrates that children actively learn parental prejudice through the facilitation of discussion that makes a scapegoat of minorities (Degner & Dalege 2013; Lee et al., 2013; Meeusen & Dhont, 2015). This was the reason for the development of the parental anti-Muslim discourse construct.

For context, during the childrearing process, parents try to transmit their values, belief systems, and social attitudes to their children in an attempt to shape fundamental aspects of the child’s identity (Degner & Dalege, 2013). In some families, this childrearing process includes the transmission of prejudice from parent to child (Meeusen & Dhont, 2015; Rodríguez-García & Wagner, 2009). Studies show that regular and routine interaction with parents give children ample opportunities to observe and imitate their parents’ attitudes (Wachs, Görzig, Wright, Schubarth, & Bilz, 2020). Therefore, it stands to reason that during the childrearing process, parents with Islamophobic attitudes would frequently communicate anti-Muslim sentiment to their offspring via anti-Muslim discourse which would facilitate the development of offspring Islamophobia.

Using this framework, it was predicted that during the childrearing process, parents with Islamophobic attitudes displayed anti-Muslim sentiment through deliberate speech which facilitated the transmission of anti-Muslim prejudice in the home. This hypothesis was supported by the results of the current study. Indeed, other researchers have asserted that in families where parents are more explicit and less ambivalent in their attitudes, their children will be more likely to adopt their beliefs because they are more likely to perceive their beliefs with accuracy (Knafo &

Schwartz, 2003). However, research suggests that for the child to acquire the parent's attitudes and beliefs, the communication between the parent and the child must be strong and consistent, otherwise, weak and inconsistent communication could lead to the distortion of views (Nesdale, 2001; Hardin & Conley, 2001).

According to integrated threat theory, four different types of perceived threats lead to the development of prejudice in individual people: realistic threat, symbolic threat, negative stereotypes, and intergroup anxiety (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Regarding the current study, realistic threats would be perceived as harmful to the physical, economic, and political well-being of non-Muslims, and non-Muslim people would perceive realistic threats as harmful to fundamental aspects of their personal identity (Croucher, 2013). To non-Muslims, realistic threat exists in the form of terrorist attacks (Lee et al., 2013). Symbolic threats can be defined as cultural differences in worldview and non-Muslim people would perceive symbolic threats as harmful to fundamental aspects of their cultural identity (Uenal et al., 2020). An example of a symbolic threat would be if non-Muslims felt as if they were being dishonored, disrespected, or dehumanized by the Muslim community (Lee et al., 2013). Straightforwardly, negative stereotypes arise from misinformation and lack of education (Stephan, Ybarra, & Morrison, 2009), and finally, intergroup anxiety refers to fear experienced by non-Muslims in the process of interacting with Muslims, perhaps because they feel as if Muslim people will exploit them or even perceive them to be Islamophobic (Croucher, 2013). The parent-to-child communication of the four different types of perceived threats would therefore have the potential to lead to the development of Islamophobia. This is one area that could help to account for the transmission of prejudice from person to person.

Parental Support of Muslims and Peer Group Support of Muslims Do Not Predict Offspring Islamophobia

Neither parental support of Muslims nor peer group support of Muslims were associated with offspring Islamophobia in the bivariate correlation analyses. For this reason, neither variable was tested in the regression analyses. Both variables were original constructs and scales that were strongly correlated with one another and while each of these measures had high reliability, it appears that neither were valid measures. It is believed that stronger measures of both constructs would lead to an association with offspring Islamophobia. This is because research shows that the older one gets, the stronger the influence their social context, including peers and schooling environments, has on their levels of prejudice (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011).

A multilevel analysis of Swedish adolescents conducted in 2019, revealed that youth from ethnically diverse classrooms were less affected by their parents' prejudice than youth from less diverse classrooms (Miklikowska, Bohman, & Titzmann, 2019). These findings suggested that for adolescents raised by prejudiced parents, peer group, and classroom diversity could offset some of the negative effects of parental bias. In other words, peer groups could moderate prejudicial attitudes in adolescents even when these same adolescents were raised by prejudiced parents. Therefore, it stands to reason that both peer group support of Muslims and parental support of Muslims would have a unique effect on offspring Islamophobia. While they were not supported in this analysis, further development of measures representing these constructs may lead to more findings in the future. Importantly, from this work, it appears that the actual representation of Muslims may be more important than the perception of peer group support.

Offspring Aggression Explains the Association Between Parental Rejection and Offspring Islamophobia

A central finding from the current study is that offspring aggression explains the association between parental rejection by parents of both genders and Islamophobic attitudes. That is, in the current study both maternal and paternal rejection predicted increased offspring aggression, which in turn predicted an increase in Islamophobic attitudes. These results are consistent with previous literature in the field of adolescent aggression and offspring prejudice. Studies show that levels of adolescent hostility can differ depending on whether the child perceives themselves to be accepted by their parents or rejected by them (Akse et al., 2004; Hale et al., 2005). Rohner's theory of parental acceptance-rejection asserts that when children perceive themselves to be rejected by their parents, they enter adulthood with hostility and aggression towards society (Rohner, 2004). In other words, offspring internalize their aggression and are likely to disseminate these negative feelings towards outgroups. In fact, one study found that people higher in individual endorsements of aggression significantly reported higher levels of prejudice and lower levels of tolerance for ethnic outgroups (Piumatti and Mosso. 2017).

Indeed, this work complements another previous longitudinal study on children's perceptions of parental rejection which found that all forms of parental aggression were associated with externalizing and internalizing behaviors in children (Rothenberg et al, 2021). This means that when offspring are rejected by their parents, they internalize negative feelings of anger and resentment which then leads to externalized aggression against other people (Piumatti and Mosso. 2017; Rothenberg et al, 2021). Findings also suggest that aggression has a direct impact on the development of prejudice because high levels of accumulated hostility can transform into social aggression and malignant prejudice outside of the home (Parens, 2012). Because of the negative media messages and active anti-Muslim discourse in society, the Muslim

community therefore represents a target through which the aggressive actions can be focused or channeled.

Offspring Aggression Explains the Association Between Authoritarian Parenting and Offspring Islamophobia

The indirect effects of aggression were tested for both analyses. Findings show that offspring aggression explains the association between paternal authoritarian parenting and offspring Islamophobia. Findings also show that aggression indirectly affects the association between maternal authoritarian parenting and offspring Islamophobia. Past literature has revealed gender differences in prejudicial attitudes and intergroup conflict (Goldstein, 2003; McDonald, Navarrete, & Van Vugt, 2012; Navarrete, McDonald, Molina, & Sidanius, 2010). That is, findings suggest men are more likely to perpetrate intergroup conflict and intergroup aggression (i.e., a type of aggression intended to harm another person who is a member of an outgroup; Navarrete, McDonald, Molina, & Sidanius, 2010). Researchers have proposed that this may be due to the fact that men and women respond to general threats very differently (i.e., traditionally, men tend to approach threats and women tend to avoid them; Goldstein, 2003).

Findings regarding gender differences and intergroup aggression are well-established. In fact, empirical evidence shows that men are not only the primary perpetrators of intergroup conflict but also its primary targets (McDonald, Navarrete, & Van Vugt, 2012; Navarrete, McDonald, Molina, & Sidanius, 2010). Other research shows that men are far more likely to exhibit preferences for “group-based systems of social hierarchy” in comparison to women (McDonald, Navarrete, & Van Vugt, 2012). When investigating the origins of anti-Muslim sentiment from a developmental perspective, further consideration of gender is needed in the analysis of aggressive behaviors and responses to perceived threats.

High School Representation of Muslims will Moderate the Relationship Between Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse and Offspring Islamophobia

Findings revealed that high school representation of Muslims did not moderate the association between parental-anti Muslim discourse and offspring Islamophobia. However, the analysis revealed that high school representation of Muslims was a unique predictor of offspring Islamophobia. Parental anti-Muslim discourse was also found to be a unique predictor of offspring Islamophobia. Nonetheless, the interaction between both variables did not predict Islamophobic attitudes after the effects of control variables were accounted for. These results are complementary to previous work suggesting that greater levels of intergroup contact are widely associated with lower levels of intergroup prejudice among adolescents (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Additional research in the field of development prejudice also supported the notion that classroom diversity offsets some of the negative effects of parental bias (Miklikowska, Bohman, & Titzmann, 2019).

Adolescents who attend diverse schools (or are educated in diverse classrooms) are less likely to be affected by the prejudicial attitudes of their parents. Additionally, research shows that as children continue to get older, they become more susceptible to peer influences (Cote & Erikson, 2009; Degner & Dalege, 2013; Hjerm, Eger, & Danell, 2018; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011) and findings demonstrate that there is greater tolerance among people with diversified social networks and among those who participate in diversified social settings such as metropolitan areas (Cote & Erikson, 2009). While this work shows the direct impact of peer group representation, it does not suggest that the peer context directly alters the impact of parental discourse but rather serves as an additional independent predictor of adolescent Islamophobic attitudes.

Given that empirical evidence shows that it is reasonable to predict that a diverse student body in high school and the increased likelihood of positive exposure to Muslim people would moderate the effect of anti-Muslim discourse on offspring Islamophobia, it is likely that statistical power may be an issue here. Thus, the moderation effect may not have been significant here due to a lack of statistical power in the study. After all, research shows that moderation effects are often small and can require larger samples to be detectable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The fact that the variable of high school representation of Muslims was found to be a unique predictor of offspring Islamophobia lends support to this possibility. The variable clearly matters, as does the variable of parental-anti Muslim discourse. Future work, with larger sample sizes, should further investigate this intersection of peer and family influence.

Additional Findings

Optimism

Past research demonstrated that dispositional optimism was positively correlated with parental warmth and acceptance and negatively correlated with children's aggression and hostility (Hjelle, Busch, & Warren, 1996). Other findings showed that optimism can have a moderating effect on how people deal with novel, challenging and difficult situations (Conversano et al., 2010). In short, adolescents with higher levels of optimism were found to be more resilient in the face of setbacks and stressful events (Conversano et al., 2010). Researchers had also found a significant negative correlation between optimism and aggressive behaviors, meaning that higher levels of optimism are associated with decreased levels of aggression (Chaudhry & Shabbir, 2018).

Given all this data in the field of child development, it was predicted that offspring optimism may have an indirect effect on the association between parental anti-Muslim discourse

and offspring Islamophobia. Offspring optimism was measured using the Revised Life Orientation Test (LOT-R, Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994). The Revised Life Orientation Test measured individual differences in generalized optimism versus pessimism. However, subsequent visual inspection of the offspring optimism variable did not lead to confidence in the measure. The reliability for the Revised Life Orientation Test on the study sample was very low. There were only 10 items in the measure, three of which needed to be reverse coded. Due to errors in participant responding, it appeared that the questions had not been answered properly. None of the other measures in this study had issues with reliability except for this measure. For this reason, the variable was not included in the rest of the study.

Strengths

There are several strengths to the current study, including the use of validated measures and a national sample. The current study utilized multiple measures of Islamophobia across a sample of 303 participants and then conducted a principal components analysis to investigate the existing subcomponents in the overall construct. The conceptualization of Islamophobia has been heavily contested in academic circles with several scholars in the field arguing that Islamophobia was a multi-dimensional construct (Hafez, 2018; Imhoff & Recker, 2012). However, this study found that the factor structure of Islamophobia was uniquely unidimensional, and thus, likely analogous to antisemitism. The notion that Islamophobia is a unique form of racism provides valuable insight in to how the phenomenon develops. It suggests that anti-Muslim sentiment may not originate as a form of intergroup anxiety or due to concerns of integration. Instead, it may be more appropriately conceptualized as the hatred of an ethno-religious community due to feelings of racial superiority. As Hafez (2018) notes; the approach that Islamophobia is an umbrella term

for anti-Muslim racism takes into consideration Western power structures and systematic discrimination.

This was also the first study to test both mothers and fathers for parental rejection and authoritarian parenting. In the field of family science, data collection on parenting is heavily skewed and too often focused on mothers. As noted, the expression of prejudice may differ significantly across genders (e.g., Navarrete, McDonald, Molina, & Sidanius, 2010) but very little work has identified differential impacts of mothers and fathers on offspring prejudice, particularly in the area of Islamophobic attitudes. Thus, it is a major strength of the current study that data was also collected from fathers, thereby allowing for testing of comparable impacts of the parents. Indeed, the reason both parents were tested was to assess if both parents had a significant influence on the development of offspring aggression and offspring Islamophobia. It was found that parenting behaviors predicted offspring aggression and offspring Islamophobia regardless of parent gender. Past research in the Islamophobia field had never assessed maternal and paternal differences in parenting behaviors or their influence on offspring aggression and hostility.

Additionally, this study was the first to test the association between parental acceptance-rejection and the development of prejudice in offspring. Parental acceptance-rejection is a pancultural phenomenon and past research had primarily assessed the associations between parental rejection and adolescent aggression (Akse et al., 2004; Hale et al., 2005). Findings from this study demonstrate that parental rejection is uniquely predictive of the development of offspring Islamophobia. This is an important finding that can help to illuminate the ways in which prejudice develops in childhood and adolescence.

Moreover, this study tested the indirect affects of offspring aggression on the association between parental behaviors and Islamophobia attitudes. Findings showed that aggression influences the association between parenting and offspring Islamophobia. This falls in line with past research on aggression which demonstrates that people who are subject to aggression but unable to retaliate against the person who hurt them, are likely to display their own aggression toward an innocent third party (Marcus-Newhall, Pedersen, Carlson, & Miller, 2000). However, past research had not focused on the development of prejudice or intergroup attitudes, which makes the findings from the current study significant in the field of child prejudice.

Finally, parental anti-Muslim discourse is a novel construct that was developed for the purposes of the current study. The measure achieved strong reliability and the variable was found to be a uniquely strong predictor of the development of offspring Islamophobia. Parent to child discourse is an understudied phenomenon in the field of developmental prejudice. Future researchers would do well to delve more into the nuances of parent to child discourse in the transmission and facilitation of intergroup attitudes.

Limitations

The primary limitation of the current study is the homogeneity of the participant pool. It was anticipated that the use of MTurk would lead to a relatively diverse sample, instead the participant pool was overwhelmingly Caucasian (89.8%), Female (63.7%), Christian (95%), and raised by both parents (95.4%). While some research has shown that MTurk offers more diverse samples than the average college student subject pool (Chandler et al., 2019), truly detailed demographic information of MTurk participants is not available due to confidentiality (Pew Research Center, 2020). Unfortunately, this sample was the most diverse sample obtainable. It would be beneficial to expand the current study and collect data from a larger and more diverse

sample size. This would include adolescents raised in single-parent homes, of different cultural communities, and of different nationalities and ethnicities.

Indeed, the homogenous nature of the sample limits the generalizability of the findings. For example, the unidimensional factor structure of Islamophobia may have been due to the unique subset of participants that were surveyed for this study. Perhaps, the lack of structural variation in Islamophobia was a consequence of the fact that the sample was overwhelmingly White, Christian, and female. It is possible that, in this subset of the U.S. population, Islamophobia has a unidimensional factor structure. However, a data sample with more racial or religious variation may have shown more structural variation in the overall construct.

Shared item bias may also have accounted for the unidimensional nature of the Islamophobia construct. In future research, perhaps a focus group could be utilized to develop newer items for measuring the construct. In addition to this, it may have been beneficial to pull out a few items from each of the different subscales instead of using all 41 items. The use of all 41 items for this study may have led to questions overlapping and measuring the same construct, this may have influenced the structural variation of Islamophobia.

Finally, shared method bias was a limitation of the current study. That is, all the variables in this study were measured within one survey, using the same response method: in this case self-report. Some researchers have argued that self-report measures may lack validity, whereas others have found them to be very accurate (Baumeister, Vohs, & Funder, 2007). Although, this study also had the additional challenge of requiring adolescents to provide retrospective reports on observed parenting behaviors in childhood. The only alternative to this method would have been conducting research on parent-to-child interactions via observations which would arguably

have led to inaccurate portrayals of day-to-day parenting and thus, inaccurate reports of parental behavior.

Directions for Future Research

Authoritarian Parenting

There is still need for further study in the field of Islamophobia research. There are several ways that future research can extend the current study. For one, the efficiency design that has been utilized in this study to collect both maternal and paternal data can be used on larger and more diverse samples. This would allow researchers to better understand whether there are differences regarding parent gender in the association between authoritarian parenting and offspring Islamophobia. In the current study, paternal authoritarianism was strongly associated with Islamophobic attitudes in offspring whereas maternal authoritarianism was not. It is possible that with a larger sample size, both forms of authoritarian parenting would be significantly associated with offspring Islamophobia. However, more extensive data collection is needed to test this association in the future.

Religious Identification and Religiosity

In the current study it is evident that Christian identity is associated with increased Islamophobia. Levels of religiosity were also found to be associated with higher levels of Islamophobia. These findings fall in line with past research which shows some evidence that religiosity may be a contributing factor to the development of other forms of prejudice (Shen et al., 2013; Shepperd et al., 2019). For example, seminal research indicated that there were higher levels of prejudicial attitudes amongst religiously affiliated people than people without religious affiliations (Allport & Kramer, 1946). However, none of these findings related to Islamophobia specifically. In the field of Islamophobia, there is still a need to assess the extent to which

religiosity is an influence on the development of Islamophobic attitudes. That is, while it is evident that religiosity is an associating factor, would different types of ideologies have differing levels of association with Islamophobia? Future researchers would do well to build upon the findings of the current study. For one, comparisons may be drawn between more conservative Christian sects and more liberal Christian sects. Future research could also assess the influence of other religious identities on the likelihood of having Islamophobic attitudes.

Qualitative Research in non-Western Contexts

There is also a need for qualitative research in the field of Islamophobia. This would allow researchers to better understand existing nuances in the religious backgrounds, nationalities, politics, and personal identities of people with Islamophobic attitudes (Love, 2015). For this reason, I plan to conduct research in different cultural communities and contexts. Particularly, non-Western contexts, such as in Asia. Past research shows that there is cultural variation in the development of anti-Muslim sentiment. Quantitative results from a mixed-methods study in the United States showed that anti-Muslim sentiment was most likely associated with pervasive misconceptions about Islam (Haque et al., 2019). Surveys of public sentiment in the United Kingdom (i.e., England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland) and France show that the average non-Muslim person appears to view Muslim members of society as both a real and symbolic threat to their way of life (Croucher, 2013; Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011; Zempi, 2020). Other findings showed that the average German citizen does not view Muslims to be a symbolic threat to the “German way of life” (Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011). Thus, qualitative studies in non-Western contexts, such as in Asian countries, would not only provide new cultural communities with which to compare these findings, but also more detailed data overall. It is also very possible that if data were collected in different cultural communities

outside of a U.S.-centered context, that the factor structure of Islamophobia would not be unidimensional after all and instead would show more structural variation.

Longitudinal Data Collection

Additionally, there is a need for longitudinal qualitative research in this field. Longitudinal research would illuminate how Islamophobic attitudes develop over time. A long-term goal of mine is to collect data on intergroup attitudes from parents with pre-school age children, again when these children are in grade school, a third time when children are in high school, and finally to collect data from both parents and children when the children are over 18 years of age (or older). This would lead to a more detailed pool of information that would allow researchers to investigate the parental determinants of prejudice with far more nuance than would be obtained through cross-sectional research alone. It would also be beneficial to speak with children directly, instead of having young adults self-report their childhood experiences in the form of a survey. It may prove difficult to obtain parental permission to interview children one-on-one over an extended period of time. However, data collection in this manner would be extremely valuable. In any case, self-report surveys when offspring are 18 years or older may be the best and most realistic choice for data collection in this field, although more qualitative forms of data collection over an extended time period should also be pursued by researchers.

Measuring Peer Group Support of Muslims and Parental Support of Muslims

More research should also be conducted on the influence of peer group attitudes on the development of Islamophobia. The results of one study indicated that in late childhood, the “level of prejudice among peers” affected individual prejudice over time (Hjerm, Eger, & Danell, 2018). Thus, it stands to reason, that the older children get, the stronger the peer influence is on levels of Islamophobia. The current study collected data with an original measure called Peer

Group Support of Muslims. Participants were asked questions such as “*How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you dated someone who was Muslim?*” and “*How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you converted to Islam?*” While the reliability of this measure was high, the construct was not associated with offspring Islamophobia in the bivariate correlation analyses. Further development of measures is needed with which to collect peer group data. Perhaps the phrasing of “peers” was vague, and participants should have been asked about their close friends specifically. Another possibility is that participants should have been asked directly about the diversity of their friend group at school, which may have been a better gauge of their open-mindedness regarding different outgroups, including Muslims. After all, research shows there is greater tolerance among people with diversified social networks (Cote & Erikson, 2009). There is indeed empirical evidence to support the notion that peers groups are important factors in the development of intergroup attitudes (Miklikowska, 2016). However, valid measures need to be created to better assess the influence of peer groups on the development of Islamophobia.

A valid measure of parental support is also needed. The current study collected data with another original measure called Parental Support of Muslims. Participants were asked questions such as “*How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you befriended someone who was Muslim?*” and “*How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you married someone who was Muslim?*” Similar to the peer group measure, the reliability of the parental support measure was very high, but the construct was not correlated with offspring Islamophobia in the correlation analyses. To be clear, empirical evidence in the field of developmental prejudice supports the notion that both peer group support and parental support would be influential in predicting intergroup attitudes (Miklikowska, 2016; 2019; Raabe & Beelmann,

2011). The issue in the current study is that the variables were assessed with measures with unclear psychometric characteristics. Stronger measures for both constructs need to be developed and validated.

The Role of Sibling Influence on Offspring Islamophobia Empirical evidence suggests that “psychodynamically-informed parenting education” can optimize parenting, which, in turn, can reduce the accumulation of prejudice in children (Parens, 2012). Caregivers, parents, older siblings, and extended families can avoid broadening the stigmatization of Muslims by educating adolescents about the religion of Islam, learning about Islamic practices (such as wearing a hijab or praying five times a day), and visiting a mosque. These actions may help to diminish (and even curb) the development of Islamophobic attitudes in adolescents. While the focus of the current paper was the transmission of Islamophobic attitudes from parent to child, little is known about the role other close family members play in the development of prejudice in children (Alfieri & Marta, 2015). For example, sibling transmission of prejudice remains a very understudied phenomenon (Urbatsch, 2011). Of the few studies that have been conducted on sibling-to-sibling transmission, the focus was on prejudice in general and not on the transmission of Islamophobia (Eckstein, Šerek, & Noack, 2018; Urbatsch, 2011). Future studies should examine the influence of sibling dynamics on the development of prejudice, and specifically, on the development of Islamophobic attitudes.

An Intersectional Analysis of Islamophobia

Future research should examine Islamophobia in the context of other forms of oppression of marginalized communities. As Zempi (2020) writes, the intersection between gender and Islamophobia highlights the victimization of Muslim women. But beyond the intersection of gender and religion, there is also the intersection of anti-Blackness, race, colorism, classism,

homophobia, and transphobia, along with other forms of marginalization and discrimination. It is markedly difficult to disentangle one form of prejudice from another. While the current paper focuses on the development of Islamophobia specifically, it is unlikely that Islamophobia develops within a vacuum, completely separated from other forms of prejudice and discrimination. Thus, in order for the field of Islamophobia to advance, it is necessary to analyze the development of Islamophobic attitudes through an intersectional lens. *Policy Changes in Education*

According to Cote and Erikson (2009), people become more tolerant of minority outgroups in part because they have learned more about minorities and about issues of tolerance in general. Thus, exposing children to people who are Muslim or to Muslim traditions promotes tolerance. Parents can set up peer networks that expose kids to diverse viewpoints. Research shows there is greater tolerance among people with diversified social networks and among those who participate in diversified social settings such as metropolitan areas (Cote & Erikson, 2009). Even slight contact opportunities in the school seem to be enough to foster a decrease in prejudice by, for example, diminishing feelings of anxiety towards the out-group in question (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Results from one study suggest that children are less likely to be Islamophobic if they have positive contact with people who are Muslim (Dekker, 2020). All these actions help to diminish (and even curb) the development of Islamophobic attitudes in adolescents and they can be carried out by caregivers other than parents (such as teachers, aunts, uncles, and older friends; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). There is also a well-documented link between education and tolerance and past research shows evidence that education can enlighten individuals to be more accepting of outgroups (Miklikowska, 2016). Educators who wish to raise

children that will not develop Islamophobic attitudes would do well to emphasize literature that exposes positive themes of Islam (Bakali, 2016).

Finally, there is a need for anti-bias education with an explicit focus on Islamophobia. An anti-bias education presents an active approach to challenging racist ideologies and existing prejudices (Derman-Sparks, 1989). As Derman-Sparks (1989) writes, instead of promoting passive attitudes of tolerance, an anti-bias curriculum requires children and adolescents to confront personal attitudes of racism. For example, an anti-bias curriculum would also teach young students valuable lessons on the importance of standing up for Muslim peers. Shafer (2017) writes that an active example of this type of education would be having students role-play examples of Islamophobic bullying, by having each student play both the perpetrator and the victim. Students would be also educated upon the historical consequences of blindly following stereotypes as well as the history of Islamophobic violence which ensued in the wake of 9/11. Finally, in addition to educating students on history, students would be guided to “lead discussions on how movies and news reports portray Muslims” (Shafer, 2017). A valuable lesson on media literacy and anti-Islamophobic rhetoric.

Tables

Table 1.

Constructs and Measures

Constructs	Cronbach's Alpha	Measures
Islamophobic Attitudes	$\alpha = .98^*$	Tripartite Islamophobia Scale (Uenal et al, 2020) Intergroup Anxiety Towards Muslims Scale (Hopkins & Shook, 2017) Islamophobia Scale (Lee, Gibbons, Thompson, & Timani, 2009)
Authoritarian Parenting Maternal; Paternal	$\alpha = .84$ $\alpha = .89$	Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991)
Parental Acceptance-Rejection Maternal; Paternal	$\alpha = .96$ $\alpha = .96$	Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (Rohner, 2004)
Offspring Aggression	$\alpha = .91$	Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire (Buss and Perry, 1992)
Parental Support of Muslims	$\alpha = .89$	Parental Support of Muslims Scale
Peer Group Support of Muslims	$\alpha = .82$	Peer Group Support of Muslims Scale
Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse	$\alpha = .89$	Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse Scale

Note. *Cronbach's alpha listed for Islamophobic attitudes is for the aggregate scale.

Table 2.

Descriptive Statistics for Identity

Variables	%	N	M	SD
Age	-	-	21	1
Race/Ethnicity				
White/Caucasian	89.8%	272		
Hispanic/Latino	1.7%	5	-	-
Black/African American	3.0%	9		
Native American/American Indian	1.7%	5		
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.6%	11		
Other (Please Specify)				
* West Indian	.2%	1		
Gender Identity				
Male	36.3%	110	-	-
Female	63.7%	193		
Sexual Orientation				
Heterosexual	80.6%	241		
Homosexual	2.7%	8	-	-
Bisexual	16.7%	50		
Where were you born?				
North America	46.8%	141		
Central America	15.3%	46	-	-
South America	30.9%	93		
Europe	4.0%	12		
Asia	2.7%	8		
Pacific Islander	.3%	1		
Please specify your religion.				
Christianity	95%	288	-	-
Judaism	.3%	1		
Islam	1.7%	5		
Atheist	.7%	2		
Agnostic	2.3%	7		
How often do you attend religious services these days?				
Never	5.3%	16		
Once a year or so	13.2%	40	-	-
Several times a year	21.9%	66		
About once a month	22.5%	68		
About once a week or so	30.5%	92		
More than once a week	6.6%	20		
Regardless of whether you attend religious services, do you consider yourself to be:				
Not religious at all	4.0%	12		
Somewhat religious	19.7%	59	-	-
Moderately religious	37.2%	111		
Very religious	24.7%	74		
Very religious	14.4%	43		

Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics for Education and Employment

Variables	%	N	M	SD
Current Employment Status				
Permanent Full-Time	57.9%	175		
Non-Permanent Full-Time	3.3%	10		
Permanent Part-Time	2%	6	-	-
Non-Permanent Part-Time	1%	3		
Unemployed	1%	3		
Full-Time Student	32.5%	98		
Part-Time Student	2.3%	7		
Did you graduate high school?				
Yes	92.7%	280		
No, but I got my GED.	6%	18	-	-
No, and I did not get my GED.	1.3%	4		
Are you currently enrolled in college?				
Yes, currently enrolled.	64.5%	194		
No, not currently enrolled.	12.3%	37	-	-
I was enrolled, but I am currently taking time off.	3%	9		
I've already graduated college.	20.2%	61		
Are you currently a member of the U.S. Armed Forces?				
Yes	38%	115	-	-
No	62%	188		
In your school, how well represented were Christians in the student body?				
Not well at all	1.3%	4		
Slightly well	16.7%	50	-	-
Moderately well	34.1%	102		
Very well	35.8%	107		
Extremely well	12.1%	36		
In your school, how well represented were Jewish people in the student body?				
Not well at all	6%	18		
Slightly well	24.9%	74	-	-
Moderately well	36.9%	110		
Very well	25.2%	75		
Extremely well	7%	21		
In your school, how well represented were Muslims in the student body?				
Not well at all	8.6%	26		
Slightly well	26.7%	81	-	-
Moderately well	37.3%	113		
Very well	20.5%	62		
Extremely well	6.9%	21		
Did you have Muslim friends growing up?				
Yes	72.2%	216	-	-
No	27.8%	83		

Table 4.

Descriptive Statistics for Parenting and Family Background

Variables	%	N	M	SD
Number of Siblings	-	-	1	.8
Are you part of a 'blended family'? (Do you have stepparents or stepsiblings etc.)				
No	79.7%	239		
Yes, but I have no contact with my stepsiblings.	8.3%	25	-	-
Yes, and I was raised with my stepsiblings.	11.7%	35		
Other (Please Specify)				
* Stepdad	.3%	1		
Which sibling are you in terms of birth order?				
Oldest	21.8%	66		
Middle	28.7%	87	-	-
Youngest	39.6%	120		
Only Child	9.9%	30		
Did your parents' divorce during your childhood?				
Yes, they divorced.	5.3%	16		
No, they never divorced.	86.5%	262	-	-
Yes, but then they got back together.	3%	9		
They never married but are still together.	4.2%	12		
They never married and are no longer together.	1%	4		
Did your parents live together?				
Yes, they lived together.	95.4%	289		
No, they lived apart.	4.3%	13	-	-
Other (Please Specify)				
*Lived together for 9 yrs. then lived apart	.3%	1		
If your parents lived apart, who did you primarily live with?				
My parents lived together.	80.1%	242		
Spent equal time with both.	15.6%	47	-	-
Mother	3.6%	11		
Father	.7%	2		
Family Configuration				
One Mother/One Father	96%	289		
Two Mothers	2%	6		
Two Fathers	.7%	2		
Single-Parent Mother	.7%	2	-	-
Single-Parent Father	.3%	1		
Other (Please Specify)				
*Lived with both for 9 yrs. then raised by mother.	.3%	1		
Was your mother regularly involved with your upbringing?				
Yes	94.3%	283	-	-
No	5.7%	17		
Was your father regularly involved with your upbringing?				
Yes	92%	276	-	-
No	8%	24		

Table 5.

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Demographic Variables, Offspring Aggression, Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse, Parental Support of Muslims, Peer Group Support of Muslims, Maternal Rejection, Maternal Authoritarian Parenting, and Offspring Islamophobia

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Female Identity	—	-.15**	-.04	-.07	.03	-.02	-.03	-.05	.00	.08	.02	.08	-.03	.08
2. Caucasian Identity		—	-.06	.11	-.00	.12*	-.01	.00	-.10	-.10	-.19**	-.13	-.05	-.03
3. High School Representation of Muslims			—	-.29**	.11	.14*	.36**	.41**	.14*	.35**	.29**	.36**	.03	.21**
4. Having Muslim Friends				—	-.10	-.06	-.01	-.13*	.05	-.41**	-.42**	-.17*	.13	.03
5. Parents Not Divorced					—	-.24**	-.01	.07	.09	.13*	.15**	.18*	.16	.03
6. Christian Identity						—	.22**	.22**	.19**	-.05	-.20**	-.04	.04	.25**
7. Level of Religiosity							—	.14*	.09	-.11	-.19**	.06	.09	.13*
8. Offspring Aggression								—	.57**	.30**	.28**	.50**	.38**	.54**
9. Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse									—	.02	.07	.27**	.51**	.71**
10. Parental Support of Muslims										—	.85**	.35**	-.16*	.07
11. Peer Group Support of Muslims											—	.38**	-.04	.08
12. (Maternal) Authoritarian Parenting												—	.17*	.31**
13. (Maternal) Parental Rejection													—	.53**
14. Offspring Islamophobia														—

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 6.

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Demographic Variables, Offspring Aggression, Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse, Parental Support of Muslims, Peer Group Support of Muslims, Paternal Rejection, Paternal Authoritarian Parenting, and Offspring Islamophobia

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Female Identity	—	-.15**	-.04	-.07	.03	-.02	-.03	-.05	.00	.08	.02	.02	-.14	.08
2. Caucasian Identity		—	-.06	.11	-.00	.12*	-.01	.00	-.10	-.10	-.19**	-.10	-.06	-.03
3. High School Representation of Muslims			—	-.29**	.11	.14*	.36**	.41**	.14*	.35**	.29**	.26**	.05	.21**
4. Having Muslim Friends				—	-.10	-.06	-.01	-.13*	.05	-.41**	-.42**	-.08	.15	.03
5. Parents Not Divorced					—	-.24**	-.01	.07	.09	.13*	.15**	-.00	.13	.03
6. Christian Identity						—	.22**	.22**	.19**	-.05	-.20**	.07	.20*	.25**
7. Level of Religiosity							—	.14*	.09	-.11	-.19**	.02	-.04	.13*
8. Offspring Aggression								—	.57**	.30**	.28**	.56**	.48**	.54**
9. Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse									—	.02	.07	.47**	.53**	.71**
10. Parental Support of Muslims										—	.85**	.25**	.06	.07
11. Peer Group Support of Muslims											—	.25**	.01	.08
12. (Paternal) Authoritarian Parenting												—	.38**	.60**
13. (Paternal) Parental Rejection													—	.54**
14. Offspring Islamophobia														—

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 7.

Descriptives: Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges

Variables	M	SD	Range
1. Female Identity	.36	.48	1
2. Caucasian Identity	.90	.30	1
3. High School Representation of Muslims	2.90	1.04	4
4. Having Muslim Friends	1.28	.45	1
5. Parents Not Divorced	.10	.29	1
6. Christian Identity	.95	.22	1
7. Level of Religiosity	3.26	1.06	4
8. Offspring Aggression	3.00	.70	3.52
9. Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse	2.23	.89	3.80
10. Parental Support of Muslims	3.50	.72	3.63
11. Peer Group Support of Muslims	3.50	.72	3.60
12. Maternal Rejection	178.93	28.74	139.00
13. Paternal Rejection	177.20	27.09	107.00
14. Maternal Authoritarian Parenting	3.59	.57	3.40
15. Paternal Authoritarian Parenting	3.49	.65	3.70
16. Offspring Islamophobia	2.78	.94	3.60

Table 8.

Total Variance Explained in Principal Components Analysis of Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.50	70.07	70.07
2	.48	9.63	79.70
3	.45	9.07	88.76
4	.30	6.07	94.83
5	.26	5.17	100.00

Table 9.

Correlation Matrix of Four Factor Islamophobia Subcomponents

Four Factor Subcomponents	1	2	3	4
1. Anti-Islam Prejudice	-	0.96	0.92	0.98
2. Anti-Muslim Racism		-	0.97	0.99
3. Intergroup Anxiety			-	0.94
4. Conspiracy Beliefs				-

Table 10.

Factor Loadings for Single Factor Islamophobia Model

Variables	Unstandardized.	SE	Standardized.
There is strong support among Muslims for Islamist terrorists.	.686	.031	.69
Muslims appear to be irrational, compared to non-Muslims.	.698	.03	.70
Muslims are a social and economic burden for the U.S.	.76	.03	.76
Muslims are not trustworthy.	.82	.02	.82
Muslims attract more attention due to their aggressive behavior.	.74	.03	.74
Islam is a sexist religion.	.69	.03	.69
Islam is a violence-glorifying religion.	.81	.02	.81
Islam is an anti-Semitic religion.	.80	.02	.80
The Islamic religion is harmful for world peace.	.80	.02	.80
The Islamic religion is by default not compatible with modernity.	.79	.02	.79
Muslims are planning to Islamize the West step by step.	.78	.02	.78
Muslims are striving to establish Sharia Law in the U.S.	.82	.02	.82
Muslims secretly plot for an Islamization of the U.S.	.84	.02	.84
Muslims would like to control international political institutions.	.80	.02	.80
I support any policy that would stop the building of new mosques.	.70	.03	.70
If possible, I would avoid going to places where Muslims would be.	.77	.02	.78
I would become extremely uncomfortable speaking with a Muslim.	.82	.02	.82
It is important to stay away from places where Muslims could be.	.84	.02	.84
I dread the thought of having a professor that is Muslim.	.82	.02	.82
If I could, I would avoid contact with Muslims.	.83	.02	.83
If I could, I would live in a place where there were no Muslims.	.83	.02	.83
Muslims should not be allowed to work in places where Americans gather.	.83	.02	.83
Islam is a dangerous religion.	.79	.02	.79
The religion of Islam supports acts of violence.	.81	.02	.81
Islam supports terrorist acts.	.79	.02	.79
Islam is anti-American.	.80	.02	.80
Islam is an evil religion.	.80	.02	.80
Islam is a religion of hate.	.83	.02	.83
I believe that Muslims support the killings of all non-Muslims.	.83	.02	.83
Muslims want to take over the world.	.82	.02	.82
I would feel nervous if I were the only person on a bus and a Muslim came on.	.84	.02	.84
I worry about my safety when interacting with Muslims.	.83	.02	.83
When interacting with a Muslim I am nervous that he/she will want to fight me.	.83	.02	.83
I would feel anxious alone in a doctor's waiting room with a Muslim.	.81	.02	.81
I would feel nervous on the street alone w/ a Muslim was walking towards me.	.78	.02	.78
I feel uncomfortable because I think Muslims want me to convert to their faith.	.81	.02	.81
I feel uncomfortable when interacting with Muslims because I fear they will think I am prejudiced against them.	.81	.02	.81
I don't know much about the Islamic faith and that makes me feel uncomfortable around Muslims.	.76	.03	.76
I wouldn't consider myself a racist, but because I don't know how to act around Muslims I fear they may think I am racist.	.80	.02	.80
I have little experience interacting w/ Muslims and that makes me nervous.	.80	.02	.80
I would feel awkward at a social gathering where I was the only non-Muslim.	.80	.02	.80

Table 11.

Regression Analysis Assessing the Predictive Nature of Maternal Rejection and Maternal Authoritarian Parenting on Offspring Aggression (N=146)

Variables	Model 1 (Demographics)			ΔR^2	Model 2 (Parenting)			ΔR^2
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	
Step 1				.20***				
Female Identity	-.06	.11	-.04		-.09	.09	-.06	
Caucasian Identity	-.01	.18	-.00		.12	.15	.05	
Parents Not Divorced	.17	.19	.07		-.09	.16	-.04	
Christian Identity	.61*	.26	.19		.56*	.22	.17	
Level of Religiosity	-.03	.06	-.04		-.02	.05	-.03	
High School Representation of Muslims	.26***	.06	.39		.17**	.05	.24	
Having Muslim Friends	-.01	.13	-.01		-.07	.11	-.04	
Step 2								.25***
(Maternal) Parental Rejection	-	-	-		.01***	.02	.32	
(Maternal) Authoritarian Parenting	-	-	-		.47***	.09	.38	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 12.

Regression Analysis Assessing the Predictive Nature of Paternal Rejection and Paternal Authoritarian Parenting on Offspring Aggression (N=148)

Variables	Model 1 (Demographics)			ΔR^2	Model 2 (Parenting)			ΔR^2
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	
Step 1				.20**				
Female Identity	-.06	.11	-.04		.00	.09	.00	
Caucasian Identity	-.01	.18	-.00		.17	.15	.07	
Parents Not Divorced	.17	.19	.07		.02	.16	.01	
Christian Identity	.61*	.26	.19		.23	.22	.07	
Level of Religiosity	-.03	.06	-.04		.03	.04	.04	
High School Representation of Muslims	.26***	.06	.39		.17**	.05	.25	
Having Muslim Friends	-.01	.13	-.01		-.13	.10	-.08	
Step 2								.30**
(Paternal) Parental Rejection	-	-	-		.01***	.00	.33	
(Paternal) Authoritarian Parenting	-	-	-		.40***	.07	.37	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 13.
Regression Analysis Assessing the Predictive Nature of Offspring Aggression on Offspring Islamophobia (N = 295)

Variables	Model 1 (Demographics)			ΔR^2	Model 2 (Parenting)			ΔR^2
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	
Step 1				.12***				
Female Identity	.18	.11	.09		.22*	.10	.11	
Caucasian Identity	-.15	.18	-.05		-.14	.15	-.05	
Parents Not Divorced	.26	.19	.08		.13	.16	.04	
Christian Identity	1.11***	.26	.25		.67**	.23	.16	
Level of Religiosity	.00	.05	.00		.02	.05	.02	
High School Representation of Muslims	.18**	.06	.20		-.00	.05	-.00	
Having Muslim Friends	.26*	.12	.12		.27*	.11	.13	
Step 2								.22***
Offspring Aggression	-	-	-		.71***	.07	.53	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 14.

Regression Analysis Assessing the Predictive Nature of Maternal Rejection, Maternal Authoritarian Parenting, and Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse on Offspring Islamophobia (N = 146)

Variables	Model 1 (Demographics)				Model 2 (Parenting)				Model 3 (Discourse)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	ΔR^2
Step 1				.12*								
Female Identity	.18	.16	.09		.17	.13	.09		.18	.11	.09	
Caucasian Identity	-.15	.25	-.05		.02	.21	.01		.17	.18	.05	
Parents Not Divorced	.26	.27	.08		-.14	.23	-.04		-.18	.19	-.06	
Christian Identity	1.11**	.37	.25		.94**	.31	.22		.50	.26	.12	
Level of Religiosity	.00	.08	.00		-.01	.06	-.02		-.01	.05	-.01	
High School Representation of Muslims	.18*	.08	.20		.11	.07	.12		.09	.06	.10	
Having Muslim Friends	.26	.18	.12		.11	.15	.05		.04	.12	.02	
Step 2								.29***				
(Maternal) Parental Rejection	-	-	-		.02***	.00	.49		.01***	.00	.25	
(Maternal) Authoritarian Parenting	-	-	-		.34**	.12	.20		.18	.10	.11	
Step 3												.18***
Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse	-	-	-		-	-	-		.56***	.07	.53	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 15.

Regression Analysis Assessing the Predictive Nature of Paternal Rejection, Paternal Authoritarian Parenting, and Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse on Offspring Islamophobia (N = 148)

Variables	Model 1 (Demographics)				Model 2 (Parenting)				Model 3 (Discourse)			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	ΔR^2
Step 1				.12*								
Female Identity	.18	.16	.09		.26*	.12	.13		.23*	.10	.12	
Caucasian Identity	-.15	.25	-.05		.13	.19	.04		.21	.17	.07	
Parents Not Divorced	.26	.27	.08		.03	.20	.01		-.06	.18	-.02	
Christian Identity	1.11**	.37	.25		.52	.29	.12		.34	.25	.08	
Level of Religiosity	.00	.08	.00		.09	.06	.10		.05	.05	.06	
High School Representation of Muslims	.18*	.08	.20		.04	.06	.04		.04	.05	.04	
Having Muslim Friends	.26	.18	.12		.08	.13	.04		.04	.12	.02	
Step 2								.40***				
(Paternal) Parental Rejection	-	-	-		.01***	.00	.36		.01**	.00	.19	
(Paternal) Authoritarian Parenting	-	-	-		.65***	.10	.45		.44***	.09	.31	
Step 3												.12***
Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse	-	-	-		-	-	-		.47***	.07	.44	

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 16.

Indirect Effects of Offspring Aggression on the Relationship between Maternal Rejection and Offspring Islamophobia (N = 146)

Effect	B	SE	95% CI	
			Lower	Upper
Direct	.013	.002	.017	.008
Indirect	.003	.001	.006	.001

Note. Controlled for *Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Parental Divorce, Religion, Religiosity, High School Representation of Muslims, and Having Muslim Friends*

Table 17.

Indirect Effects of Offspring Aggression on the Relationship between Paternal Rejection and Offspring Islamophobia (N =148)

Effect	B	SE	95% CI	
			Lower	Upper
Direct	.013	.003	.018	.007
Indirect	.007	.002	.010	.003

Note. Controlled for *Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Parental Divorce, Religion, Religiosity, High School Representation of Muslims, and Having Muslim Friends*

Table 18.

Indirect Effects of Offspring Aggression on the Relationship between Maternal Authoritarianism and Offspring Islamophobia (N = 146)

Effect	B	SE	95% CI	
			Lower	Upper
Direct	.130	.140	.148	.407
Indirect	.255	.079	.117	.427

Note. Controlled for Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Parental Divorce, Religion, Religiosity, High School Representation of Muslims, and Having Muslim Friends

Table 19.

Indirect Effects of Offspring Aggression on the Relationship between Paternal Authoritarianism and Offspring Islamophobia (N = 148)

Effect	B	SE	95% CI	
			Lower	Upper
Direct	.607	.109	.391	.824
Indirect	.240	.082	.109	.427

Note. Controlled for Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Parental Divorce, Religion, Religiosity, High School Representation of Muslims, and Having Muslim Friends

Table 20.

Regression Analysis Assessing the Moderating Nature of High School Representation of Muslims on Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse and Offspring Islamophobia

Variables	Model 1 (Demographics)			ΔR^2	Model 2 (Standardized)			ΔR^2
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β		<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	
Step 1				.08***				
Female Identity	.16	.11	.08		.16*	.08	.08	
Caucasian Identity	-.24	.18	-.08		.05	.13	.02	
Parents Not Divorced	.34	.18	.11		-.06	.13	-.02	
Christian Identity	1.20***	.26	.28		.47*	.18	.11	
Level of Religiosity	.05	.05	.05		-.03	.04	-.03	
Having Muslim Friends	.17	.12	.05		.13	.09	.06	
Step 2								.55***
Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse	-	-	-		.64***	.04	.67	
High School Representation of Muslims	-	-	-		.16***	.04	.16	
Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse X High School Representation of Muslims	-	-	-		.07	.04	.07	

Note. Scores for *Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse* and *High School Representation of Muslims* are standardized.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Appendix A

Recruitment Script

I am a student at Syracuse University working on a research project for my dissertation. This involves a written survey that asks questions about your background, your primary caregiver, and your level of agreement with a variety of statements about both your primary caregiver and you. Your participation involves minimal risk. I am wondering if you would be interested in participating. Participation is entirely voluntary and would be anonymous. Completing the survey would take about 30 minutes of your time. I appreciate your consideration.

Appendix B



DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SCIENCE
144 White Hall
Syracuse, New York, 13244

My name is Sanum Shafi, and I am a doctoral student at Syracuse University. I am inviting you to participate in a research study that will be conducted as part of the work for my doctoral dissertation. Involvement in the study is voluntary, so you may choose to participate or not without penalty. This sheet will explain the study to you and please feel free to ask questions about the research if you have any. I will be happy to explain anything in detail if you wish.

I am interested in learning more about parenting behaviors and the personality characteristics of children. As part of this research project, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire, answering questions about your personal characteristics, your perceptions of your primary caregiver, and your level of agreement with certain statements. The questions simply ask about your level of agreement with statements concerning either yourself, or your primary caregiver. All of this information will be treated confidentially. You will be answering these questions anonymously; there is no place to include your name on the measures and so there is no way to link your responses back to you. There are no right or wrong answers, so please answer the questions to the best of your ability. Completing the survey will take approximately 10 minutes of your time, but please take as much time as you would like.

There should be minimal risk involved in participating in this project. But please note that this may include self-examination related to family experiences. You are asked only to report on your own attitudes, and your perceptions of your primary caregiver, using a standard questionnaire format. By completing this survey, you will be helping researchers to better understand the childrearing process. You will also help add to the general knowledge base regarding the transmission of values and attitudes from parents to their children.

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research, please contact Sanum Shafi at sshafi@syr.edu, or the supervising faculty member Matthew Mulvaney at mmulvane@syr.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, or if you have questions, concerns, or complaints that you wish to address to someone other than the investigator, or if you cannot reach the investigator, contact the Syracuse University Institutional Review Board at (315) 443-3013.

Please keep one copy of this consent form for your records.

I have read the description of the project, all of my questions have been answered, I am 18 years of age or older, and I wish to participate in this research study. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature of participant

Date

Printed name of participant

Signature of researcher

Date

Printed name of researcher

Appendix C

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

1. Please specify your age.

1. _____

2. Please specify your ethnicity.

1. White / Caucasian
 2. Hispanic / Latino
 3. Black / African American
 4. Native American / American Indian
 5. Asian / Pacific Islander
 6. Other (Please Specify):
-

3. Please specify your gender identity.

1. Male
 2. Female
 3. Non-binary / Gender fluid
 4. Other (Please Specify):
-

4. What is your sexual orientation?

1. Heterosexual
 2. Homosexual
 3. Bisexual
 4. Unsure / Questioning
 5. Other (Please Specify):
-

5. Where were you born?

1. North America
2. Central America
3. South America
4. Europe
5. Africa
6. Asia
7. Australia
8. Pacific Islander
9. Caribbean Islands

10. Other (Please Specify):

6. What is your current employment status?

1. Permanent full-time employment
 2. non-permanent full-time employment
 3. Permanent part-time employment
 4. non-permanent part-time employment
 5. Unemployed
 6. Full-time student
 7. Part-time student
 8. Other (Please Specify):
-

7. Did you graduate high school?

1. Yes
 2. No, but I got my GED
 3. No, and I did not get my GED
 4. Other (Please Specify)
-

8. Are you currently enrolled in college?

1. Yes, I am currently enrolled
 2. No, I am not currently enrolled
 3. I was enrolled in college, but I am currently taking time off
 4. I was enrolled in college, but I dropped out and no longer wish to pursue
 5. I've already graduated college
 6. Other (Please Specify)
-

9. Are you currently a member of the U.S. Armed Forces?

1. Yes
2. No

10. How many siblings do you have?

1. _____

11. Are you part of a 'blended family'? (Do you have stepparents or stepsiblings etc.)

1. No
2. Yes, but I have no contact with my stepsiblings

3. Yes, and I was raised with my stepsiblings
 4. Other (Please Specify)
-

12. Which sibling are you in terms of birth order?

1. Oldest
 2. Middle
 3. Youngest
 4. Only Child
 5. Other (Please Specify)
-

13. Which best represents the configuration of your family growing up?

1. One mother, One father
 2. Two mothers
 3. Two fathers
 4. Single-parent Mother
 5. Single-parent Father
 6. Other (Please Specify):
-

14. Did your parents' divorce at any point during your childhood?

1. Yes, they divorced
 2. No, they never divorced
 3. Yes, they divorced but then they got back together
 4. My parents were never married but are still together
 5. My parents never married and are no longer together
 6. Other (Please Specify)
-

15. Did your parents live together when you were growing up?

1. Yes, they lived together
 2. No, they lived apart
 3. Other (Please Specify)
-

16. If your parents lived apart, who did you primarily live with?

1. My parents lived together during my entire childhood
2. My parents lived apart, but I spent equal time with both
3. My parents lived apart, and I primarily lived with my mother

4. My parents lived apart, and I primarily lived with my father
 5. Other (Please Specify):
-

17. Please specify your religion.

1. Christianity
 2. Judaism
 3. Islam
 4. Buddhism
 5. Hinduism
 6. Atheist
 7. Agnostic
 8. Other (Please Specify):
-

18. How often do you attend religious services these days?

1. Never
2. Once a year or so
3. Several times a year
4. About once a month
5. Once a week or so
6. More than once a week

19. Regardless of whether you attend religious services, do you consider yourself to be:

1. Not at all religious
2. Slightly religious
3. Somewhat religious
4. Moderately religious
5. Extremely religious

20. In your school, how well represented were Christians in the student body?

1. Not well at all
2. Slightly well
3. Moderately well
4. Very well
5. Extremely well

21. In your school, how well represented were Jewish people in the student body?

1. Not well at all
2. Slightly well

3. Moderately well
4. Very well
5. Extremely well

22. In your school, how well represented were Muslims in the student body?

1. Not well at all
2. Slightly well
3. Moderately well
4. Very well
5. Extremely well

23. Did you have a close Muslim friend growing up?

1. Yes
2. No

24. Was your mother regularly involved with your upbringing?

1. Yes
2. No

25. Was your father regularly involved with your upbringing?

1. Yes
2. No

**If your father was regularly involved with your upbringing, please answer all the following “primary caregiver” questions about your father.*

If your father was NOT regularly involved with your upbringing, please answer all the following “primary caregiver” questions about your mother.

26. If you were not raised by your mother or your father, who would you consider to be your primary caregiver? (Possible answers may include grandmother, grandfather, aunt, uncle, a godparent, etc.) Please specify this primary caregiver below or put N/A if you were raised by your mother or father.

1. _____

**If neither your mother nor your father were regularly involved with your upbringing, please answer all of the following “primary caregiver” questions about the person you specified above.*

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire)

PARQ

The following questions are related to the behaviors of your primary caregiver during childhood. Please read the statements and choose the number that best describes your experiences with your primary caregiver.

VERSION 1: FATHERS

27.1. My father...said nice things about me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

28.1. My father...nagged or scolded me when I was bad

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

29.1. My father...paid no attention to me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

30.1. My father...did not really love me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

31.1. My father...talked to me about our plans and listened to what I had to say

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

32.1. My father...complained about me to others when I did not listen to him

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

33.1. My father...took a real interest in me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

34.1. My father...wanted me to bring my friends home, and tried to make things pleasant for them

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

35.1. My father...ridiculed and made fun of me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

36.1. My father...paid no attention to me as long as I did nothing to bother him

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

37.1. My father...yelled at me when he was angry

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

38.1. My father...made it easy for me to tell him things that were important to me

1. Almost always true

2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

39.1. My father...treated me harshly

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

40.1. My father...enjoyed having me around him

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

41.1. My father...made me feel proud when I did well

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

42.1. My father...hit me, even when I did not deserve it

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

43.1. My father...forgot things he was supposed to do for me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

44.1. My father...saw me as a big nuisance

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

45.1. My father...praised me to others

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

46.1. My father...punished me severely when he was angry

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

47.1. My father...made sure I had the right kind of food to eat

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

48.1. My father...talked to me in a warm and loving way

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

49.1. My father...got angry at me easily

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

50.1. My father...was too busy to answer my questions

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

51.1. My father...seemed to dislike me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True

4. Almost Never True

52.1. My father...said nice things to me when I deserved them

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

53.1. My father...got mad quickly and picked on me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

54.1. My father...cared about who my friends were

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

55.1. My father...was really interested in what I did

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

56.1. My father...said many unkind things to me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

57.1. My father...paid no attention when I asked for help

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

58.1. My father...thought it was my own fault when I was having trouble

1. Almost always true

2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

59.1. My father...made me feel wanted and needed

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

60.1. My father...told me I got on his nerves

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

61.1. My father...paid a lot of attention to me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

62.1. My father...told me how proud he was of me when I was good

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

63.1. My father...went out of his way to hurt my feelings

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

64.1. My father...forgot important things I thought that he should remember

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

65.1. My father...made me feel unloved if I misbehaved

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

66.1. My father...made me feel what I did was important

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

67.1. My father...frightened or threatened me when I did something wrong

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

68.1. My father...liked to spend time with me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

69.1. My father...tried to help me when I was scared or upset

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

70.1. My father...shamed me in front of my friends when I misbehaved

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

71.1. My father...tried to stay away from me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True

4. Almost Never True

72.1. My father...complained about me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

73.1. My father...cared about what I thought, and liked me to talk about it

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

74.1. My father...felt other children were better than I was no matter what I did

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

75.1. My father...cared about what I would like when he made plans

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

76.1. My father...let me do things I thought were important, even if it was hard for him

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

77.1. My father...thought other children behaved better than I did

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

78.1. My father...wanted other people to take care of me (for example, a neighbor or relative)

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

79.1. My father...let me know I was not wanted

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

80.1. My father...was interested in the things I did

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

81.1. My father...tried to make me feel better when I was hurt or sick

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

82.1. My father...told me how ashamed he was when I misbehaved

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

83.1. My father...let me know that he loved me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

84.1. My father...treated me gently and with kindness

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

85.1. My father...made me feel ashamed or guilty when I misbehaved

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

86.1. My father...tried to make me happy

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

VERSION 2: MOTHERS**27.2. My mother...said nice things about me**

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

28.2. My mother...nagged or scolded me when I was bad

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

29.2. My mother...paid no attention to me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

30.2. My mother...did not really love me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

31.2. My mother...talked to me about our plans and listened to what I had to say

1. Almost always true

2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

32.2. My mother...complained about me to others when I did not listen to her

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

33.2. My mother...took a real interest in me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

34.2. My mother...wanted me to bring my friends home, and tried to make things pleasant for them

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

35.2. My mother...ridiculed and made fun of me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

36.2. My mother...paid no attention to me as long as I did nothing to bother her

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

37.2. My mother...yelled at me when she was angry

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

38.2. My mother...made it easy for me to tell her things that were important to me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

39.2. My mother...treated me harshly

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

40.2. My mother...enjoyed having me around her

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

41.2. My mother...made me feel proud when I did well

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

42.2. My mother...hit me, even when I did not deserve it

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

43.2. My mother...forgot things she was supposed to do for me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

44.2. My mother...saw me as a big nuisance

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true

3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

45.2. My mother...praised me to others

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

46.2. My mother...punished me severely when she was angry

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

47.2. My mother...made sure I had the right kind of food to eat

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

48.2. My mother...talked to me in a warm and loving way

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

49.2. My mother...got angry at me easily

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

50.2. My mother...was too busy to answer my questions

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

51.2. My mother...seemed to dislike me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

52.2. My mother...said nice things to me when I deserved them

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

53.2. My mother...got mad quickly and picked on me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

54.2. My mother...cared about who my friends were

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

55.2. My mother...was really interested in what I did

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

56.2. My mother...said many unkind things to me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

57.2. My mother...paid no attention when I asked for help

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

58.2. My mother...thought it was my own fault when I was having trouble

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

59.2. My mother...made me feel wanted and needed

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

60.2. My mother...told me I got on her nerves

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

61.2. My mother...paid a lot of attention to me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

62.2. My mother...told me how proud she was of me when I was good

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

63.2. My mother...went out of her way to hurt my feelings

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

64.2. My mother...forgot important things I thought that she should remember

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true

3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

65.2. My mother...made me feel unloved if I misbehaved

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

66.2. My mother...made me feel what I did was important

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

67.2. My mother...frightened or threatened me when I did something wrong

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

68.2. My mother...liked to spend time with me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

69.2. My mother...tried to help me when I was scared or upset

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

70.2. My mother...shamed me in front of my friends when I misbehaved

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

71.2. My mother...tried to stay away from me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

72.2. My mother...complained about me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

73.2. My mother...cared about what I thought, and liked me to talk about it

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

74.2. My mother...felt other children were better than I was no matter what I did

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

75.2. My mother...cared about what I would like when she made plans

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

76.2. My mother...let me do things I thought were important, even if it was hard for her

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

77.2. My mother...thought other children behaved better than I did

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

78.2. My mother...wanted other people to take care of me (for example, a neighbor or relative)

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

79.2. My mother...let me know I was not wanted

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

80.2. My mother...was interested in the things I did

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

81.2. My mother...tried to make me feel better when I was hurt or sick

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

82.2. My mother...told me how ashamed she was when I misbehaved

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

83.2. My mother...let me know that she loved me

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true
3. Rarely True
4. Almost Never True

84.2. My mother...treated me gently and with kindness

1. Almost always true
2. Sometimes true

- 3. Rarely True
- 4. Almost Never True

85.2. My mother...made me feel ashamed or guilty when I misbehaved

- 1. Almost always true
- 2. Sometimes true
- 3. Rarely True
- 4. Almost Never True

86.2. My mother...tried to make me happy

- 1. Almost always true
- 2. Sometimes true
- 3. Rarely True
- 4. Almost Never True

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Parental Authority Questionnaire)

PAQ – AP

The following questions are related to the attitudes and behaviors of your primary caregiver during childhood. Please read the statements and choose the number that best describes your experiences with your primary caregiver.

VERSION 1: FATHERS

87.1. Even if his children didn't agree with him, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

88.1. Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

89.1. As I was growing up my father did not allow me to question any decisions he had made.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

90.1. My father always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

91.1. My father felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

92.1. As I was growing up my father would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

93.1. As I was growing up, my father let me know what behaviors he expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, he punished me.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

94.1. My father always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

95.1. As I was growing up, my father often told me exactly what he wanted me to do and how he expected me to do it.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

96.1. As I was growing up, I knew what my father expected of me in the family, and he insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his authority.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

VERSION 2: MOTHERS

87.2. Even if her children didn't agree with her, my mother felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what she thought was right.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

88.2. Whenever my mother told me to do something as I was growing up, she expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

89.2. As I was growing up my mother did not allow me to question any decisions she had made.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

90.2. My mother always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

91.2. My mother felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

92.2. As I was growing up my mother would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

93.2. As I was growing up, my mother let me know what behaviors she expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, she punished me.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

94.2. My mother always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

95.2. As I was growing up, my mother often told me exactly what she wanted me to do and how she expected me to do it.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

96.2. As I was growing up, I knew what my mother expected of me in the family, and she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for her authority.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neither agree nor disagree 4=agree 5= strongly agree

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Life Orientation Test – Revised) - Optimism

LOT-R

Please read each statement and choose the number that best describes your level of agreement with the statement. Please don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.

97. In uncertain times, I usually expect the best.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

98. It's easy for me to relax.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

99. If something can go wrong for me it will.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

100. I'm always optimistic about my future.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

101. I enjoy my friends a lot.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

102. It's important for me to keep busy.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

103. I hardly ever expect things to go my way.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

104. I don't get upset too easily.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

105. I rarely count on good things happening to me.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

106. Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =neutral 4=agree 5= strongly agree

*Please continue the survey on the next page.***(Tripartite Islamophobia Scale)****TIS***Please read each statement and choose the number that best describes your level of agreement with the statement. Please don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.***107. The Islamist terrorists find strong support among Muslims.**

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

108. Muslims appear to be rather irrational, compared to non-Muslims in this country.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

109. Muslims are a social and economic burden for the U.S.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

110. Muslims are not trustworthy.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

111. Muslims attract more attention due to their aggressive behavior.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

112. Islam is a sexist religion.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

113. Islam is a violence-glorifying religion.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

114. Islam is an anti-Semitic religion.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

115. The Islamic religion is harmful for world peace.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

116. The Islamic religion is by default not compatible with modernity.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

117. Muslims are planning to Islamize the West step by step.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

118. Actually, Muslims are striving to establish Sharia Law in the United States.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

119. Muslims secretly plot for an Islamization of the United States.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

120. Muslims would like to control international political institutions.

1= definitely false 2= probably false 3 =neither true nor false 4=probably true 5= definitely true

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Islamophobia Scale)

IS

Please read each statement and choose the number that best describes your level of agreement with the statement. Please don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.

121. I would support any policy that would stop the building of new mosques (Muslim place of worship) in the U.S.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

122. If possible, I would avoid going to places where Muslims would be.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

123. I would become extremely uncomfortable speaking with a Muslim.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

124. Just to be safe, it is important to stay away from places where Muslims could be.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

125. I dread the thought of having a professor that is Muslim.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

126. If I could, I would avoid contact with Muslims.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

127. If I could, I would live in a place where there were no Muslims.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

128. Muslims should not be allowed to work in places where many Americans gather such as airports.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

129. Islam is a dangerous religion.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

130. The religion of Islam supports acts of violence.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

131. Islam supports terrorist acts.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

132. Islam is anti-American.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

133. Islam is an evil religion.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

134. Islam is a religion of hate.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

135. I believe that Muslims support the killings of all non-Muslims.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

136. Muslims want to take over the world.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Intergroup Anxiety Against Muslims Scale)**IATMS**

Please read each statement and choose the number that best describes your level of agreement with the statement. Please don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.

137. I would feel nervous if I were the only person on a bus and a Muslim came on.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

138. I worry about my safety when interacting with Muslims.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

139. When interacting with a Muslim I am nervous that he/she will want to fight me.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

140. I would feel anxious alone in a doctor's waiting room with a Muslim.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

141. I would feel nervous if I was walking on the street alone and a Muslim was walking towards me.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

142. I feel uncomfortable because I think Muslims want me to convert to their faith.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

143. I feel uncomfortable when interacting with Muslims because I fear they will think I am prejudiced against them.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

144. I don't know much about the Islamic faith and that makes me feel uncomfortable around Muslims.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

145. I wouldn't consider myself a racist, but because I don't know how to act around Muslims I fear they may think I am racist.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

146. I have little experience interacting with Muslims and that makes me feel nervous.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

147. I would feel awkward at a social gathering where I was the only non-Muslim.

1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3 =not sure 4=agree 5= strongly agree

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Parental Anti-Muslim Discourse Scale)

PAMDS

The following questions are related to conversations between you and your primary caregiver during childhood. Please read the statements and choose the number that best describes your experiences with your primary caregiver.

148. How frequently did your parents disparage the religion of Islam?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

149. How frequently did your parents indicate that the religion of Islam was dangerous?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

150. How frequently did your parents use a slur when referring to Muslims?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

151. How frequently did your parents indicate that you should be afraid of Muslims?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

152. How frequently did your parents indicate that Muslims were a dangerous people?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

153. How frequently did your parents speak positively of the religion of Islam?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

154. How frequently did your parents indicate that the religion of Islam was peaceful?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

155. How frequently did your parents speak positively of Muslim people?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

156. How frequently did your parents indicate that Muslims were a peaceful people?

1=never 2=rarely 3=occasionally 4= frequently 5=often

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Parental Support of Muslims)

PSM

Please read each statement and choose the number that best answers the statement. Please don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.

157. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you befriended someone who was Muslim?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

158. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you brought a Muslim guest to your home?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

159. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you dated someone who was Muslim?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

160. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you married someone who was Muslim?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

161. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you had a Muslim professor?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

162. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you visited a Muslim-majority country?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

163. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you converted to Islam?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

164. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you raised your children to be Muslim?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

165. How supportive do you believe your parents would be if you said something Islamophobic?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Peer Group Support of Muslims)
PGSM

Please read each statement and choose the number that best answers the statement. Please don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.

166. How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you befriended someone who was Muslim?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

167. How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you dated someone who was Muslim?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

168. How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you had a Muslim professor?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

169. How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you visited a Muslim-majority country?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

170. How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you converted to Islam?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

171. How supportive do you believe your peers would be if you said something Islamophobic?

1=very unsupportive 2=unsupportive 3=neutral/neither supportive nor unsupportive
4=supportive 5=very supportive

Please continue the survey on the next page.

(Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire)

BPAQ

Please read each statement and choose the number that best describes you. Please don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.

172. Some of my friends think I am a hothead.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

173. If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights, I will.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

174. When people are especially nice to me, I wonder what they want.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

175. I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

176. I have become so mad that I have broken things.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

177. I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

178. I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

179. Once in a while, I can't control the urge to strike another person.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

180. I am an even-tempered person.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

181. I am suspicious of overly friendly strangers.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

182. I have threatened people I know.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

183. I flare up quickly but get over it quickly.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

184. Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

185. When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

186. I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

187. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

188. At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

189. I have trouble controlling my temper.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

190. When frustrated, I let my irritation show.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

191. I sometimes feel that people are laughing at me behind my back.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

192. I often find myself disagreeing with people.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

193. If somebody hits me, I hit back.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

194. I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

195. Other people always seem to get the breaks.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

196. There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

197. I know that "friends" talk about me behind my back.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

198. My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

199. Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

200. I get into fights a little more than the average person.

1= extremely uncharacteristic 2=somewhat uncharacteristic 3=neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic 4=somewhat characteristic 5=extremely characteristic

Thank you for completing the survey!

Appendix D



DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SCIENCE

144 White Hall

Syracuse, New York, 13244

Thank you for your participation!

The questions you answered today will allow for a better understanding of the development of Islamophobic attitudes in adolescence. This project will be used to complete my dissertation requirements and may be used to inform the broader literature on developmental prejudice after information is gathered and analyzed. I will be using the information gathered from all the people who participated in this study to see how prejudicial attitudes can be transmitted from parents to their children during the child-rearing process. Your responses to questions about parenting behaviors, offspring aggression, offspring optimism, parental anti-Muslim discourse, and Islamophobic attitudes in offspring will be compared to the responses of other college-aged (18-22) participants in the United States. It is hypothesized that authoritarian parenting, parental acceptance-rejection, parental anti-Muslim discourse, offspring optimism, offspring aggression, and having a Muslim friend, can predict the development of Islamophobic attitudes in children. The results of this research will inform the current academic literature on developmental prejudice and the origins of Islamophobia. If you wish to learn more about this study, or have any questions, please contact Sanum Shafi at sshafi@syr.edu or Dr. Matthew Mulvaney at mmulvane@syr.edu.

References

- About, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- About, F. E. (2005). The development of prejudice in childhood and adolescence. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 310–326). Blackwell Publishing. doi:10.1002/9780470773963.ch19
- 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
- Adofo, P. Y., & Etsey, Y. K.A. (2016). Impact of divorce on adolescent students in Ghana. *Pyrex Journal of Psychology and Counseling*, 2(4), 21–27.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Ahluwalia, M. K. (2011). Holding my breath: The experience of being Sikh after 9/11. *Traumatology*, 17(3), 41–46. doi:10.1177/1534765611421962
- Ajaegbu, O. O., Nkwocha, D. I., Mbagwu, M. I., & Chinedu, N. (2016). Impact of Parental Care and Separation on Aggressive Behaviour of Adolescents in Owerri. *Sociology and Criminology-Open Access*. 04. doi:10.4172/2375-4435.1000140.
- Akse J., Hale W., Engels R, Raaijmakers Q., Meeus W. (2004). Personality, perceived parental rejection and problem behavior in adolescence. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology: The International Journal for Research in Social and Genetic Epidemiology and Mental Health Services*. 2004;39(12):980-988. doi:10.1007/s00127-004-0834-5

- Alfieri, S., & Marta, E. (2015). Sibling relation, ethnic prejudice, direct and indirect contact: There is a connection? *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 11(4), 664.
- Ali S., Khaleque A., Rohner R.P. (2015). Pancultural Gender Differences in the Relation Between Perceived Parental Acceptance and Psychological Adjustment of Children and Adult Offspring: A Meta-Analytic Review of Worldwide Research. *Journal of Cross Cultural. Psychology*, 46:1059–1080. doi: 10.1177/0022022115597754
- Allen, C. (2010). *Islamophobia*. Aldershot, Burlington, Singapore, and Sydney: Routledge.
- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Allport, G. W., & Kramer, B. M. (1946). Some roots of prejudice. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 22, 9–39. doi:10.1080/00223980.1946.9917293
- Amato, P., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental Divorce and the Well-Being of Children: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 110. 26-46. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.26.
- Archer, J. (2004). Sex Differences in Aggression in Real-World Settings: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(4), 291–322. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.8.4.291
- Bakali, N. (2016). *Islamophobia: understanding anti-Muslim racism through the lived experiences of Muslim youth*. Brill | Sense.
- Bangstad S. (2016). Islamophobia: What's in a Name? *Journal of Muslims in Europe*, 5(2), 145–169. doi:10.1163/22117954-12341324
- 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

- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*(6), 1173–1182. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173
- Bartlett, M.S. (1954). A note on the multiplying factors for various chi square approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *16*, 296-298.
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspectives on psychological science : a journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, *2*(4), 396–403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00051.x>
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, *4*(1, Pt.2), 1–103. doi:10.1037/h0030372
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, *88*(3), 588–606. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588
- Bleich E. (2011). What is Islamophobia and how much is there? Theorizing and measuring an emerging comparative concept. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *55*(12), 1581–1600. doi:10.1177/0002764211409387
- Bornstein, M. H., & Putnick, D. L. (2016). Mothers' and fathers' parenting practices with their daughters and sons in low- and middle-income countries. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *81*(1), 60–77. doi:10.1111/mono.12226
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen and J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Buehler, A. F. (2011). Islamophobia: A Projection of the West's 'Dark Side'. *ICR Journal*, 2(4), 639–653. doi:10.52282/icr.v2i4.603
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A New Source of Inexpensive, Yet High-Quality, Data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3–5. doi:10.1177/1745691610393980
- Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(1), 110–119. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5701_13
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452–459. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.63.3.452
- Cabrera, N. J., Wight, V., Fagan, J., & Schadler, C. (2011). Influence of mother, father, and child risk on parenting and children's cognitive and social behaviors. *Child Development*, 82(6), 1985–2005. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01667.x
- Chandler, J., Rosenzweig, C., Moss, A.J. et al. (2019). Online panels in social science research: Expanding sampling methods beyond Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods*, 51, 2022–2038 (2019). doi:10.3758/s13428-019-01273-7
- Chaudhry, K.M., & Shabbir, F. (2018). Perceived inter-parental conflict and aggression among adolescents: Moderating role of optimism and pessimism. *Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences*. doi: 10.33582/2637-8027/1016
- Cheng, J. (2015). Islamophobia, muslimophobia or racism? Parliamentary discourses on Islam and Muslims in debates on the minaret ban in Switzerland. *Discourse & Society*. 2015;26(5):562-586. doi:10.1177/0957926515581157

- Cheung, J.H., Burns, D.K., Sinclair, R.R. (2017). Amazon Mechanical Turk in Organizational Psychology: An Evaluation and Practical Recommendations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32, 347–361 doi:10.1007/s10869-016-9458-5
- Ciftci, S. (2012). Islamophobia and threat perceptions: Explaining anti-muslim sentiment in the west. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 32(3), 293-309.
doi:10.1080/13602004.2012.727291
- Coie J. D., Dodge K. A. (1998). Aggression and antisocial behavior. In: Eisenberg N, editor. Handbook of child psychology. 5th ed. Vol. 3. New York: Wiley; pp. 779–862.
- Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia (1997).
- Conversano, C., Rotondo, A., Lensi, E., Della Vista, O., Arpone, F., & Reda, M. A. (2010). Optimism and its impact on mental and physical well-being. *Clinical practice and epidemiology in mental health: CP & EMH*, 6, 25–29.
doi:10.2174/1745017901006010025
- Cote, R. R., & Erikson, B. H. (2009). Untangling the roots of tolerance: How forms of social capital shape attitudes toward ethnic minorities and immigrants. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 52, 1664–1689. doi:10.1177/0002764209331532
- Council on American-Islamic Relations, California. (2015).
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66(3), 710–722. doi:10.2307/1131945
- Croucher, S. M. (2013). Integrated threat theory and acceptance of immigrant assimilation: An analysis of Muslim immigration in Western Europe. *Communication Monographs*, 80(1), 46–62. doi:10.1080/03637751.2012.739704

- Croucher, S. M., Cronn-Mills, D. (2011). *Religious misperceptions: the case of muslims and christians in France and Britain*. United States: Hampton Press.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487–496. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487
- Degner, J., & Dalege, J. (2013). The apple does not fall far from the tree, or does it? A meta-analysis of parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 1270–1304. doi:10.1037/a0031436
- Dekker, K., Brouwer, W., & Colic-Peisker, V. (2019). *Suburb with a higher concentration of Muslim residents in Sydney and Melbourne: Spatial concentration, community, liveability and satisfaction* (RMIT Draft Report), Part of 'The impact of ethnic diversity, socioeconomic disadvantage and sense of belonging on Islamophobia and social cohesion locally and nationally: a mixed-method, longitudinal analysis', RMIT University.
- Dekker, K. (2020). Who is islamophobic and why? explanations of islamophobia in two suburbs with high muslim concentrations in melbourne's north. *Australian Geographer*, 51(4), 437-454. doi:10.1080/00049182.2020.1840715
- Delveaux, K. D., & Daniels, T. (2000). Children's social cognitions: Physically and relationally aggressive strategies and children's goals in peer conflict situations. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 46(4), 672–692.
- De Neve, J. (2015). Personality, childhood experience, and political ideology. *Political Psychology*, 36(1), 55–73. Doi:10.1111/pops.12075
- Derman-Sparks, L. (1989). *Anti-bias curriculum: Tools for empowering young children*. National Association for the Education of Young Children.

- Difallah, D., Filatova, E., & Ipeirotis, P. (2018). Demographics and dynamics of Mechanical Turk workers. In *WSDM 2018 - Proceedings of the 11th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining* (pp. 135-143). (WSDM 2018 - Proceedings of the 11th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining; Vol. 2018-February). Association for Computing Machinery, Inc. doi:10.1145/3159652.3159661
- Dolinska, B., Jarzabek, J., & Dolinski, D. (2020). I like you even less at Christmas dinner! Prejudice level as a function of an approaching national or religious holiday. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 42(2), 88–97. doi:10.1080/01973533.2019.1695615
- Dunham, Y., Srinivasan, M., Dotsch, R., & Barner, D. (2013). Religion insulates ingroup evaluations: The development of intergroup attitudes in India. *Developmental Science*, 17(2), 311–319. doi:10.1111/ desc.12105
- Duriez, B., & Soenens, B. (2009). The intergenerational transmission of racism: The role of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 906–909. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2009.05.014
- Eckstein, K., Šerek, J., & Noack, P. (2018). And what about siblings? A longitudinal analysis of sibling effects on youth's intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(2), 383–397. doi:10.1007/s10964-017-0713-5
- Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Araya, T. (2003). Group differences in implicit prejudice. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 1509-1523. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00132-0.
- Elkasssem, S., Csiernik, R., Mantulak, A., Kayssi, G., Hussain, Y., Lambert, K., Bailey, P., & Choudhary, A. (2018) Growing up Muslim: The impact of islamophobia on children in a

- Canadian community. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health*, 12(1). pp. 3-18. ISSN 1556-4908. doi:10.3998/jmmh.10381607.0012.101
- Epli, H., Batik, M.V., Cabuker, N.D. & Celik, S.B. (2021). The relationship between perceived parental rejection and dating anxiety: the mediating role of interpersonal cognitive distortions . *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 17(3), 70-85. doi: 10.29329/ijpe.2021.346.5
- Erdenir, B. (2010). Islamophobia qua Racial Discrimination: Muslimophobia. In *Muslims in 21st Century Europe: Structural and Cultural Perspectives*. Edited by Anna Triandafyllidou. London: Routledge.
- Gafoor, K. A., & Kurukkan, A. (2014). Construction and validation of scale of parenting style. *Guru. Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences*, 2(4), 315-323
- Gelfand, M. J. ., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. A., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., Duan, L., Almaliach, A., Ang, S., Arnadottir, J., Aycan, Z., Boehnke, K., Boski, P., Cabecinhas, R., Chan, D., Chhokar, J., D'Amato, A., Ferrer, M., Fischlmayr, I. C., ... Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332(6033), 1100–1104. doi:10.1126/science.1197754
- Goldstein, J. (2003). *War and gender*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gómez-Ortiz, O., Romera, E. M., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2016). Parenting styles and bullying. The mediating role of parental psychological aggression and physical punishment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 51, 132–143. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.10.025
- Gracia, E., Lila, M., & Musitu, G. (2005). Parental rejection and psychosocial adjustment of children. *Salud Mental*. 28. 73-81.

- Hafez, F. (2018). Schools of thought in Islamophobia studies: prejudice, racism, and decoloniality. *Islamophobia Studies Journal*. Vol. 4(2):210-225. doi: 10.13169/islastudj.4.2.0210
- Hale, W. W., III, van der Valk, I., Engels, R., & Meeus, W. (2005). Does perceived parental rejection make adolescents sad and mad? The association of perceived parental rejection with adolescent depression and aggression. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 36, 466–474. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2004.04.007
- Haque, A., Tubbs, C. Y., Kahumoku-Fessler, E. P., & Brown, M. D. (2019). Microaggressions and islamophobia: Experiences of muslims across the united states and clinical implications. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 45(1), 76-91. doi:10.1111/jmft.12339
- Hardin, C. D., & Conley, T. D. (2001). A relational approach to cognition: Shared experience and relationship affirmation in social cognition. In G. B. Moskowitz (Ed.), *Cognitive social psychology: The Princeton Symposium on the legacy and future of social cognition* (pp. 3–17). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harris J. A. (1995). Confirmatory factor analysis of The Aggression Questionnaire. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 33(8), 991–993. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(95)00038-y
- Hassan, M. K. (1987). Parental behaviour, authoritarianism and prejudice. *Manas*, 34(1-2), 41–50.
- Hassan, I., & Azmi, M. N. L. (2021). Islamophobia in non-Western media: A content analysis of selected online newspapers. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 42(1), 29–47. doi:10.1177/0739532921989136

- Heiphetz, L., Spelke, E. S., & Young, L. L. (2015). In the name of God: How children and adults judge agents who act for religious versus secular reasons. *Cognition*, 144, 134–149. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2015.07.017
- Hjelle, L. A., Busch, E. A., & Warren, J. E. (1996). Explanatory style, dispositional optimism, and reported parental behavior. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 157(4), 489–499. doi:10.1080/00221325.1996.9914881
- Hjerm, M., Eger, M. A., & Danell, R. (2018). Peer attitudes and the development of prejudice in adolescence. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 4, 237802311876318. doi:10.1177/2378023118763187
- Hochberg, G. (2020). From ‘sexy Semite’ to Semitic ghosts: Contemporary art between Arab and Jew. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 54(1–2), 15–28. doi:10.1080/0031322X.2019.1685166
- Hopkins, P. D., & Shook, N. J. (2017). Development of an intergroup anxiety toward Muslims scale. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 61, 7-20. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.08.002
- Imhoff R., Recker J. (2012). Differentiating Islamophobia: Introducing a new scale to measure Islamoprejudice and secular Islam critique. *Political Psychology*, 33(6), 811–824. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00911.x
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31–36.
- Khaleque, A. (2017). Perceived parental hostility and aggression, and children’s psychological maladjustment, and negative personality dispositions: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(4), 977–988.

- Killen, M., Luken Raz, K., & Graham, S. (2021). Reducing Prejudice Through Promoting Cross-Group Friendships. *Review of General Psychology, 18*(1), 212-255.
doi:10.1177/10892680211061262
- Knafo, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Parenting and adolescents' accuracy in perceiving parental values. *Child Development, 74*(2), 595–611. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.7402018
- 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. doi:10.1007/s10826-018-1242-x
- Lan, T. X., & Navera, G. S. (2022). The slanted beam: A critical discourse analysis of anti-Islam and anti-Muslim discourse in China. *Discourse & Society, 33*(1), 107–125.
doi:10.1177/09579265211048704
- Lansford, J. E., Skinner, A. T., Sorbring, E., Giunta, L. D., Deater, D. K., Dodge, K. A., Malone, P. S., Oburu, P., Pastorelli, C., Tapanya, S., Tirado, L. M. U., Zelli, A., Al, H. S. M., Alampay, L. P., Bacchini, D., Bombi, A. S., Bornstein, M. H., & Chang, L. (2012). Boys' and girls' relational and physical aggression in nine countries. *Aggressive Behavior, 38*(4), 298–308. doi:10.1002/ab.21433
- Lee, S. A., Gibbons, J. A., Thompson, J. M., & Timani, H. S. (2009). The Islamophobia Scale: Instrument development and initial validation. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 19*(2), 92–105. doi:10.1080/10508610802711137
- Lee, S. A., Reid, C. A., Short, S. D., Gibbons, J. A., Yeh, R., & Campbell, M. L. (2013). Fear of Muslims: Psychometric evaluation of the Islamophobia Scale. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 5*(3), 157-171. doi:10.1037/a0032117

- Love, E. (2015). Islamophobia in the west: measuring and explaining individual attitudes. *Contemporary Sociology*, 44(2), 213–215. doi:10.1177/0094306115570271x
- Luqiu L.R., Yang F. (2018) Islamophobia in China: News coverage, stereotypes, and Chinese Muslims' perceptions of themselves and Islam. *Asian Journal of Communication* 28(6): 598–619.
- Ma, H. (2019). The Anti-Islamic Movement in China. *Hudson Institute*, 13.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. *Handbook of child psychology: formerly Carmichael's Manual of child psychology/Paul H. Mussen, editor*.
- Marcus-Newhall, A., Pedersen, W. C., Carlson, M., & Miller, N. (2000). Displaced aggression is alive and well: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 670–689. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.670
- McDonald, M. M., Navarrete, C. D., Van Vugt, M. (2012). Evolution and the psychology of intergroup conflict: the male warrior hypothesis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*; 367 (1589): 670 doi: 10.1098/rstb.2011.0301
- 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. doi:10.1002/per.2011
- Mehdi, Z. (2017). Phobia of religion: Religion as Islam a political argument and a psychoanalytic inquiry of Islamophobia in India. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 14(3), 222–244. doi:10.1002/aps.1535
- Mendo-Lázaro, S., León-del-Barco, B., Polo-del-Río, M.-I., Yuste-Tosina, R., & López-Ramos, V.-M. (2019). The Role of Parental Acceptance–Rejection in Emotional Instability

- During Adolescence. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(7), 1194. doi:10.3390/ijerph16071194
- Miklikowska, M. (2016). Like parent, like child? development of prejudice and tolerance towards immigrants. *The British Journal of Psychology*, 107(1), 95-116. doi:10.1111/bjop.12124
- Miklikowska, M. (2017). Development of anti-immigrant attitudes in adolescence: The role of parents, peers, intergroup friendships, and empathy. *The British Journal of Psychology*, 108(3), 626-648. doi:10.1111/bjop.12236
- Miklikowska, M., Bohman, A., & Titzmann, P. F. (2019). Driven by context? the interrelated effects of parents, peers, classrooms on development of prejudice among swedish majority adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(11), 2451-2463. doi:10.1037/dev0000809
- Miller, N., Pedersen, W. C., Earleywine, M., & Pollock, V. E. (2003). A theoretical model of triggered displaced aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(1), 75–97. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0701_5
- Navarrete, C. D., McDonald, M. M., Molina, L. E., & Sidanius, J. (2010). Prejudice at the nexus of race and gender: An outgroup male target hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(6), 933–945. doi:10.1037/a0017931
- Nesdale, D. (2001). The development of prejudice in children. In M. Augoustinos & K. J. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding prejudice, racism, and social conflict* (pp. 57–72). London, UK: Sage.
- O'Bryan, M., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. (2004). Intergenerational transmission of prejudice, sex role stereotyping and intolerance. *Adolescence*, 39(155), 407–426.

- Pal, S., & Wellman, J. D. (2020). Threat, fundamentalism, and Islamophobia: Assessing the factors associated with negative attitudes toward Muslims. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. doi:10.1037/rel0000347
- Paluck, E. L. (2011). Peer pressure against prejudice: A high school field experiment examining social network change. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(2), 350–358. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.11.017
- Parens, H. (2012). Attachment, aggression, and the prevention of malignant prejudice. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 32(2), 171-185. doi:10.1080/07351690.2011.592742
- Perry, B. (2013) Gendered Islamophobia: Hate crime against Muslim women. *Social Identities* 20(1): 74-89.
- Pew Research Center. (2015; 2016; 2017; 2020; 2021).
- Pinquart, M. (2017a). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with externalizing problems of children and adolescents: an updated meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(5), 873–932.
- Pinquart, M. (2017b). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with internalizing symptoms in children and adolescents: a meta-analysis. *Marriage & Family Review*, 53, 613–640.
- Piumatti, G., & Mosso, C. (2017). Relationships between individual endorsement of aggressive behaviors and thoughts with prejudice relevant correlates among adolescents. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 13(1), 47–59. doi:10.5964/ejop.v13i1.1223
- Raabe, T., & Beelmann, A. (2011). Development of ethnic, racial, and national prejudice in childhood and adolescence: A multinational meta-analysis of age differences. *Child Development*, 82(6), 1715-1737. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01668.x

- Rodriguez-Garcia, 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, 516–523. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2009.08.001
- Rohner R.P. (1986). *The Warmth Dimension: Foundations of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory*. Sage Publications, Inc.; Beverly Hills, CA, USA.
- Rohner R. P. (2004). The parental "acceptance-rejection syndrome": universal correlates of perceived rejection. *The American psychologist*, 59(8), 830–840. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.830
- Rohner, R. P., Khaleque, A., & Cournoyer, D. E. (2005). Parental Acceptance-Rejection: Theory, Methods, Cross-Cultural Evidence, and Implications. *Ethos*, 33(3), 299–334. doi:10.1525/eth.2005.33.3.299
- Rothenberg, W. A., Ali, S., Rohner, R. P., Lansford, J. E., Britner, P. A., Di Giunta, L., Dodge, K. A., Malone, P. S., Oburu, P., Pastorelli, C., Skinner, A. T., Sorbring, E., Steinberg, L., Tapanya, S., Tirado, L. M. U., Yotanyamaneewong, S., Alampay, L. P., Al-Hassan, S. M., Bacchini, D., ... Deater-Deckard, K. (2021). Effects of parental acceptance-rejection on children’s internalizing and externalizing behaviors: A longitudinal, multicultural study. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. doi: 10.1007/s10826-021-02072-5
- Rydgren, J. (2004). The logic of xenophobia. *Rationality and Society*, 16(2), 123–148. doi:10.1177/1043463104043712
- Salaita, S. (2006). Beyond Orientalism and Islamophobia: 9/11, Anti-Arab Racism, and the Mythos of National Pride. *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 6(2), 245–266. doi:10.1353/ncr.2007.0011
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life

- Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6), 1063–1078. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1063
- Schmuck, D., Matthes, J., von Sikorski, C., Materne, N., & Shah, E. (2018). Are unidentified terrorist suspects always muslims? how terrorism news shape news consumers' automatic activation of muslims as perpetrators. *Religions* (Basel, Switzerland), 9(10), 286. doi:10.3390/rel9100286
- Shafer, L. (2017, February 21). Anti-Muslim bias. Harvard Graduate School of Education. <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/ideas/usable-knowledge/17/02/anti-muslim-bias>
- Shen, M. S., Haggard, M. C., Strassburger, D. C., & Rowatt, W. C. (2013). Testing the love thy neighbor hypothesis: Religiosity's association with positive attitudes toward ethnic/racial and value-violating out-groups. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 5, 294–303. doi:10.1037/a0033648
- Shepperd, J. A., Pogge, G., Lipsey, N. P., Smith, C. T., & Miller, W. A. (2019). The link between religiousness and prejudice: Testing competing explanations in an adolescent sample. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. doi:10.1037/re10000271
- Sinclair, S., Dunn, E., & Lowery, B. (2005). The relationship between parental racial attitudes and children's implicit prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41(3), 283–289. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2004.06.003
- Spigelman, G., Spigelman, A., & Engleson, I. (1991). Hostility, aggression, and anxiety levels of divorce and nondivorce children as manifested in their responses to projective tests. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 56(3), 438–452. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5603_6

- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *"The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology" Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (p. 23–45). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Morrison, K. R. (2009). Intergroup threat theory. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 43-60). New York, NY, USA: Psychology Press.
- Taras, R. (2013) 'Islamophobia never stands still': race, religion, and culture, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(3), 417-433, doi:10.1080/01419870.2013.734388
- Tomada, G., & Schneider, B. H. (1997). Relational aggression, gender, and peer acceptance: Invariance across culture, stability over time, and concordance among informants. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(4), 601–609. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.33.4.601
- Tropp, L. R., & Prenovost, M. A. (2008). The role of intergroup contact in predicting children's interethnic attitudes: Evidence from meta-analytic and field studies. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (p. 236–248). Oxford University Press.
- Uenal, F. (2016). Disentangling islamophobia: The differential effects of symbolic, realistic, and terroristic threat perceptions as mediators between social dominance orientation and islamophobia. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 4(1), 66–90. doi:10.5964/jspp.v4i1.463
- Uenal, F., Bergh, R., Sidanius, J., Zick, A., Kimel, S., & Kunst, J. R. (2020). The nature of islamophobia: A test of a tripartite view in five countries. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 47(2), 275-292. doi:10.1177/0146167220922643
- United Nations (2021).

- Urbatsch, R. (2011). "Sibling ideological influence: a natural experiment." *British Journal of Political Science*. 41(4): 693–712.
- Wachs, S., Görzig, A., Wright, M. F., Schubarth, W., & Bilz, L. (2020). Associations among adolescents' relationships with parents, peers, and teachers, self-efficacy, and willingness to intervene in bullying: A social cognitive approach. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(2), 420. doi:10.3390/ijerph17020420
- Zakhour, M., Haddad, C., Salameh, P., Al Hanna, L., Sacre, H., Hallit, R., Soufia, M., Obeid, S., & Hallit, S. (2021). Association Between Parental Divorce and Anger, Aggression, and Hostility in Adolescents: Results of a National Lebanese Study. *Journal of Family Issues*. doi:10.1177/0192513X211054468
- Zempi, I. (2020). Veiled Muslim women's responses to experiences of gendered Islamophobia in the UK. *International Review of Victimology*, 26(1), 96-111.
doi:10.1177/0269758019872902

Sanum Shafi

144 White Hall, Department of Human Development and Family Science, 607.723.9000, sshafi@syr.edu

OBJECTIVE To obtain a faculty position focused on undergraduate and graduate teaching as well as DEI research.
Research Interests: Developmental Prejudice, Cross-Cultural Child Development, Bilingual Education

EDUCATION

May 2023 **PhD, Syracuse University** *Expected
• Certificate in University Teaching
Human Development and Family Science
Dissertation: Parental Determinants of Islamophobic Attitudes in Offspring

Dec 2020 **M.S., Syracuse University**
Human Development and Family Science
Thesis: Does Age of Second-Language Acquisition Improve Intellectual Processing Abilities? A Meta-Analysis

Aug 2015 **B.A., SUNY Binghamton**
Psychology

AWARDS AND HONORS

2023 **Syracuse University Doctoral Fellowship**
The Graduate School, Syracuse University
Provides funding to advance scientific research by outstanding doctoral students.

2022 **Falk Student Research Celebration Certificate**
Awarded by the Falk College Research Center, Syracuse University.
Highlights student research projects that are judged by a committee of faculty, staff, and peers.

2021 **HDFS Graduate Student Marshal**
Nominated by the HDFS Graduate Committee, Syracuse University.
Selection is based on research, academic accomplishments, and service to the department and university.

2019 **HDFS Master's Award for Research Excellence**
Awarded by the Department of Child and Family Studies, Syracuse University.
Given to a student who excels in academic achievement, research practice, and also shows great potential for continued growth in the area of child and family studies.

ADJUNCT INSTRUCTOR

Aug 2022 — Dec 2022 **HFS 315: Children, Youth, and the Media** Small; Discussion-Based
Designed and administered all lectures, lesson plans, examinations, and activities.
Responsible for maintaining class syllabus, assignment logs, and supplementary materials.

Jan 2022 — May 2022 **HFS 388: Human Sexuality** Large; Lecture Hall Class
Designed and administered all lectures, examinations, and quizzes for evaluating purposes.
Promoted an open and interactive classroom environment for enhanced learning.

TEACHING ASSISTANTSHIPS

Aug 2021 — Dec 2021	<p>HFS 474: Promises and Problems in Emerging Adulthood</p> <p>Designed lectures and assisted in developing lesson plans.</p> <p>Administered and graded synchronous and asynchronous coursework.</p> <p>Independent Lectures: Culture; Family Relationships</p>
Aug 2021 — Dec 2021	<p>HFS 202: Development of Children and Youth</p> <p>Designed and facilitated in-class activities.</p> <p>Used differentiated instruction for both in-class and online assignments.</p> <p>Independent Lecture: Toddlerhood</p>
Jan 2021 — May 2021	<p>HFS 331: Play, Childhood Development, and Early Education</p> <p>Facilitated online synchronous class activities.</p> <p>Graded asynchronous online writing assignments.</p> <p>Independent Lectures: Cultural Experiences; Emotion Regulation and Impulse Control</p>
Jan 2021 — May 2021	<p>HFS 395: Risk, Resilience, and Intervention for Troubled Youth</p> <p>Analyzed performance metrics of students to identify learners that need extra assistance.</p> <p>Managed study sessions and office hours for students who needed such assistance.</p> <p>Discussion Facilitator: Evidence-Based Resilience Programs</p>
Aug 2020 — Dec 2020	<p>HFS 204: Applied Research Methods in Child and Family Studies</p> <p>Administered and graded synchronous and asynchronous coursework.</p> <p>Used differentiated instruction for both in-class and online assignments.</p> <p>Discussion Facilitator: Performing Library-Based Research</p>
Aug 2020 — Dec 2020	<p>HFS 201: Introduction to Family Development</p> <p>Set up weekly writing assignments and quiz materials online.</p> <p>Administered and graded synchronous and asynchronous coursework.</p> <p>Independent Lectures: Parenting and Raising Children in a Diverse Society; Family Stress, Crisis, and Resilience</p>
Aug 2019 — Dec 2019	<p>HFS 202: Development of Children and Youth</p> <p>Designed quizzes and written assignments to evaluate student work.</p> <p>Evaluated final research projects.</p> <p>Independent Lecture: Language Development and Literacy</p>
Aug 2017 — May 2018	<p>HFS 388: Human Sexuality</p> <p>Designed and facilitated in-class activities.</p> <p>Led group discussions and evaluated final papers.</p> <p>Managed study sessions and office hours for students who needed extra assistance.</p> <p>Discussion Facilitator: Contraception and Abortion; Adult Sexual Relationships</p>

ADDITIONAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE

2018 — 2020	<p>Bernice M. Wright Child Development Laboratory</p> <p>Head Teaching Assistant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Designated head teacher; supervised classroom activities and administered lesson plans independently.• Developed course activities to meet the diverse intellectual needs of preschool children.• Provided basic childcare to toddlers and infants
-------------	--

COMMUNITY SERVICE

2023 — Present

HDFS Undergraduate Committee, Syracuse University

Graduate Representative

- Assisted committee members with the implementation of prospective department policies
- Provided TA perspective to help inform future policy deliberations

2017 — 2023

Orange Success Mentoring Collective, Syracuse University

Graduate Mentor

- Mentored undergraduate students in data analysis for an honors research project.
- Conducted a comprehensive analysis of the data and developed a report to present the findings.

2017 — 2018

Islamic Organization of the Southern Tier

Peer Mentor

- Recommended learning resources and assisted students in applying to universities.
- Assisted with planning and coordinating weekly services as needed.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

Lewis, M., **Shafi, S.** (Under review). Colorism: The hidden ACE of childhood experiences of racial acceptance or rejection based on skin tone and hair texture.

Roberts, M., Birenbaum, K., **Shafi, S.** (In progress). Personality and developmental predictors of engagement with diverse viewpoints.

Shafi, S., Krishnakumar, A., Roopnarine, J., Carter, B. (In progress). Does age of second-language acquisition improve intellectual processing abilities? A meta-analysis.

Shafi, S., Lewis, M. (In progress). The influence of parental colorist attitudes on sibling relationships in South Asian families.

Shafi, S., Mulvaney, M. (In progress). Parental determinants of Islamophobic attitudes in offspring.

ACCEPTED POSTERS

2023

Society for Research in Child Development

Shafi, S., Mulvaney, M. (2023, March). *Parental Determinants of Islamophobic Attitudes in Offspring*. [Poster presentation]. SRCD Biennial Meeting; Salt Lake City, Utah, USA.

2023

Society for Personality and Social Psychology

Roberts, M., Birenbaum, K., **Shafi, S.** (2023, Feb). *Personality and developmental predictors of engagement with diverse viewpoints*. [Poster presentation]. SPSP Annual Convention; Atlanta, GA, USA.

2022

Falk Research Center

Roberts, M., Birenbaum, K., **Shafi, S.** (2022, May). *Personality and developmental predictors of engagement with diverse viewpoints*. [Poster presentation]. Falk Research Center; Syracuse, NY, USA.

ADDITIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE

2023 — Present

The Institute for Humane Studies

Research Assistant

2017 — 2018

The Discovery Center of the Southern Tier

Administrative Assistant

2015 — 2016

Binghamton Mood Disorders Institute Center for Affective Science

Research Assistant

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND WORKSHOPS

- 2022 **ADVANCE Future Faculty Workshop**
Northeastern University, in partnership with Harvard Medical School
- 2022 **Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Building Blocks**
The Graduate School, Syracuse University
- 2021 **Structural Equation Modeling and Factor Analysis Workshop**
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- 2020 **Infant Toddler Interest-Driven Learning Framework**
The New York Association for the Education of Young Children
- 2019 — 2021 **Future Professoriate Program**
The Graduate School, Syracuse University

RELEVANT COURSEWORK

- 2021 **Structural Equation Modeling and Factor Analysis**
- 2020 **Teaching and Leadership for Social Justice**
- 2020 **Linguistic Anthropology: Language, Culture, Society**
- 2019 **Health Equity and the Social Determinants of Health**
- 2018 **Child and Family: Cross-Cultural Perspectives**

LANGUAGES

English	Urdu
French	Punjabi
Hindi	

REFERENCES

Dr. Matthew Mulvaney from Syracuse University
mmulvane@syr.edu · (315) 443-5654

Dr. Rachel Razza from Syracuse University
rrazza@syr.edu · (315) 443-7377

Dr. Eunjoo Jung from Syracuse University
ejung03@syr.edu · (315) 443-5778