

PARENTING STYLES AS PREDICTOR OF CYBER VICTIMIZATION AND ANXIETY DISORDERS IN ADOLESCENTS

Mehreen Nisar

MS in Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Islamabad,
Punjab, Pakistan

mehreennisar2169@gmail.com

Received: August 05, 2024 Revised: September 05, 2024 Accepted: September 20, 2024 Published: September 28, 2024

ABSTRACT

Present study was conducted to study the relationship of parenting styles (Parental control, parental response,) with cyber-victimization and anxiety disorders (social anxiety disorder, Panic Disorder, Separation Anxiety Disorder, Selective Mutism and Generalized Anxiety Disorder) with the sample of 300 adolescents (age range= 17 to 19), 131 were girls and 169 were boys. In current study Scale of Parenting styles, Florence cyber- bullying-cyber-victimization scales (FCBVSs) and Youth Anxiety Measure for DSM-5, Part I (YAM-5-1) was used. Participants were asked to provide appropriate responses. Psychometric properties of scales were established on sample of current study. All the instruments used in present study found to have satisfactory inter-consistency and satisfactory reliability coefficients of scales as well. Multiple regression analysis was performed that shows parental control negatively predicts the Cyber victimization while parental control positively predicts Anxiety Disorders specifically Separation Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder and Generalized Anxiety Disorder. The findings of current research indicates that Parental response negatively predicts anxiety disorders specifically GAD. Results finding also shed light on the fact that permissive parenting makes children more vulnerable for being a Cyber Victim.

Keywords: Parenting dimensions, Anxiety Disorders, Cyber Victimization, Florence cyber bullying cyber victimization scale, Youth Anxiety Measure for DSM-5, Part I

INTRODUCTION

Higher authority brings higher responsibility and this is the same scenario with parents. In one scenario, it is a countless blessing and a huge gift but in another, it is a huge challenge that encompasses enormous responsibilities and efforts to make their children able to survive in good and positive manners by means of adopting rules and norms of the society. Parenting skills provides a strong basis for a healthy development of a child and may have immediate and long lasting effects on the life of a child. Different Parenting attitudes are being used worldwide to make a child more obedient and self-sufficient so that the child will be capable enough to handle daily life activities without being involved in any health issue

An important dimension of parenting attitude is called parental warmth or response in which parents ranging between accepting and responsive attitudes towards the actions and needs of their

children to a rejecting and insensitive attitude towards the actions of their children. Another important dimension of parenting attitude is called parental control in which parents ranging from being very controlling by setting strict rules in all aspects to no rules and demands from children (Padir et al., 2021).

The use of various stable approaches, specific patterns of actions with long lasting and specific effects on child's behavior and tactics to raise their children are collectively called as parenting styles (Kopko, 2007). By the combination of two parenting dimensions (response and control) four emerging parenting styles are explained by Kopko (2007):

1. Authoritative. Parents who are high in both response and control dimensions are considered as authoritative parenting style. The followers of this style always encourages their kids to be self-

sufficient by controlling their own actions and defining their limits.

2. **Authoritarian.** In this style, parents are low in response dimension but high in control dimension. They set strict rules and children are supposed to follow them blindly.

3. **Permissive.** Permissive parents are high in response but they do not exert any control over their children's actions. Children are free to act without parental contribution.

4. **Uninvolved.** Parents who are low in both response and control dimensions are called uninvolved parents. They do not show any interest in the life of a child as a result they perceive themselves free from rules and boundaries.

The choice of parenting attitude depends on many factors as explained by Jay Belsky (1984) in his process of parenting mode. He explained that personality of parent, child and social characteristics are the most common and powerful elements that can affect the choice of parenting attitudes. He further explained parent personality in terms of their psychosomatic functioning and developmental history while on the other side child personality includes different temperaments. In the last domain, he emphasizes the importance of environmental factors that includes quality of marital relationship, work habits of parents and their social networking that play an important role in the selection of parenting attitude (Taraban & Shaw, 2018).

Interestingly it is very clear to notice that parenting attitude is not only factor with power of emotional impact. The excessive and easy social media usage has changed the world of business, education, government and entertainment in short, the whole life of a person. Previous researches have revealed the fact that at least ninety percent of the whole population uses the Internet frequently while fifty percent adolescents exercise it on regular basis (Lenhart & Madden, 2005). Previous researches showed that adolescents' access to their smart phones has increased in last few years (Lenhart, Duggan, Perrin, Stepler, Rainie & Parker, 2015). Excessive social media usage has introduced a new sort of intimidation and harassment known as "cyberbullying" (Slonje & Smith, 2008). The phenomenon of cyber bullying leads to increased risk for victimization.

Person use social media or different sites to make fun of another person, to insult, to taunt or to post

harmful material like pictures videos and the person who is facing such type of behaviors is known as cyber victim (Brown, Demaray & second, 2014). Victimization take place in different forms. It can be Visual that includes pictures or videos or it can be Written-verbal that includes threatening calls or messages via internet. Online exclusion is another form of cyber victimization in which person is excluded or rejected from an online group or chat rooms with the purpose of insult. Impersonation cyber-victimization is another form of victimization that involves a condition in which someone impersonates the victim to make fun of him/her (Palladino, Nocentini & Menesini, 2015). It is very attention grabbing that parenting attitudes are considered as important factors that can lessen or enhance the risk of being a cyber-victim as literature shows that permissive parenting, strict rules and parent-child issues may cause increase the usage of internet as a result person serve as a suitable target for bully (Truong et al., 2017). A study done by Giles and Price (2008) shed the light on the fact that high maternal control is positively related with internet addiction while another study showed contrary results by stating that there is negative correlation in parental control and internet addiction (Li et al., 2013).

Moreover, literature revealed strong association in high parental warmth (authoritative parenting style) and lower level of cyber-victimization (Elsaesser et al., 2017). Studies showed authoritarian parenting (low in response dimension and high in control dimension) as a strong predictor of cyber victimization (Moreno-Ruiz et al., 2019). In addition, literature noticeably and persistently enlightened the

fact that authoritative parenting serve as a strong protective factor against cyber-victimization (Fanti et al., 2012; Kokkinos et al., 2016). On the other side, passive attitude by parents is highly associated with excessive sufferings of cyber victimization (Aoyama et al., 2012; Low & Espelage, 2013). Previous researches also revealed that Muslim fathers are considered high in warmth dimension while Muslim mothers are well thought out to be high in control dimension (Rosli, 2014). Mainly authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parenting styles are more common in practice (Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserie, & Farah, 2006b; Khodaii, Medanipori, & Naghdi, 2008) as compared to uninvolved parenting style. Studies

revealed a well-known cause of emotional and behavioral difficulties in children is too much control and strictness from parents (Wijsbroek, Hale, Raaijmakers, & Meeus, 2011). Parents adopt different parenting attitudes according to situational demands that means they show inconsistency in their choice of parenting attitudes. Inconsistency in attitudes may cause confusion and serious psychological issues (Dwairy, 2010) like aggression and anxiety (Dwairy, 2010) specifically separation anxiety (Hersov, 1960) in children as well. Previous researches also revealed that Muslim fathers are considered high in warmth dimension while Muslim mothers are well thought out to be high in control dimension (Rosli, 2014). Stress and anxiety are the most established outcomes of cyber victimization. Fredstrom et al. (2011) suggested that cyber-victimization is linked with low level of self-esteem and elevated level of stress, anxiety and depression. Musharraf & Haq (2018) further study the relation between cyber-victimization and anxiety. Hinduja and Patchin (2006) suggested that age, computer expertise, and extent of time spent online could be the predictors of cyber-victimization. Cohen and Felson (1979) included another predictor that can raise the likelihood of cyber-victimization that is the absence of guardian. According to Sahin (2012) feelings of being alone also predict cyber-victimization.

Anxiety can be defined as a general state of mood that can be triggered without any particular stimuli. Anxiety is not the same as fear, which is consistent with definite actions of flight or escaping, however it is linked to circumstances apprehended as out of control or inescapable (Cisler et al., 2010). Another way to define anxiety as a future-oriented mood state within which one is ready to aim to deal with future negative incidents (Barlow & David, 2002). Previous researches showed that childhood Social Anxiety Disorder (SAD) may predicts other anxiety disorders for instance obsessive-compulsive disorder, specific phobia, acute stress disorder, and posttraumatic stress disorder (Hanna et al, 2006). Research showed that selective mutism could be the result of shyness, inhibited temperaments, any psychosocial factors, and delayed development (Dow et al, 1995). According to Watson and Rayner (1920) development of phobia work on the ideology of classical conditioning where unconditional stimulus paired

with the other conditioned stimuli in order to elicit the same response, which was obtained from unconditioned stimulus.

Many studies explore the relations between being cyber victim and changes in psychological situations of individuals. Literature shows that persons who have not been exposed to bullying show minor psychiatric symptoms than target and harassment victims. (Tynes & Giang, 2009). It is suggested that cyber victimization do not linked with depression alone but anxiety, phobias and paranoia (Schenk & Fremouw 2012; Cowie et al, 2013). Literature shows that parenting control had a significant effect over adolescent's psychological health and by controlling or limiting their internet use, they can prevent their teens becoming a victim in online world

Cyber-victimization in adolescents is associated with many devastating health outcomes that involves psychosomatic problems (Gini & Pozzoli, 2013), emotional problems and depression (Reijntjes et al., 2010), psychotic symptoms (Schreier et al., 2009; Van-Dam et al., 2012) and suicide (Klomek et al., 2010; Van-Geel et al., 2014). Cyber-victimization is particularly linked with adolescent's social anxiety (Landoll et al., 2015). Musharraf & Haq (2018) also study the relationship of cyber victimization with anxiety and they found it positively related. Nishina & Juvonen (2005) also found a high level of anxiety among the cyber-victims. Further data revealed the fact that cyber-victimization in childhood is associated with many mental health/adjustment problems in later life such as depression, suicidal ideation, particularly anxiety disorders (Gibb et al., 2011). An apparent sign of social anxiety places a person at more risk for cyber-victimization (Troy & Sroufe, 1987). Previous information about the incidents of cyber-victimization has showed that cyber-victimization is related with many problems like distress, fear and discomfort for victims (Bossler, Holt, and May, 2012).

Previous data suggested that cyber-victimization is linked with harmful and negative outcomes like depression and anxiety (Perren, Dooley, Shaw & Cross, 2010; Hunt, Peters, & Rapee, 2012). Wang, Nansel and Lannotti (2011) provided an evidence for the high prevalence of depression among cyber-victims. Ybarra, West and Leaf (2007) conducted a study that provides the evidence of emotional disturbance and poor educational performance of

those students who had been cyber victimized. Recent researches indicated that cyber-victimization is linked with low level of self-esteem and high-level of stress, anxiety and depression (Fredstrom, Adams & Gilman, 2011). Cyber-victimization is also related with many behavioral problems like the greater use of marijuana and alcohol among youngsters (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008). Cyber victimization is thought to be related with symptoms of depression and suicidal thoughts (Bonanno & Hymel, 2013). Parenting also play an important role in the development of mental health of the adolescents. It can also be a risky or a protective factor against many mental health issues specifically, related with anxiety disorders. Multiple studies suggested that parental ignorance and rejection might be an important factor in the progress of different types of children's anxiety disorders (Weymouth & Buehler, 2018; Yaffe, 2021). Previous researches shows that over controlling and less autonomy granting parenting style is positively linked with anxiety related problems (Pinquart, 2017; Rose et al., 2018; Wood et al., 2003). Wood et al. (2003) suggests that over protecting feature of permissive parenting style makes a child more dependent on parents that can lead them to show separation anxiety disorder. According to another study done by Eun et al. (2018) suggests that there is a significant relation between parenting control and both social and separation anxiety disorders among adolescents. Previous researches showed that the authoritative parenting style associated with lower levels of anxiety and the authoritarian parenting styles associated with higher levels of anxiety in offsprings (Erozkan, 2012; Manoochehri & Mofidi, 2014; Panetta et al., 2014; Pinquart, 2017; Timpano et al., 2015; Yaffe, 2021). The children and adolescents who experience their parents as authoritarian, permissive or uninvolved are more anxious as compared to the children and adolescents who experience their parents as authoritative (Yaffe, 2021).

There is an extensive data that gives information about cyber bullying and cyber victimization but there are still many things that we do not know yet. One basic challenge is to prove the role of gender differences between cyber-victimization and mental health (stress, anxiety and depression). In comparison with female students, male students are more probably to be victims equally in physical and

cyber environments (Bingöl, 2018). But there are so many other studies that do not indicate any gender differences in cyber-bullying enactment and victimization (Christian Elledge et al., 2013). In recent meta-analysis study done by Barlett & Coyne (2014), they suggested that gender variations are related to age. Results recommended that young women conveyed more acts of cyber-bullying throughout early adolescence while young men in late adolescence. According to Dempsey, Sulkowski, Nichols and Storch (2009), a large number of females (17%) reported cyber-victimization than did males (11%). For males, acceptance of cyber-victimization has been associated with depressive symptoms, behavioral issues, drug use, and unfavorable attitudes related to faculty atmosphere (Ybarra, 2004; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a).

Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the current study are as follows:

1. To investigate the most common perceived parenting style by the adolescents.
2. To determine the relationship among parenting styles (response and control), CV and anxiety disorders (GAD, PD, SD, SAD, and SM) in adolescents.
3. To find the predicting role of Perceived parental control and perceived parental response across CV and Anxiety Disorders (GAD, PD, SD, SAD, and SM)
4. To find the difference between perceived parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and negligent) in relation with CV and Anxiety Disorders.

Hypotheses

Research hypotheses of the current study are as under:

1. There is a significant difference among perceived parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and negligent), CV and Anxiety Disorders (GAD, PD, SD, SAD, and SM) in late adolescence.
2. Perceived parental control will predicts cyber-victimization negatively among late adolescents
3. Perceived parental response will predicts Cyber Victimization negatively.

4. Perceived parental control will predicts anxiety disorders positively (GAD, PD, SD, SAD, and SM) in late adolescents.
5. Perceived parental response will predicts Anxiety Disorders negatively (GAD, PD, SD, SAD, and SM) in late adolescents.

Participants

Present study focused on adolescents including both girls (n = 169) and boys (n = 131). Age ranges between 17 to 19 years (M = 17.68; SD = .77) Participants (N = 300) were selected from different institutions by using purposive sampling technique. For current study Only 300 questionnaires were selected out of 400.

Instruments

Scale of parenting style. The scale of parenting style (Abdul Gafor & Kurukkan, 2014) consist of two main dimensions; first one is parental responsiveness (all odd items from 1 to 37, total 19 items) and second one is parental control (all even numbers from 2 to 38, total 19 items) with total 38 items.. Each item was evaluated on five point Likert scale as, 0= “always true”, 1= “almost true”, 2= “sometimes true, 3= sometimes false”, 4= “almost false”, and 5= “always false”.

The current scale provides six separate scores for each participant, namely mother’s responsiveness, father’s responsiveness, mother’s control, father’s control, parental responsiveness and parental control. Participants (age ranges from 17 to 19 years) was asked to fill the questionnaire of parenting style according to their own perception about mother and father. The test-retest coefficient of reliability of responsiveness variable in the scale is 0.81 and for control it is 0.83 (Abdul Gafor & Kurukkan, 2014).

Florence cyber-bullying-cyber-victimization scales (FCBVSs). Florence cyber-bullying-cyber-victimization scale (Palladino et al., 2015) consist of two subscales, first one for perpetration and second for cyber victimization. Only one subscale (cyber victimization) was used in the current research. It includes 14 Likert-type items and each item was evaluated on a 5-point scale, where 1 =

“never,” 2 = “once or twice,” 3 = “one or two times at month,” 4 = “once a week,” and 5 = “several times a week.” Participants (age range 17 to 19 years) was asked to report the frequency of specific behavior they had experience during the past couple of months. The Cronbach’s alpha for FCBVSs (for victimization only) ranges from 0.6 - 0.8 (Palladino et al., 2015).

Youth Anxiety Measure for DSM-5, Part I (YAM-5-1).

Part I of the YAM-5 (Muris et al., 2017) consists of 28 items, including items related to separation anxiety disorder (SA; 1 + 6 + 10 + 15 + 19 + 24), selective mutism (SM; 2+11+20+25), social anxiety disorder (SAD; 3+7+12+16+23+28), panic disorder (PD; 4+8+13+17+21+26) and generalized anxiety disorder (GAD; 5+9+14+18+22+27). Items was evaluated on a four-point Likert scale where 1 = “never”, 2= “sometimes”, 3= “often” and 4 = “always”. Participants (age ranges from 8 to 18 years, Muris et al., 2016) were asked to report the frequency of specific behavior they had experience during the past couple of months. The Cronbach’s alpha for YAM-5 (part I only) values ranges from .65 - .93. Test retest reliability ranges from 0.73 - 0.90.

Procedure

Current study was conducted for exploring the relationship amongst Parenting response, Parenting control and cyber-victimization. First of all, permission was taken by researcher from the corresponding authors for utilizing their instruments in current research. Consent was obtained from participants and rationale of the study was thoroughly explained to each of them. The participants were assured about the confidentiality of responses and all the data collected from them will be used only for the research purposes. Participants were provided with scale of parenting style first then FCBVSs (only for cyber victimization). They were asked to fill up and return the questionnaire at the spot. The participants requested to provide their genuine and authentic responses and they ended with the word of thanks, from researcher for their cooperation.

Results

Table 1

Descriptive statistics and Reliability Co-efficient (α) of Scales (N=300)

Variables	K	α	M (SD)	Range		Skewness	Kurtosis
				Actual	Potential		
Parent responsiveness	38	.89	151.08(19.71)	82-185	38-190	-.86	1.13
Parent control	38	.90	157.44(19.79)	92-190	38-190	-.76	.77
Mother responsiveness	19	.78	79.92(9.46)	27-95	19-95	-.84	.769
Mother control	19	.80	80.87(9.13)	51-95	19-95	-.031	.281
Father responsiveness	19	.89	71.16(13.35)	18-90	19-95	-1.36	2.10
Father control	19	.90	76.57(13.49)	19-95	19-95	-1.39	2.10
Cyber victimization	28	.89	19.50(8.62)	14-65	28-140	3.04	1.89
Separation anxiety	06	.74	11.72(4.35)	06-24	06-24	.81	.15
Selective mutism	04	.58	7.66(2.47)	04-16	04-16	.71	.41
Social anxiety	06	.61	11.71(3.49)	06-24	06-24	.80	.64
Panic disorder	06	.75	10.91(3.7)	06-24	06-24	1.02	.96
Generalized anxiety	06	.70	13.69(4.08)	06-24	06-24	.41	-.23

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics and psychometric properties for the scales used in this study. The reliability coefficient (alpha) for the Parental responsiveness scale is .89, and for the Parental Control scale is .90. For Cyber-victimization scale alpha coefficient value is .89, for Separation anxiety is .74, selective mutism is .58, social anxiety is .61, panic disorder is .75 and for generalized anxiety the value of Cronbach alpha is .70.

Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation are reported for each scale. Skewness and kurtosis values are also provided to assess the distribution of the data. It is observed that all the scales exhibit normal distributions within an acceptable range, as indicated by the skewness and kurtosis values falling within ± 2 (Lomax & Hahs-Vaughn, 2012).

Table 2

Correlation among study variables (Parenting Styles) (N=300)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 PR	1	.84**	.64**	.80**	.78**	.91**	-.06	.05	.00	.05	-.02	-.07
2 PC		1	.78**	.65**	.91**	.79**	-.10	.07	-.01	-.04	-.03	-.09
3 MR			1	.75**	.47**	.41**	-.10	.16**	.03	.01	.05	-.01
4 MC				1	.42**	.51**	-.13*	.17*	.02	.12	.00	.01
5 FR					1	.86**	-.04	-.00	-.03	-.08	-.09	-.13*
6 FC						1	-.03	-.05	-.02	-.00	-.03	-.09
7 CV							1	.22**	.33**	.29**	.33**	.21**
8 SA								1	.40**	.50**	.51**	.48**
9 SM									1	.52**	.38**	.41**
10 SAD										1	.56**	.62**
11 PD											1	.60**
12 GAD												1

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

Read as. PR= Parent Responsiveness; PC= Parent Control; MR= Mother Responsiveness; MC= Mother Control; FR= Father Responsiveness; FC= Father Control; CV= Cyber Victimization; SA=

Separtartion Anxiety; SM= Selective Mutism; SAD= Social Anxiety Disorder; PD= Panic Disorder; GAD= Generalized Anxiety Disorder.

Table 2 shows that Parent Responsiveness is significant positively correlated with Parent Control, Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control. Parental control shows significant positive correlation with Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control. Result further reveals that Mother Responsiveness is significant positively correlated with Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, father control and Separation Anxiety. Mother Control is significant positively correlated with Father Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Separation Anxiety and significant negatively correlated with Cyber Victimization. Father Responsiveness is significant positively correlated with Father Control and significant negatively correlated with Generalized Anxiety Disorder. Result further revealed that there is significant positive correlation among cyber victimization Separation Anxiety, Selective Mutism, Social Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, and Generalized Anxiety Disorder.

Table 3

Parenting Styles	f	%
Authoritative	123	41.0
Authoritarian	27	9.0
Permissive	27	9.0
Negligent	123	41.0

Commonly Perceived Parenting styles by adolescents (N=300)

Table 3 shows that 41 % adolescent’s perceived parenting style is Authoritative and negligent while 9% adolescent’s perceived parenting style is Authoritarian and Negligent. Table reveals the fact that Authoritative and Negligent parenting styles are commonly perceived parenting styles by the

Table 6

One Way ANOVA to Investigate Difference on the basis of Parenting Styles on study variables (N=300)

Variables	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive	Negligent	F	p	η ²	Post hoc
	n=123	n=27	n=27	n=123				
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)				

adolescents. *Table did not present the equal number of parenting styles (as need larger sample size) but it reflects the obtained styles only from the sample of 300.

Table 4

Commonly Perceived Mother Parenting style of adolescents (N=300)

Parenting Styles	f	%
Authoritative	109	36.3
Authoritarian	41	13.7
Permissive	36	12.0
Negligent	114	38.0

Table indicated that 38 % adolescents perceive negligent mother parenting style while 12%, 13.7% and 36.3% adolescents perceive Permissive, Authoritarian and Authoritative mother parenting style correspondingly. Table reveals the fact that negligent mother parenting style is commonly perceived parenting style by the adolescents.

Table 5

Commonly Perceived Father Parenting style of adolescents (N=300)

Parenting Styles	f	%
Authoritative	111	37
Authoritarian	31	10.3
Permissive	26	8.7
Negligent	132	44.0

Table indicated that 44% adolescents perceived negligent father parenting style while 8.7%, 10.3% and 37% adolescents perceive Permissive, Authoritarian and Authoritative father parenting style correspondingly. Table reveals the fact that negligent father parenting style is commonly perceived parenting style by the adolescents.

Cyber	18.26(8.48)	17.77(3.80)	25.77(16.84)	19.73(5.98)	6.30	.000	.01	1>2<3>4
Victimization	11.58(4.25)	13.66(5.13)	11.85(4.30)	11.41(4.23)	2.06	.105	.01	
Separation	7.56(2.74)	8.07(2.74)	8.06(2.21)	7.59(2.18)	.59	.619	.02	
Anxiety	11.69(3.93)	10.66(2.71)	11.88(3.01)	11.93(3.25)	.99	.394	.01	
Selective	10.43(3.80)	11.44(3.75)	11.77(4.66)	11.08(3.41)	1.44	.231	.01	
Mutism	13.32(4.23)	13.37(4.31)	13.66(4.68)	14.13(3.73)	.85	.464	.03	
Social Anxiety Disorder								
Panic Disorder								
Generalized Anxiety								

Table 6 shows one way ANOVA to investigate differences on the basis of Parenting Styles across Separation Anxiety, Selective Mustism, Social Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, and Generalized

Anxiety disorder. Significant mean differences are found in Cyber Victimization on Permissive Parenting Style.

Table 7

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Cyber victimization through Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control (N=300)

Scales	B	SEB	β	t	p	LL-UL
Constant	31.74	4.56		6.94	.000	22.74, 40.73
Mother Responsiveness	.59	.52	.65	1.14	.251	-.42, 1.62
Mother Control	-.45	.58	-.48	.78	.431	-1.59, .68
Father Responsiveness	.63	.55	.98	1.14	.255	-.45, 1.72
Father Control	-.27	.58	-.42	.47	.637	-1.40, .86
Parent Responsiveness	.35	.57	.82	.62	.534	-.77, 1.48
Parent Control	-.65	.52	-1.54	1.26	.208	-1.68, .36
R			.28			
R2			.08			
ΔR2			.06			
F			4.29***			

Note. LL= Lower Limit; UL= Upper Limit

Table shows the summary of regression analysis. It shows that Mother Responsiveness, Father Responsiveness and Parental Responsiveness positively predicts Cyber-victimization among adolescents. Mother Responsiveness,

Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control accounted for 8% of variance in Cyber-victimization among adolescents.`

Table 8

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Separation Anxiety through Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control (N=300)

Scales	B	SEB	β	t	p	LL-UL
Constant	5.34	2.30		2.31	.021	.80, 9.89
Mother Responsiveness	-.47	.26	-1.04	1.82	.069	-.99, .38
Mother Control	-.46	.29	-.97	1.58	.114	-1.04, .11
Father Responsiveness	-.47	.28	-1.43	1.67	.095	-1.02, .08
Father Control	-.69	.29	-2.16	2.39	.017	-1.27, -.12
Parent Responsiveness	.58	.28	2.67	2.03	.043	.01, 1.15
Parent Control	.49	.26	2.30	1.87	.061	-.02, 1.01

R	.28
R ²	.08
ΔR ²	.06
F	4.34***

Note. LL= Lower Limit; UL= Upper Limit

Table shows the Predictive role of Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control on Separation Anxiety among adolescents. It shows that 8%

change in separation anxiety is due to Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control among adolescents.

Table 9

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Selective Mutism through Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control (N=300)

Scales	B	SEB	β	t	p	LL-UL
Constant	7.26	1.36		5.33	.000	4.58, 9.94
Mother Responsiveness	.03	.15	.11	.20	.842	-.27, .33
Mother Control	-.05	.17	-.21	.34	.731	-.40, .28
Father Responsiveness	-.01	.16	-.02	.02	.978	-.33, .32
Father Control	-.05	.17	-.26	.28	.777	-.38, .29
Parent Responsiveness	.06	.17	.46	.33	.737	-.27, .39
Parent Control	-.01	.15	-.11	.08	.929	-.31, .29
R			.09			
R ²			.01			
ΔR ²			-.01			
F			.408		.874	

Note. LL= Lower Limit; UL= Upper Limit

Table shows the Predictive role of Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control on Selective Mutism among adolescents. It shows that 1%

change in Selective Mutism is due to Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control among adolescents.

Table 10

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Social Anxiety through Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control (N=300)

Scales	B	SEB	β	t	p	LL-UL
Constant	9.20	1.87		4.90	.000	5.51, 12.89
Mother Responsiveness	-.31	.52	.65	1.14	.251	-.42, 1.62
Mother Control	-.19	.58	-.48	.78	.431	-1.59, .68
Father Responsiveness	-.36	.55	.98	1.14	.255	-.45, 1.72
Father Control	-.24	.58	-.42	.47	.637	-1.40, .86
Parent Responsiveness	.27	.57	.82	.62	.534	-.77, 1.48
Parent Control	.28	.52	-1.54	1.26	.208	-1.68, .36
R			.23			
R ²			.05			
ΔR ²			.03			
F			2.74***		.013	

Note. LL= Lower Limit; UL= Upper Limit

Table shows the Predictive role of Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control on Social Anxiety among adolescents. It shows that 5%

change in Social Anxiety is due to Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control among adolescents.

Table 11

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting through Panic disorder Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control (N=300)

Scales	B	SEB	β	t	p	LL-UL
Constant	10.11	2.02		4.99	.000	6.12, 14.09
Mother Responsiveness	-.22	.23	-.56	.96	.336	-.67, .23
Mother Control	-.38	.25	-.94	1.50	.135	-.89, .12
Father Responsiveness	-.42	.24	-1.52	1.73	.084	-.91, .05
Father Control	-.26	.25	-.95	1.03	.301	-.76, .23
Parent Responsiveness	.33	.26	1.73	1.28	.199	-.17, .82
Parent Control	.31	.23	1.71	1.36	.172	-.13, .76
R			.20			
R2			.04			
$\Delta R2$.02			
F			2.02		.062	

Note. LL= Lower Limit; UL= Upper Limit

Table shows the Predictive role of Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control on Panic disorder among adolescents. It shows that 4%

change in Panic disorder is due to Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control among adolescents.

Table 12

Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting GAD through Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control (N=300)

Scales	B	SEB	β	t	p	LL-UL
Constant	13.81	2.21		6.22	.000	9.44, 18.18
Mother Responsiveness	-.07	.25	-.17	.29	.771	-.57, .42
Mother Control	.05	.28	.12	.19	.849	-.50, .60
Father Responsiveness	-.17	.27	-.58	.66	.507	-.71, .35
Father Control	.06	.28	.20	.22	.823	-.48, .61
Parent Responsiveness	-.04	.27	-.19	.14	.884	-.58, .51
Parent Control	.10	.25	.498	.39	.692	-.39, .59
R			.18			
R2			.03			
$\Delta R2$.01			
F			1.63		.138	

Note. LL= Lower Limit; UL= Upper Limit

Table shows the summary of regression analysis. It shows that Mother responsiveness, Father responsiveness and Parent responsiveness

negatively predicts GAD among adolescents. Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent

Responsiveness and Parent Control accounted for 3% of variance in GAD among adolescents.

Table 13
 Mean, Standard Deviation and t-values across gender on study variables (N=300)

Variables	Female (n=169)	Male (n=131)	t	p	95% CI		Cohen's d
	M (SD)	M (SD)			LL	UL	
Parent Responsiveness	155.28(19.44)	156.98(20.47)	-.73	.46	-6.25	2.86	.
Parent Control	157.69(19.66)	155.50(21.15)	.92	.35	-2.46	6.84	.
Mother Responsiveness	81.01(9.57)	78.51(9.16)	2.29	.02	.35	4.65	0.26
Mother Control	81.81(8.85)	79.64(9.39)	2.04	.04	.08	4.25	0.23
Father Responsiveness	70.87(14.06)	71.53(12.42)	-.42	.67	-3.72	2.40	.
Father Control	75.02(14.52)	78.58(11.80)	-2.27	.02	-6.62	-.48	0.26
Cyber Victimization	18.07(6.51)	21.33(10.50)	3.29	.001	-5.20	-1.31	0.37
Separation Anxiety	13.15(4.30)	9.88(3.67)	6.92	.000	2.34	4.19	0.82
Selective Mutism	7.62(2.50)	7.71(2.45)	.31	.755	-.65	.47	.
Social Anxiety Disorder	12.08(3.39)	11.23(3.56)	2.10	.036	.05	1.64	0.24
Panic Disorder	11.55(3.59)	10.09(3.77)	3.41	.001	.61	2.30	0.39
Generalized Anxiety	14.31(4.13)	12.88(3.88)	3.04	.003	.50	2.35	0.35

df=298

Note. CI= Confidence Interval; LL= Lower Limit; UL= Upper Limit

Table 13 shows independent sample t-test analysis for investigating the difference across gender on Parent Responsiveness, Parent Control, Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Cyber Victimization, Separation Anxiety, Selective Mutism, Social Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, and Generalized Anxiety disorder. There is significant difference in mean scores on Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Control, Cyber Victimization, Separation Anxiety, Social Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder and Generalized Anxiety disorder between female and male participants. There is non-significant difference on Parent Responsiveness, Parent Control, Father Responsiveness and Selective Mutism for male and female participants.

Discussion

This research study has aimed to investigate the parenting styles (response and control) as a predictor of cyber victimization and anxiety disorders. In this study, parenting styles includes both mother and father separately and collectively as well. Parent control, Parent response, Mother Control, Mother Response, Father Control and Father Response (representing Parenting

dimensions) are considered as independent variables. However, cyber-victimization and anxiety disorders are used as dependent variables. Different questionnaires (authorized by authors) are there to collect data from respondents and to test the acceptance and rejection of hypotheses of the current study. For testing relationship among variables of current study, statistical tests (such as correlation, multiple regression, T-test and one-way ANOVA) are performed.

In current study, findings of correlation analysis (objective 2) provides valuable insights into the relationships between parenting styles (Mother Control, Mother Response, Father Control and Father Response), cyber victimization, and anxiety disorders (Separation Anxiety Disorder, Selective Mutism, Specific Phobia, Social Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, agoraphobia and Generalized Anxiety Disorders). Findings of correlation analysis (Table 2) reveal intriguing correlations between parenting styles and various factors. Notably, Parental control shows significant positive correlation with Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness and Father Control. Parent Responsiveness is significant positively correlated with Parent Control, Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father

Responsiveness, and Father Control. This suggests that parents who are more responsive tend to exercise more control in their parenting approach.

Result further reveals that Mother Responsiveness is significant positively correlated with Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, father control and Separation Anxiety. Mother Control is significant positively correlated with Father Control, Father Responsiveness, Separation Anxiety and significant negatively correlated with Cyber Victimization. Results reveals the fact that higher level of mother control is a protective factor against being a Cyber Victim.

Father Responsiveness is significant positively correlated with Father Control and significant negatively correlated with Generalized Anxiety Disorder. This reinforces the idea that higher level of Father Responsiveness decrease the chances of GAD in adolescents. Result further revealed that there is significant positive correlation among cyber victimization Separation Anxiety, Selective Mutism, Social Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, and Generalized Anxiety Disorder. This underscores the significant impact of online victimization on various anxiety disorders among adolescents, highlighting the need for awareness and protective measures in the digital age

Results of present study also calls attention to the most commonly perceived parenting style (objective 1) by the adolescents (table 3, 4 and 5). Both Authoritative and Negligent parenting styles (41%) are the most commonly perceived parenting styles by the adolescents (table 3). Negligent Mother parenting style (38%) is the most commonly perceived parenting style by the adolescents while 12%, 13.7 % and 36.3% adolescents perceive Permissive, Authoritarian and Authoritative Parenting style (table 4). Negligent Father parenting style (44%) is the most commonly perceived parenting style by the adolescents while 8.7, 10.3 % and 37% adolescents perceive Permissive, Authoritarian and Authoritative Parenting style (table 5). These results make it very clear that parents use Authoritative and Negligent approaches usually to deal with their children which means parents are inconsistent in their approaches (Belsky, 1984)

Present study also investigates the differences (objective 4, hypothesis 1) among Parenting styles (Authoritative, Authoritarian, Permissive and Negligent), CV and Anxiety Disorders (Separation

Anxiety Disorder, Selective Mutism, Specific Phobia, Social Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, agoraphobia and Generalized Anxiety Disorders). Results reveals the fact (table 6) that parents who shows extra leniency and do not exert any control (Permissive) over their adolescent's actions are more prone towards being cyber victimized. Literature also make it very clear that more leniency by parents can cause internet addiction that means person is easily accessible and serve as a suitable target for offenders (Baldry & Farrington, 2017; Dehue et al., 2012; Truong et al., 2017).

According to the current results, hypotheses 1 is partially supported (table 6). There are many reasons that can explain why we do not find significant differences among parenting styles (Authoritative, Authoritarian and Negligent), CV and Anxiety disorders. The most important one is the sampling size (N=300) which is not sufficient to find any important difference on study variables. Next important factor is population and age restrictions. We selected late adolescents (17 to 19 years) only despite the fact that these phenomenons needs more variation and representative sampling to understand clearly. Reliance on self-report measures only can introduce response bias and social desirability that can be another important reason behind the current results.

In current study, the multiple regression analyses shed light on the predictive roles of various Parenting styles (response and control) and parental characteristics on cyber victimization, anxiety disorders, and related outcomes. These findings provide valuable insights into the complex relationships between parenting practices and children's psychological well-being. Regression analysis indicates that (table 7) Mother Control, Father Control and Parental Control negatively predicts Cyber- Victimization (objective 3, hypotheses 2) whereas Mother Responsiveness, Father Responsiveness and Parental Responsiveness positively predicts Cyber-victimization (objective 3, hypothesis 3) among adolescents. Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control accounted for 8% of variance in Cyber-victimization among adolescents. This suggests that children raised in households characterized by

high parental control are more likely to experience cyber victimization.

Results of current study supported the hypotheses 2 which states that Perceived Parental control negatively predicts Cyber- Victimization. These results are similar with the findings of Giles and price (2008) that explains high Parental Control can reduce the chances of being Cyber victimized by limiting internet use of adolescents. Findings of Elsaesser et al. (2017) and Li et al. (2013) have shown similar results by revealing that high control serves as a protective factor against Cyber-victimization. .

Findings of current study also do not support the hypotheses 3 which explains the negative predictive role of parental responsiveness and cyber victimization. Results of current study are contrary with the finding of Wood et al. (2003). Literature shows that parental responsiveness makes a child more confident in communication with their parents as a result they are not a suitable target for cyber victimization (Gomez-Ortiz et al., 2016).

Furthermore, regression analysis also point out relation among parenting styles (response and control) and anxiety disorder (objective 3). Results shows the predictive role of Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control on Separation Anxiety among adolescents (Table 8). It is evident from results that Father control significantly and negatively predict Separation anxiety whereas Parent Responsiveness significantly and positively predicts it. Apparently, 8% change in separation anxiety is due to Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control among adolescents.

Analysis also shed light on the predictive role of Parenting styles (Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control) on Selective Mutism among adolescents (table 9). It shows that 1% change in mutism is due to these Parenting styles (response and control). On the other hand, Predictive role of Parenting styles (Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control) on Social Anxiety also studied (table 10). It is evident from

results that 5% change in Social Anxiety is due to change in Parenting styles (response and control).

The Predictive role of Mother Responsiveness, Mother Control, Father Responsiveness, Father Control, Parent Responsiveness and Parent Control on Panic disorder is also investigated among adolescents (table 11). Results point out that 4% change in Panic disorder is due to changes in Parenting styles (response and control). Additionally, results showed (table 12) that Mother responsiveness, Father Responsiveness and Parent responsiveness negatively predicts GAD among adolescents however, Mother Control Father Control and Parent Control positively predicts GAD. Collectively Parenting styles (response and control) accounted for 3% of variance in GAD among adolescents.

Results of the current study partially supports the hypotheses 4 according to which Parental Control is a positive predictor of Anxiety Disorders. Results shows that Parent Control is a positive predictor of Separation Anxiety Disorder (table 8), Panic Disorder (table 11) and Generalized Anxiety Disorder (table 12). These results suggests that high control over adolescents make them more vulnerable for anxiety disorders (Bosmans et al., 2014; Pinquart, 2017) specifically Separation Anxiety (wood et al., 2003) Disorder, Panic Disorder and Generalized Anxiety Disorder (DiBartolo & Helt, 2007; Eun et al., 2018; Rose et al., 2018). There are so many explanations behind the partially supported hypotheses. The most important one is the sampling size (N=300) which is not satisfactory. Next important factor is population and age restrictions. We selected late adolescents (17 to 19 years) only despite the fact that these phenomena require more variation and representative sampling to understand clearly. Reliance on self-report measures only can introduce response bias and social desirability that can be another important reason behind the current results.

Results of current study partially supports the hypotheses 5, which explains that Perceived Parental Response is a negative predictor of Anxiety Disorders. Results from current study illustrates that Parental Response negatively predicts GAD (table 12). This result suggests that parents, who are high in response, behave kindly and show their active involvement in the life of their children are the protective factor against

GAD. Literature reveals the fact that parents who are more responsive raised a mentally healthy children as compared to those who are more controlling (McLeod et al., 2007; Murry et al., 2009). There are so many explanations behind the partially supported hypotheses. The most important one is the sampling size (N=300) which is not satisfactory. Next important factor is population and age restrictions. We selected late adolescents (17 to 19 years) only despite the fact that these phenomenons require more variation and representative sampling to understand clearly. Reliance on self-report measures only can introduce response bias and social desirability that can be another important reason behind the current results.

Conclusion

Parenting and their approaches paved the way towards mentally healthy development of a child and serve as a protective factor against several environmental threats like Cyber Victimization. Current study aimed to investigate the predicting role of these parenting approaches in the development of Cyber Victimization and Anxiety Disorders among late adolescents. In present study two main styles of parents, Control and response were added as independent variable. The role of mother and father also included separately as well as collectively. Cyber Victimization and anxiety Disorders (Separation Anxiety, Social Anxiety, Selective Mutism, Panic Disorder and Generalized Anxiety Disorder) were taken as dependent variable.

T-test, one way ANOVA and multiple regression analysis were used to test the hypotheses. Results of the current study showed that parental control negatively predicts the Cyber victimization that means higher level of control by parents specifically by mother can be a shield against Cyber Victimization (table 7) for adolescents . On the other hand, parental control positively predicts Anxiety Disorders that means higher level of control makes adolescents more susceptible for the development of anxiety disorders specifically Separation Anxiety Disorder (table 8), Panic Disorder (table 11) and Generalized Anxiety Disorder (table 12).

Results of the current study states that Mother Responsiveness, Father Responsiveness and Parental Responsiveness positively predicts Cyber

Victimization (table 7) that are contrary to the hypotheses 3. Literature shed the light on the facts that parental response decreases the gap between parents and child. Attention, care and involvement of parents in the activities of children serve as a worst target for offenders. In addition, the findings of current research indicates that Parental response negatively predicts anxiety disorders specifically GAD (table 12). This result suggests that parents, who are responsive, behave kindly and show their active involvement in the life of their children are the protective factor against GAD.

Results finding also shed light on the fact that permissive parenting makes children more vulnerable for being a Cyber Victim (table 6). According to the results of current study, the most common perceived parenting style is Negligent (table 3, 4, 5). There are so many reason behind these results. Today the life is too hectic not for only father but for mother too. Both parents are working and had less time for their children as a result children perceive them as being negligent. Excessive involvement in android cell phones is another important factor behind these results. Everyone is busy with their own cell phone and have less or even no time for family.

Conclusively, findings from the various analyses suggest that Perceived Parental Control negatively predicts Cyber Victimization but positively predicts Anxiety Disorders. Similarly finding also suggests that Perceived Prenatal Response negatively predicts Anxiety Disorders. Hypotheses 2 is accepted while hypotheses 1, 4 and 5 are partially accepted however the findings of current research are contrary to hypotheses 3.

References

- Abdul Gafor, K., & Kurukkan, A. (2014). Construction and Validation of Scale of Parenting Style. *Guru Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences* g, 2(4), 315-323.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2022). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed., text rev.).
- Aoyama, I., Utsumi, S., & Hasegawa, M. (2012). Cyberbullying in Japan: Cases, government reports, adolescent relational aggression, and parental monitoring roles. *Cyberbullying in the global playground: Research from international perspectives*, 183-201.
- Baldry, A. C., Farrington, D. P., & Sorrentino, A. (2017). School bullying and cyberbullying

- among boys and girls: Roles and overlap. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 26(9), 937-951.
- Barlett, C., & Coyne, S. M. (2014). A meta-analysis of sex differences in cyber-bullying behavior: The moderating role of age. *Aggressive behavior*, 40(5), 474-488. DOI:10.1002/ab.21555
- Barlow, David H. (2002). "Unraveling the mysteries of anxiety and its disorders from the perspective of emotion theory". *American Psychologist* 55 (11): 1247-63. PMID 11280938. Retrieved from: <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/amp/55/11/1247.pdf>
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child development*, 83-96.
- Bingöl, T. Y. (2018). The Predictive Role of Self-Efficacy, Gender, and Cyber Victimization on Cyber Bullying in Adolescents. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(11), 2478-2483.
- Bonanno, R. A., & Hymel, S. (2013). Cyber bullying and internalizing difficulties: Above and beyond the impact of traditional forms of bullying. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 42(5), 685-697. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-013-9937-1
- Bossler, A. M., Holt, T. J., & May, D. C. (2012). Predicting online harassment victimization among a juvenile population. *Youth & Society*, 44(4), 500-523. DOI:10.1177/0044118x11407525
- Brown, C. F., Demaray, M. K., & Secord, S. M. (2014). Cyber victimization in middle school and relations to social emotional outcomes. *Computers in human behavior*, 35, 12-21.
- Christian Elledge, L., Williford, A., Boulton, A. J., DePaolis, K. J., Little, T. D., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Individual and contextual predictors of cyberbullying: The influence of children's provictim attitudes and teachers' ability to intervene. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 42, 698-710.
- Cisler, J. M., Olatunji, B. O., Feldner, M. T., & Forsyth, J. P. (2010). Emotion Regulation and the Anxiety Disorders: An Integrative Review. *Journal of psychopathology and behavioral assessment*, 32(1), 68-82. DOI:10.1007/s10862-009-9161-1
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 588-608. DOI: 10.2307/2094589
- Cowie, H., Bauman, S., Coyne, I., Myers, C., Pörhölä, M., & Almeida, A. (2013). Cyberbullying amongst university students: An emergent cause for concern?. In *Cyberbullying through the new media* (pp. 165-177). Psychology Press.
- DeHue, F., Bolman, C., & Vollink, T., (2008). Cyberbullying: youngsters' experiences and parental perception. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11(2), 217-223. DOI:10.1089/cpb.2007.0008
- Dempsey, A. G., Sulkowski, M. L., Nichols, R., & Storch, E. A. (2009). Differences between peer victimization in cyber and physical settings and associated psychosocial adjustment in early adolescence. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(10), 962-972. DOI:10.1002/pits.20437
- DiBartolo, P. M., & Helt, M. (2007). Theoretical models of affectionate versus affectionless control in anxious families: A critical examination based on observations of parent-child interactions. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 10, 253-274.
- Dow, S. P., Sonies, B. C., Scheib, D., Moss, S. E., & Leonard, H. L. (1995). Practical guidelines for the assessment and treatment of selective mutism. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 34(7), 836-846.
- Dwairy, M. (2010). Introduction to special section on cross-cultural research on parenting and psychological adjustment of children. *Journal of Children and Families Studies*, 19, 1-7. doi: 10.1007/s10826-009-9336-0
- Dwairy, M., Achoui, M., Abouserie, R., & Farah, A. (2006b). Parenting style, individuation, and mental health of Arab adolescents: A third cross-regional research study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(3), 1-11.
- Elsaesser, C., Russell, B., Ohannessian, C. M., & Patton, D. (2017). Parenting in a digital age: A review of parents' role in preventing adolescent cyberbullying. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 35, 62-72.
- Erozkan, A. (2012). Examination of Relationship between Anxiety Sensitivity and Parenting Styles in Adolescents. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(1), 52-57.
- Eun, J. D., Paksarian, D., He, J. P., & Merikangas, K. R. (2018). Parenting style and mental disorders in a nationally representative sample of US adolescents. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 53, 11-20.
- Fanti, K. A., Demetriou, A. G., & Hawa, V. V. (2012). A longitudinal study of cyberbullying:

- Examining risk and protective factors. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9(2), 168-181.
- Fredstrom, B. K., Adams, R. E., & Gilman, R. (2011). Electronic and school-based victimization: Unique contexts for adjustment difficulties during adolescence. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 40(4), 405-415. DOI:10.1007/s10964-010-9569-7
- Gibb, S. J., Horwood, J., & Fergusson, D. M. (2011). Bullying victimization/perpetration in childhood and later adjustment: findings from a 30 year longitudinal study. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace*, 3, 82-88. DOI: 10.1108/17596591111132891
- Giles, G., & Price, I. R. (2008). Adolescent computer use: Approach, avoidance, and parental control. *Australian journal of psychology*, 60(2), 63-71.
- Gini, G., & Pozzoli, T. (2013). Bullied children and psychosomatic problems: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*, 132(4), 720-729.
- 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.
- Hanna, G. L., Fischer, D. J., & Fluent, T. E. (2006). Separation anxiety disorder and school refusal in children and adolescents. *Pediatrics in Review*, 27(2), 56.
- Hersov, L. (1960). Persistent non-attendance at school. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 1, 130-136
- Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J. W. (2006). Cyberbullying Emotional and Psychological Consequences. Retrieved from http://www.cyberbullying.us/cyberbullying_emotional_consequence_s.pdf.
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior*, 29(2), 129-156. DOI:10.1080/01639620701457816
- Hunt, C., Peters, L., & Rapee, R. M. (2012). Development of a measure of the experience of being bullied in youth. *Psychological Assessment*, 24(1), 156. DOI: 10.1037/a0025178
- Khodaii, E., Medanipori, V., & Naghdi. (2008). Parents, adolescents, familial obedience or independence. *Journal of Family Research*, 12, 10-22.
- Klomek, A. B., Sourander, A., & Gould, M. (2010). The association of suicide and bullying in childhood to young adulthood: A review of cross-sectional and longitudinal research findings. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(5), 282-288.
- Kokkinos, C. M., Antoniadou, N., Asdre, A., & Voulgaridou, K. (2016). Parenting and Internet behavior predictors of cyber-bullying and cyber-victimization among preadolescents. *Deviant Behavior*, 37(4), 439-455.
- Kopko, K. (2007). *Parenting styles and adolescents*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Landoll, R. R., La Greca, A. M., Lai, B. S., Chan, S. F., & Herge, W. M. (2015). Cyber victimization by peers: Prospective associations with adolescent social anxiety and depressive symptoms. *Journal of adolescence*, 42, 77-86. DOI:10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.04.002
- Lee, M. S., Zi-Pei, W., Svanström, L., & Dalal, K. (2013). Cyber bullying prevention: intervention in Taiwan. *Plos one*, 8(5), e64031. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0064031
- Lenhart, A., & Madden, M. (2005). *Teen content creators and consumers (Vol. 2)*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.
- Lenhart, A., Duggan, M., Perrin, A., Stepler, R., Rainie, H., & Parker, K. (2015). *Teens, social media & technology overview 2015*.
- Low, S., & Espelage, D. (2013). Differentiating cyber bullying perpetration from non-physical bullying: Commonalities across race, individual, and family predictors. *Psychology of Violence*, 3(1), 39.
- Manoochchri, M., & Mofidi, F. (2014). Relationship between child rearing styles and anxiety in parents of 4 to 12 years children. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2578-2582.
- McLeod, B. D., Wood, J. J., & Weisz, J. R. (2007). Examining the association between parenting and childhood anxiety: A meta-analysis. *Clinical psychology review*, 27(2), 155-172.
- Moreno-Ruiz, D., Martínez-Ferrer, B., & García-Bacete, F. (2019). Parenting styles, cyberaggression, and cybervictimization among adolescents. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 93, 252-259.
- Muris, P., Simon, E., Lijphart, H., Bos, A., Hale, W., & Schmeitz, K. (2017). The youth anxiety measure for DSM-5 (YAM-5): development and first psychometric evidence of a new scale for assessing anxiety disorders symptoms of children and adolescents. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 48, 1-17.
- Murray, L., Creswell, C., & Cooper, P. J. (2009). The development of anxiety disorders in

- childhood: An integrative review. *Psychological medicine*, 39(9), 1413-1423.
- Musharraf, S., & Anis-ul-Haque, M. (2018). Cyberbullying in different participant roles: Exploring differences in psychopathology and well-being in university students. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Research*, 57(1), 33-39. DOI: 10.1080/10926771.2017.1422838
- Nishina, A. & Juvonen, J. (2005). Daily reports of witnessing and experiencing peer harassment in middle school. *Child Development*, 76(2), 435-450. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00855.x
- Padir, M. A., Ayas, T., & Horzum, M. B. (2021). Examining the Relationship among Internet Parental Style, Personality, and Cyberbullying/Victimization. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 5(1), 56-69.
- Palladino, B. E., Nocentini, A., & Menesini, E. (2015). Psychometric properties of the Florence cyberbullying-cybervictimization scales. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 18(2), 112-119.
- Panetta, S. M., Somers, C. L., Ceresnie, A. R., Hillman, S. B., & Partridge, R. T. (2014). Maternal and paternal parenting style patterns and adolescent emotional and behavioral outcomes. *Marriage & Family Review*, 50(4), 342-359.
- Perren, S., Dooley, J., Shaw, T., & Cross, D. (2010). Bullying in school and cyberspace: Associations with depressive symptoms in Swiss and Australian adolescents. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health*, 4, 1-10.
- Pinquart, M. (2017). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with internalizing symptoms in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Marriage & Family Review*, 53(7), 613-640.
- Reijntjes, A., Kamphuis, J. H., Prinzie, P., & Telch, M. J. (2010). Peer victimization and internalizing problems in children: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Child abuse & neglect*, 34(4), 244-252.
- Rose, J., Roman, N., Mwaba, K., & Ismail, K. (2018). The relationship between parenting and internalizing behaviours of children: A systematic review. *Early Child Development and Care*, 188(10), 1468-1486.
- Rosli, N. A. (2014). Effect of parenting styles on children's emotional and behavioral problems among different ethnicities of Muslim children in the US. Marquette University.
- Sahin, M. (2012). The relationship between the cyberbullying/cybervictimisation and loneliness among adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34, 834-837. DOI:10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.01.010
- Schenk, A. M., & Fremouw, W. J. (2012). Prevalence, psychological impact, and coping of cyberbully victims among college students. *Journal of school violence*, 11(1), 21-37. DOI:10.1080/15388220.2011.630310
- Schreier, A., Wolke, D., Thomas, K., Horwood, J., Hollis, C., Gunnell, D., ... & Harrison, G. (2009). Prospective study of peer victimization in childhood and psychotic symptoms in a nonclinical population at age 12 years. *Archives of general psychiatry*, 66(5), 527-536.
- Slonje, R., & Smith, P. K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, 49(2), 147-154.
- Taraban, L., & Shaw, D. S. (2018). Parenting in context: Revisiting Belsky's classic process of parenting model in early childhood. *Developmental Review*, 48, 55-81. doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2018.03.006.
- Timpano, K. R., Carbonella, J. Y., Keough, M. E., Abramowitz, J., & Schmidt, N. B. (2015). Anxiety sensitivity: An examination of the relationship with authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parental styles. *Journal of cognitive psychotherapy*, 29(2), 95-105.
- Tokunaga, R. S. (2010). Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(3), 277-287. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.014.
- Troy, M., & Sroufe, A. L. (1987). Victimization among preschoolers: Role of attachment relationship history. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 26, 166-172. DOI: 10.1097/00004583-198703000-00007
- Tynes, B., & Giang, M. (2009). Online victimization, depression and anxiety among adolescents in the US. *European Psychiatry*, 24(S1), 1-1.
- van Dam, D. S., van der Ven, E., Velthorst, E., Selten, J. P., Morgan, C., & de Haan, L. (2012). Childhood bullying and the association with psychosis in non-clinical and clinical samples: a review and meta-analysis. *Psychological medicine*, 42(12), 2463-2474.
- Van Geel, M., Vedder, P., & Tanilon, J. (2014). Relationship between peer victimization, cyberbullying, and suicide in children and

- adolescents: a meta-analysis. *JAMA pediatrics*, 168(5), 435-442.
- Wang, J., Nansel, T. R., & Iannotti, R. J. (2011). Cyber and traditional bullying: Differential association with depression. *Journal of adolescent health*, 48(4), 415-417. DOI: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.07.012
- Watson, J. B., & Rayner, R. (1920). Conditioned emotional reactions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 3, 1-14
- Weymouth, B. B., & Buehler, C. (2018). Early adolescents' relationships with parents, teachers, and peers and increases in social anxiety symptoms. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 32(4), 496.
- Wijsbroek, S. A. M., Hale, W. W., Raaijmakers, Q. A. W., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2011). The direction of effects between perceived parental behavioral control and psychological control and adolescents' self-reported GAD and SAD symptoms. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 20(7), 361-371. doi: 10.1007/s00787-011-0183-
- Wood, J. J., McLeod, B. D., Sigman, M., Hwang, W. C., & Chu, B. C. (2003). Parenting and childhood anxiety: Theory, empirical findings, and future directions. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*, 44(1), 134-151.
- Yaffe, Y. (2021). A narrative review of the relationship between parenting and anxiety disorders in children and adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 26(1), 449-459.
- Ybarra, M. L. (2004). Linkages between depressive symptomatology and Internet harassment among young regular Internet users. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 7(2), 247-257. DOI:10.1089/10949310432302450
- Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004a). Youth engaging in online harassment: Associations with caregiver-child relationships, Internet use, and personal characteristics. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27(3), 319-336. DOI:10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.03.007
- Ybarra, M. L., Diener-West, M., & Leaf, P. J. (2007). Examining the overlap in Internet harassment and school bullying: Implications for school intervention. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41(6), S42-S50. DOI:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.09.00

