

Perceived Family Rejection, Self-Compassion and Anger in Young Adults

Abish Rao¹, Muhammad Luqman Khan*², Muhammad Maqsood Iqbal³

¹MPhil Scholar, Department of Psychology, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

^{2*}Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

³Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Pakistan.

Corresponding author: Luqman.khan0078@gmail.com

Keywords: *Perceived Family Rejection, Self-Compassion, Anger, Young Adults*

DOI No:
<https://doi.org/10.56976/jsom.v5i2.458>

The present study explored the role of self-compassion as a mediator of perceived family rejection and anger among young adults in Pakistan (N = 300). By employing a cross-sectional survey questionnaire design, the primary survey tools used were the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), the Self-Compassion Scale-Short Form (SCS-SF), and the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ) Anger Subscale. The analysis of relationships indicated that anger was positively associated while self-compassion was negatively associated with family rejection. Self-compassion was found to partially mediate the relationship between family rejection and anger, where the perceived rejection was found to lower self-compassion and raise anger, using SPSS PROCESS macro (Model 4). Significant gender differences were evident as females showed a higher level of perceived family rejection while males presented a higher level of self-compassion, and both genders showed no significant differences in anger. These results highlight the positive, protective role that family self-compassion plays as a mediator, a psychological barrier to distressing emotions regarding family. It is recommended that self-compassion and mindfulness-based interventions be integrated into educational and clinical practices in order to better regulate emotions and decrease anger among young adults.

1. Introduction

This study aims to analyze the impact of perceived family rejection alongside self-compassion and anger of young adults. It looks at how the young adult perceiving the rejection of father, mother, or other caregiver understands their emotional regulation and potential outbursts. Lack of attention or loving behaviors, hurtful verbal, physical, or psychological behaviors, or even absence of family members leads to an increased perception of these injuries as a form of emotional regulation leading to psychological maladjustment. Following negative emotions and especially anger and hostility, the negative emotions also contribute to lowering self-compassion of young adults.

Family rejection is what people perceive to show that families care less about people or even show less love. Family rejection occurs as a result of family members being less supportive (DeChants et al., 2022). The major player in family rejection is mostly the family member (Coburn & McGeorge, 2022). It is vital to know family rejection is heavily based on the views of the people who think they are abandoned and not on the actions of the more supportive family member (Ambikile & Iseselo, 2023). Despair in the family could be attributed to a member's state of being or the state of being of several family members with respect to the social familial unit (Christophe et al., 2024). Family despair with respect to family negative configurations could be in terms of family members being social, being indifferent, or even family mean or being family neglected members (Amiri et al., 2025). Wherever the despair lies, family relationships are crucial in the social and emotional dimensions of an individual (Phan et al., 2025). Family relationships have a strong basis in the emotional welfare of an individual. Our relationships with our more supportive family members help shape our future self (Butėnaitė-Switkiewicz & Žemaitaitytė, 2024). Emotional family rejection is a significant social and emotional process that heavily influences an individual even in their early adult life (Rohner, 2004; Ambikile & Iseselo, 2023).

Self-compassion helps people be kinder to themselves when they experience challenges, failure, or feelings of inadequacy (DeChants et al., 2022). A compassionate self-approach offers kindness and support and avoids self-critical or judgmental thoughts. Inner relationship hardships and challenges can serve to become self-compassionate, while negative self-evaluation and self-judgment serve to keep people suffering (Butėnaitė-Switkiewicz & Žemaitaitytė, 2024). People understand the deep emotional and psychological suffering, but they cannot fully appreciate the effort and resolve it takes to create emotional and psychological balance (Li & Cui, 2022). People practicing self-compassion discern and label their feelings not too personal or marginal, allowing themselves to maintain balance (Cousineau, 2025).

Anger is the emotional reaction resulting from the perception of being threatened or treated unfairly or unjustly (Amiri et al., 2025). Of course, there are other stimulants of anger. Aside from the logical and conflicted thoughts, anger, depending on the situation, can easily cause annoyance, emotional and perhaps even physical outbursts. Anger is a common or natural feeling the way sadness, fear and happiness are important (Phan et al., 2025). However, anger can have adverse effects on the bearer and even the people who anger is directed to base on the intensity of anger, how the anger is expressed and how the anger is dealt with on the part of the person with anger (American Psychological Association, 2020; Spielberger, 1999).

2. Literature Review

There is plenty of empirical data evidencing that positive family environments impact the ability to regulate one's emotions and the resilience of one's psychology. Having a responsive family will lead an individual to employ adaptive coping skills and improve their mental health as an adult (Peng, 2024). In contrast, families that emotionally dismiss or reject members have a strong association with difficulty managing anger and anxiety and grow the likelihood of uncontrolled emotional responses. Also, recent data concludes that the emotional family environments influence the positive impact of attachment security and the ability to cultivate self-compassion and mindfulness, on the protective factors of emotional fluidity and stress (Li & Cui, 2022).

One pathway central to this analysis is the developmental mechanisms between perceived family rejection and deficits in self-compassion. People who feel un-valued in their family, or a negative critique from their parents, may internalize the negative critiques and incorporate them into their cognitive self-schemas, which are the schemas in the mind. People who feel un-valued in their family or a negative critique from their parents may internalize the negative critique and incorporate it into their cognitive self-schema, which is the schema in the mind. An individual's evolutionary threat system is chronically activated by perceived family rejection, which is wired to protect, to seek safety, to do defense, such as anger or anxiety. The brain's threat architecture is hyper-vigilant and directly turns down the development of the affiliative, soothing system—the neurobiology of self-compassion in the brain. These emerging adults' default to intense self-judgment, shame and self-criticism in situations of personal failure or emotional pain instead of self-kindness and emotional resilience (Gilbert, 2020; Neff & McGehee, 2010).

Anger is an emotional response often linked to bodily stress reactions. This response is more pronounced in situations perceived as threatening, unfair, frustrating, or obstructing individuals from pursuing vital goals. In y outcomes, anger is a sobering response as it relates to emotional social, and psychological stress from social and academic spheres that obviate the need for reliable emotional regulation among young adults (Spielberger, 1999; Potegal et al., 2010; Gross, 2015).

Research provides a good starting point for an unanswered question about the chronic anger in young people, as they suggest that the lack of parenting acceptance in Pakistani teens creates a gap in emotional intelligence and empathy. The individual studies contribute a lot to the field, but the overall picture is incomplete. Some studies done in Pakistan analyze perceived family rejection, self-compassion, and anger separately. However, they have not proposed integrated frameworks in which self-compassion is represented as a dynamic construct.

This study aims to better understand the emotional consequences of family rejection during young adulthood. Identity formation during young adulthood increases emotional sensitivity and autonomy. Though the family remains a main emotional support in this stage of development, emotional neglect, the criticism, or the absence of affection from the family can manifest in psychological anger and stress. These emotional problems are a widespread phenomenon. However, the understanding of the family rejection that fuels anger in individuals, especially in the context of the Non-Western World, remains under-researched.

2.1 Research Hypotheses

- 1 *There is a significant relationship among perceived family rejection, self-compassion, and anger in young adults.*
- 2 *Perceived family rejection is positively associated with anger in young adults.*
- 3 *Perceived family rejection is negatively associated with self-compassion in young adults.*
- 4 *Self-compassion mediates the relationship between perceived family rejection and anger in young adults.*
- 5 *There are significant gender differences in perceived family rejection, self-compassion, and anger among young adults*

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research adopts a cross-sectional correlation design to study perceived family rejection, self-compassion, and anger among young adults. This design gathers data from participants at a single moment in time with no variable manipulation, making it useful to examine the spontaneous relationships among psychological constructs (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The design's correlational characteristic facilitates the determination of the strength and direction of the relationships among variables using correlation and regression analysis techniques (Field, 2018).

3.2 Sampling Technique

For this study, the authors decided to use a non-probability convenience sampling method for collecting participants. This means the authors handpicked those who were easy to reach, as are most often found in their workplace and the public in general. This sampling method is often utilized in psychological studies as it is a simple, fast, and economical source of data collection. Specifically, as it pertains to studies on young adults (Etikan et al., 2016), this method of sampling may pose the authors with certain limitations in terms of findings to the larger population.

3.3 Participants

Participants were recruited for this study from the 18–25-year age range. This group specifically has reached the greater portion of emotional maturity alongside a matured sense of identity and matured cognitive awareness, as observed by Arnett in 2015. To obtain a gender balanced study, this range also includes both males and females. Participants were recruited using a non-probability sampling method and recruited from both schools and the community.

3.4 Inclusion / Exclusion Criteria

3.4.1 Inclusion Criteria

- Young adults aged between 18 and 25 years, representing the developmental stage of early adulthood (Arnett, 2015).
- Individuals currently living with both biological parents.

- Both male and female participants were included.
- Participants who were able to read, understand, and respond to self-report questionnaires in either English or Urdu.

3.4.2 Exclusion Criteria

- Individuals whose parents were divorced or separated.
- Individuals are younger than 18 years or older than 25 years.
- Individuals are diagnosed with serious psychological disorders or cognitive impairments that could affect their ability to respond accurately to the questionnaires.
- Participants who provided incomplete, inconsistent, or invalid responses.
- Individuals who declined to participate or withdrew their consent at any stage of the research process.

3.5 Research Procedure

Prior to data collection, ethical approval was granted by the respective university's research ethics committee. Ages 18 to 25 served as the target demographic for this study, and response rates for this cohort were obtained via convenience sampling. Online platforms and educational institutions served as the primary means for data collection. Informed consent was received, and participants were made aware of the study's purpose and nature. Once this was accomplished, a package was given to participants which consisted of a demographics sheet, the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), the Self-Compassion Scale—Short Form (SCS-SF), and the Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ) to which instructions were placed on top. Participants were instructed to complete them using the provided data collection sheets. Participants were also instructed to complete the data collection sheets without assistance. Participants were assured of the confidentiality and the secure collection of the data which was the primary concern of the researcher. Participants were also given a time frame of 15-20 minutes for completion.

3.6 Statistical Analysis

Version 25 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for analyzing the data. Descriptive statistics were generated for the following means and standard deviations were calculated and frequencies were charted for a better understanding of data distribution. Measurement scales were evaluated for their internal consistencies, and reliability analyses were run. Relationships between the variables of perceived family rejection, self-compassion, and anger were investigated using Pearson's correlation. Additionally, perceived family rejection, self-compassion, and anger levels in young adults were investigated using regression and mediation analyses. Field (2023) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2019) were used to set the alpha levels of significance at $p < .05$.

4. Results

Table 1 contains information on the subjects' demographics. Male subjects made up 54.7% of the sample, and female subjects made up the remaining 45.3%. Almost all subjects were BS program students (99.3%). A large majority were from the middle socioeconomic

class (94.0%). When sorted by birthorder, the largest group consisted of second born (41.0%), and the smallest group were first born (27.7%).

Table No 1: Demographic Information of Participants (N = 300)

Variables	Categories	f	%
Gender	Male	164	54.7
	Female	136	45.3
Education	Intermediate	2	0.7
	BS	298	99.3
Socioeconomic Status	Lower	2	0.7
	Middle	282	94.0
	Upper	16	5.3
Birth Order	Firstborn	83	27.7
	Second born	123	41.0
	Last born	67	22.3
	Only child	27	9.0
Family System	Joint Family	40	13.3
	Nuclear Family	259	86.3

Regarding family systems, the largest group consisted of those living in nuclear systems (86.3%), while the smallest group consisted of those living in joint systems (13.3%).

Table No 2: Psychometric Properties of Scales

Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Cronbach's alpha
PARQ	300	67.00	191.00	118.316	25.9532	.931
PARQ (F)	300	33.00	93.00	58.3733	13.75006	.883
PARQ(M)	300	33.00	101.00	60.0800	14.54552	.894
SCS	300	20.0	55.00	38.1000	4.91772	.710
BPAQ(A)	300	53.00	110.0	81.3867	12.35879	.750

Note: PARQ: Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire, PARQ(F): Parental Acceptance Rejection Father subscale, PARQ(M): Parental Acceptance Mother Scale, SCS: Self-Compassion Scale, BPAQ(A): Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire (Anger subscale)

Table 2 Depicts the means and reliabilities for perceived family rejection, self-compassion, and anger among a sample size of 300. The means show the degree of perceived family rejection ($M = 118.32$, $SD = 25.95$). This indicates that the family perceived rejection is moderate. The means and the standard deviations were also measured for the rejection of the father ($M = 58.37$, $SD = 13.75$) and rejection of the mother ($M = 60.08$, $SD = 14.55$) and the means were similar overall. The average self-compassion score was 38.10 ($SD = 4.92$) and broadly indicated a moderate level score. Participants showed even greater intensity in anger,

with an average ($M = 81.39$, $SD = 12.36$) score indicating moderate to high levels. The Perceived Family Rejection scale had excellent levels of reliability ($\alpha = .931$) and was followed up with subscales for Father ($\alpha = .883$) and Mother ($\alpha = .894$) that also had good reliability scores. The subscale for anger showed a good level of reliability ($\alpha = .750$) and the subscale of self-compassion showed a good level of reliability ($\alpha = .710$).

Table No 3: Reliability of PARQ-F Subscales

Subscale	No. of Items	Cronbach's α
Warmth	8	.833
Neglect	6	.745
Rejection	4	.769
Hostility	6	.799
Control	5	.733

Note: PARQ-F= Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire Father scale

Table 3 represents the assessment of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), Father version. Raw Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficients were calculated per five subscales. Results signified acceptable to very good reliability ($\alpha = .733$ to $.833$). The Warmth subscale ($\alpha = .833$) showed (in) the highest (subscale) internal reliability, in comparison to Hostility ($\alpha = .799$) and (subscale) Rejection ($\alpha = .769$). Both Neglect ($\alpha = .745$) and Control ($\alpha = .733$) subscales surpassed the proposed psychometric criterion of $.70$. In total, the hypothesized values illustrate item convergence, and therefore, the potential of the instrument to measure maternal, parenting perceptions, in scope of the study.

Table No 4: Reliability of PARQ-M Subscales

Subscale	No. of Items	Cronbach's α
M Warmth	8	.870
M Hostility	6	.790
M Neglect	6	.710
M Rejection	4	.760
M Control	5	.740

Note: PARQ-M=Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire Mother scale

Table 4 shows internal consistency of the mother version of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α). The collected data in the table provides information showing good/great reliability in all five subscales from $.710$ to $.870$.

The most internal consist signs were for the Warmth subscale ($\alpha = .870$); however, for Hostility ($\alpha = .790$), Rejection ($\alpha = .760$), Control ($\alpha = .740$), and Neglect ($\alpha = .710$), all surpassed the psychometric value for .70. It can be suggested based on the results and findings that to some degree subscales are internally consistent, and from the sample of the study, it can be argued that the tool is a statistically reliable measure of prominence, rejection and behavioral control for mothers.

Table No 5: Reliability of Self-Compassion Subscales

Subscale	No. of Items	Cronbach's α
Self-Kindness	2	.811
Self-Judgment	2	.760
Common Humanity	2	.766
Isolation	2	.757
Mindfulness	2	.778
Over-Identification	2	.775

Table 5 shows the internal consistency for the Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) and its six subscales using Cronbach's alpha (α) measure. The results show promising results for were good, with $.757 < \alpha < .811$, at the subscale level, considering the two-item subscales. The highest reliability was for Self-Kindness ($\alpha = .811$), followed by Mindfulness ($\alpha = .778$) and then Over-Identification ($\alpha = .775$). The remaining subscales were Common Humanity, Self-Judgment, and Self-Isolation with $.766$, $.760$, and $.757$ respectively. considering the two-item subscales, being above .70 for Cronbach's alpha shows good internal consistency, the scales are reflective of the sample and context of the research. For this study, the reliability was demonstrated for Self-Compassion within the given sample.

Table No 6: Correlation Analysis between Family Rejection, self-compassion and Anger in young adults

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
(SCS)	1				
(BPAQ)	-.204**	1			
PARQ	-.257**	.242**	1		
PARQ(F)	-.253**	.223**	.914**	1	
PARQ(M)	-.215**	.221**	.926**	.698**	1

Correlational is significant at $p < .01$ (2-tailed). $N = 300$

Note: PARQ=Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire, PARQ(F)=Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire Father subscale, PARQ(M) = Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire Mother Subscale SCS= Self-Compassion Scale, BPAQ= Buss and Perry Aggression Scale (Anger Subscale)

We calculated a Pearson product-moment correlation to study self-compassion (SCS), anger (BPAQ), and perceived family rejection (PARQ) to the father, mother, and both parents combined. Higher self-compassion predicts a lower tendency to become angry, $r(298) = -.204$,

$p < .001$. Self-compassion and perceived family rejection (both mother and father rejection) and both parents combined shows significant negative correlation. Higher perceived family rejection predicts lower self-compassion. Higher perceived family rejection is associated with higher anger. Moreover, there were clearly positive correlations with those of the perceived family rejection scales of father, mother, and both, suggesting great deals of interrelatedness amongst the constructs.

Table No 7: Intercorrelations Between Perceived Family Rejection (PARQ subscales), Self-Compassion Subscales and Anger

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Anger	—									
2. PARQ-F	.22**	—								
3. PARQ-M	.22**	.70**	—							
4. Self-kindness	-.25**	-.10	-.14*	—						
5. Self-judgment	.31**	-.07	-.12*	.00	—					
6. Humanity	-.19*	-.11	-.05	.24**	.06	—				
7. Isolation	.34**	-.21**	-.14*	-.18**	.22**	-.12*	—			
8. Mindfulness	-.32**	-.27**	-.19**	.47**	-.08	.30**	-.03	—		
9. Over-identification	.38**	.09	.06	-.37**	.20**	-.20**	.32**	-.39**	—	

Note. N= [300]. SCS = Self-Compassion Scale; PARQ-F = Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire Father subscale, PARQ-M=Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire Mother subscale, Subscales 4–9 represent dimensions of self-compassion.

$p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$.

A Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was performed to analyze connections through perceived family Rejection, self-compassion, and anger among young adults. The analysis showed that anger was positively and significantly correlated to perceived family rejection, specifically total father rejection (PARQ-F; $r = .22$, $p < .01$) and perceiving mother rejection (PARQ-M; $r = .22$, $p < .01$). Furthermore, anger showed strong positive correlation with negative self-compassion characteristics such as self-judgment ($r = .31$, $p < .01$), isolation ($r = .34$, $p < .01$), and over-identification ($r = .38$, $p < .01$). Conversely, anger was positively and significantly correlated to self-compassion characteristics such as self-kindness ($r = -.25$, $p < .01$), common humanity ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$), and mindfulness ($r = -.32$, $p < .01$).

Moreover, elements of perceived family rejection were positively linked to dimension of self-compassion. Notably, total tailored perceived father and mother rejection negatively impacted the positive dimension of self-compassion such as mindfulness and self-kindness and positively linked to the negatively dimension such as isolation and over-identification.

Collectively, it can be stated that the greater perceived family rejection, the greater perceived anger and the lower perceived self-compassion. The result of self-compassion creates the capacity to lower perceived anger and the ability to function as a self-regulatory and anger-based protective factor.

Table No 8: Regression Analysis of Perceived Family Rejection and Anger

Variable	b	SE	β
----------	---	----	---------

Constant	14.08	1.19	--
Family Rejection (PARQ)	0.04	0.01	0.106

$R^2 = .058$, $F(1, 298) = 18.58$, $p < .001$. Dependent variable: Anger.

Note: PARQ = Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire

Linear regression analysis revealed that a perception of family rejection was a statistically significant predictor of anger, despite explaining only 6% of the variance. As perceived family rejection increased, so did anger, explaining a significant proportion of variance in anger.

Table No 9: Regression analysis for Family Rejection and self-compassion

Variables	b	SE	B
Constant	43.864	1.285	-----
PARQ	-.049	0.011	-0.257

$R = .257$, $R^2 = .066$, Adjusted $R^2 = .063$, $F(1, 298) = 21.10$, $p < .001$

Note: PARQ = Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire

A linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship of family rejection and self-compassion. The regression model was statistically significant $F(1, 298) = 21.10$, $p < .001$, and accounted for 6.6% of the variability in self-compassion ($R^2 = .07$, Adjusted $R^2 = .06$). Perceived family rejection was a significant predictor of self-compassion, ($\beta = -.26$, $t = -4.59$, $p < .001$). Higher levels of family rejection were associated with less self-compassion.

Table No 10: Regression analysis for PARQ Father and Mother Rejection with Anger

Variable	B	SE	β
Constant	14.11	1.19	—
Father Rejection (PARQ-F)	.04	.03	.13
Mother Rejection (PARQ-M)	.04	.02	.13

$N = 300$. $R^2 = .058$. Predictor p values: Father Rejection ($p = .090$), Mother Rejection ($p = .105$). Constant $p < .001$. Overall Model: $F(2, 297) = 9.18$, $p < .001$.

Table 10. Shows that the statistically significant multiple regression ($F(2, 297) = 9.18$, $p < .001$) was significant. This suggests that most variance in anger scores would be due to the combination of predictors. In this case, the variance was 5.8% of anger, with the R^2 value of .058. The variance of anger scores explained by the predictors was fairly small and father (beta = .13, $t = 1.70$) as well as the mother (beta = .13, $t = 1.63$) variables, as independent predictors, did not achieve statistical significance. The statistically significant positive relationship between the parental variables and anger shows that both predictors (i.e. father and mother) carry significant importance. However, these two parental variables would be difficult to measure against anger as probably neither parent gives significant independent, unexplained variance to the overall model of anger, once the parental environment (as a whole) is presented in the model.

Table No 11: Regression analysis for PPARQ Father and Mother Rejection and Self-Compassion

Variable	B	SE	β
Constant	43.81	1.28	—
Father Rejection (PARQ-F)	-.07	.03	-.20
Mother Rejection (PARQ-M)	-.03	.03	-.07

N = 300. R² = .067. Predictor p-values: Father Rejection p = .011, Mother Rejection p = .343. Constant p < .001.

Table 11 indicates that the regression was also significant ($p < .001$). Analysis of the individual coefficients found that Father Rejection was a significant negative predictor of Self-Compassion ($p = .011$). However, it was found that Mother Rejection was not a significant predictor ($p = .343$). This suggests that Father Rejection may reflect a more pronounced, singular, negative association with lower self-compassion in the sample than Mother Rejection.

Table No 12: Self-Compassion as a mediator between Family rejection and Anger**Total Effect**

Variables	Effect b	p	Boot SE	Boot 95%CL	
				BootLL	BootUL
Father PARQ → Anger	0.0734	< .001	0.0186	0.0369	0.1099
Mother PARQ → Anger	0.0688	< .001	0.0176	0.0343	0.1033
Combined PARQ → Anger	0.0422	< .001	0.0098	0.0229	0.0614

Direct Effect

Variables	Effect b	p	Boot SE	Boot 95%CL	
				BootLL	BootUL
Father PARQ → Self-Compassion	-0.0905	< .001	0.0200	-0.1300	-0.0511
Mother PARQ → Self-Compassion	-0.0726	.0002	0.0191	-0.1103	-0.0350
Combined PARQ → Self-Compassion	-0.0487	< .001	0.0106	-0.0696	-0.0278
Self-Compassion → Anger	-0.1450	.0067	0.0531	-0.2495	-0.0406
Self-Compassion → Anger	-0.1509	.0044	0.0525	-0.2543	-0.0475
Self-Compassion → Anger	-0.1396	.0088	0.0529	-0.2438	-0.0355
Father PARQ → Anger (direct)	0.0603	.0017	0.0190	0.0229	0.0976
Mother PARQ → Anger (direct)	0.0578	.0013	0.0178	0.0229	0.0928
Combined PARQ → Anger (direct)	0.0354	.0005	0.0100	0.0156	0.0551

Indirect Effect

Mediator	Effect	Boot SE	Boot 95%CL	
			BootLL	BootUL
Self-Compassion (Father PARQ)	0.0131	0.0074	0.0013	0.0303
Self-Compassion (Mother PARQ)	0.0110	0.0064	0.0012	0.0258
Self-Compassion (Combined PARQ)	0.0068	0.0039	0.0005	0.0155

Note. = unstandardized coefficient; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; bootstrap sample = 5000. Indirect effect is significant if the confidence interval does not include zero. PARQ= Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (Perceived Family Rejection), SCS= Self-Compassion Scale (Self-Compassion), BPAQ= Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire Anger subscale (Anger)

Table no 12 A mediation analysis was implemented to study the effect of self-compassion on the relationship between perceived parental (father, mother, and both) rejection and the anger of young adults. The results showed that perceived parental rejection predicted anger in a positive and significant way in all the three models of father rejection ($B = 0.0734$, $p < .001$), mother rejection ($B = 0.0688$, $p < .001$), and combined parental rejection ($B = 0.0422$, $p < .001$). It means where father and mother rejection is high, the anger is also likely to be high, and where parental rejection is combined, anger is also likely to be high. Furthermore, all models showed that parental rejection negatively predicted self-compassion, namely, father rejection ($B = -0.0905$, $p < .001$), mother rejection ($B = -0.0726$, $p = .0002$) and combined parental rejection ($B = -0.0487$, $p < .001$), signifying that individuals perceiving high rejection from parents tend to be low in self-compassion.

Moreover, self-compassion, which also predicted father-mother model anger, showed self-compassion average values ($B = -0.1450$, $p = .0067$); ($B = -0.1509$, $p = .0044$); average values ($B = -0.1390$, $p = .0088$) anger predicted father-mother models; self-compassion is a protective factor. Self-compassion model improvement induced direct father-mother model average stay ($B = 0.0603$, $p = .0017$); ($B = 0.0578$, $p = .0013$); average values ($B = 0.0354$, $p = .0005$) is partially mediated. Lastly, self-compassion average predicted indirect models showed self-compassion is the psychological protective factor average, ($B = 0.0131$, 95% CI [0.0013, 0.0303]), ($B = 0.0110$, 95% CI [0.0012, 0.0258]), ($B = 0.0068$, 95% CI [0.0005, 0.0155]) predicted father-mother, combined models. Self-compassion average is the protective psychological factor among combined models, which predicted indirect average parental rejection is the protective psychological factor among young adults' anger, is predictive psychological regulation mechanism self-compassion average.

4.1 Discussion

This study focused on young adults and explored how perceived family rejection, as measured by the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), and the role of self-compassion and anger. In doing so, it investigated self-compassion as a mediator and described the effects of experienced family rejection and its emotional impacts. This study specifically analyzed perceived family rejection, self-compassion, and the role of anger. With litigation analysis, it advanced the study of early family experiences and processed self-compassion as a mediator that shaped the emotional concerns of adults. It was discovered that the family of origin influenced young adults' perceptions and how they condition themselves. The research indicates that self-compassion has an important role as a mediator between anger and perceived

family rejection. Through various models, the results validate that young adults who claim family rejection develop an internal critic, thereby losing their self-supportive inner voice. It states that being self-compassionate is treating oneself as someone would treat a loved one. Due to the family rejection, individuals replace self-kindness with self-criticism. The results indicate that the self-compassion deficit becomes the main precursor to anger. Without the internal means to cope, the individuals tend to project their pain as anger and aggression to the outside world (Neff, 2003).

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the connections of self-compassion, anger, and perceived family rejection among young adults in Pakistan. The findings shed light on the ways certain experiences that are interpersonal in a familial context help to mold behavior tendencies in early adulthood. The findings show that perceived family rejection is deeply linked to rising anger levels. Young adults in the study reported that feeling increasingly critical, rejecting, and emotionally un-supporting anger is shown as a predominant action. This study makes a noteworthy contribution to the literature by providing empirical evidence of self-compassion as a psychological resource. It has been found that self-going (self-kindness and self-love) of an individual to an extent is negatively related to their anger. The mediation analysis in this study revealed that self-compassion buffers the negative emotional impacts of family rejection, and self-compassion is instrumental in decreasing anger manifestations caused by rejection.

5.1 Recommendations

Considering the limitations of the current research, the following suggestions are provided. The significant relationships between the perceivable constructs of family rejection, self-compassion, and anger and the implications of each of these constructs over time indicate the need for longitudinal studies. A more comprehensive understanding of the relationships between these constructs in the early adult life stages is recommended. Empirical intervention studies in the field of self-compassion and angers of emotional regulation are highly recommended.

6. References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Allen, A. B., & Leary, M. R. (2010). Self-compassion, stress, and coping. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(2), 107–118.
- Ambikile, J. S., & Iseselo, M. K. (2023). Challenges to the provision of home care and support for people with severe mental illness: experiences and perspectives of patients, caregivers, and healthcare providers in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *PLOS global public health*, 3(1), e0001518.
- American Psychological Association. (2020). Anger. In *APA dictionary of psychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/anger>
- Amiri, E., Ebrahimi, H., Habibzadeh, H., & Baghaei, R. (2025). Family caregivers' role in dignity of people with schizophrenia: A qualitative study. *Nursing ethics*, 32(6), 1911-1925.
- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). *Human aggression*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 27–51.

- Arnett, J. J. (2014). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Arnett, J. J. (2015). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Averill, J. R. (1982). *Anger and aggression: An essay on emotion*. Springer.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Barnard, L. K., & Curry, J. F. (2011). Self-compassion: Conceptualizations, correlates, & interventions. *Review of General Psychology*, 15(4), 289–303.
- Barnard, L. K., & Curry, J. F. (2011). Self-compassion: Conceptualizations, correlates, & interventions. *Review of General Psychology*, 15(4), 289–303.
- Batool, S., & Bond, A. J. (2015). Validation of the Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire in a Pakistani sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(11), 1815–1832.
- Beck, A. T. (1999). *Prisoners of hate: The cognitive basis of anger, hostility, and violence*. HarperCollins.
- Berkowitz, L. (1990). On the formation and regulation of anger and aggression: *A cognitive neoassociationistic analysis*. *American Psychologist*, 45(4), 494–503.
- Bornstein, M. H. (2017). The specificity principle in psychological science, structural systems, and parenting. *Child Development Perspectives*, 11(1), 3–9.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. Basic Books.
- Bryant, F. B., & Smith, B. D. (2001). Refining the architecture of aggression: A measurement model for the Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35(2), 138–167.
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). *The aggression questionnaire*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452–459.
- Butėnaitė-Switkiewicz, J., & Žemaitaitė, I. (2024). The Role of Family Bonds in Nurturing Psychological Resilience in Older Adults: “In the Family, You Will Find the Support and Strength to Endure and Live”. *Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 12(3), 1-33.
- Christophe, N. K., Atkin, A. L., Williams, C. D., Quick, K. N., & Wu, C. S. (2024). Family-based and external discrimination experienced by multiracial individuals: Links to internalizing symptoms and familial support. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 38(1), 48.
- Coburn, K. O., & McGeorge, C. R. (2022). Perspectives of mainline Protestant Christian pastors on the consequences of familial acceptance and rejection of LGB members: Understanding the role of religion for family therapists. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 44(4), 360-372.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159.
- Cousineau, T. (2025). *The Perfectionist's Dilemma: Learn the Art of Self-compassion and Become a Happy Achiever*. Crooked Lane Books.

- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- DeChants, J. P., Shelton, J., Anyon, Y., & Bender, K. (2022). "It kinda breaks my heart": LGBTQ young adults' responses to family rejection. *Family Relations*, 71(3), 968-986.
- Deffenbacher, J. L. (1999). Cognitive-behavioral conceptualization and treatment of anger. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 55(3), 295–309.
- Denson, T. F., Pedersen, W. C., Friese, M., Hahm, A., & Roberts, L. (2011). Understanding impulsive aggression: Angry rumination and reduced self-control capacity are mechanisms underlying the provocation–aggression relationship. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(6), 850–862.
- Di Bello, M., Carnevali, L., Petrocchi, N., Thayer, J. F., Gilbert, P., & Ottaviani, C. (2020). The comforting amygdala: A review of the effects of self-compassion on neurophysiology. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 113, 41–50.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. Yale University Press.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4.
- Farooqui, Y. S., Khan, M. K., Kamboyo, S. H., Scholar, L. L. M., & Uddin, S. S. (2023). A critical study about Pakistan's new narrative for regional stability. *Central European Management Journal*, 31(1), 110-120.
- Ferrari, M., Hunt, C., Krieshok, T. S., & Neff, K. D. (2019). Self-compassion interventions and psychosocial outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Mindfulness*, 10, 1455–1473.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Fresnics, A., & Borders, A. (2016). Rumination mediates the relationship between self-compassion and angry affect. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 63(2), 163–170.
- Germer, C. K., & Neff, K. D. (2013). Self-compassion in clinical practice. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 69(8), 856–867.
- Gilbert, P. (2009). *The compassionate mind*. Constable & Robinson.
- Gilbert, P. (2010). *Compassion focused therapy: Distinctive features*. Routledge.
- Gilbert, P. (2014). The origins and nature of compassion focused therapy. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 53(1), 6–41.
- Gilbert, P. (2015). An evolutionary approach to emotion in mental health with a focus on affiliative emotions. *Emotion Review*, 7(3), 230–237.
- Gilbert, P. (2020). *Compassion: Concepts, research and applications*. Routledge.
- Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: *An integrative review*. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3), 271–299.
- Hofmann, S. G., Sawyer, A. T., Witt, A. A., & Oh, D. (2012). The effect of mindfulness-based therapy on anxiety and depression: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 80(2), 169–183.

- Inwood, E., & Ferrari, M. (2018). Mechanisms of change in self-compassion: A systematic review. *Mindfulness*, 9(1), 1–14.
- Iqbal, Z., Rashid, M., Anwar, A., & Shabeer, M. G. (2025). An analysis of the role of artificial intelligence in shaping unemployment trends in OECD countries. *International Journal of Social Sciences Bulletin*, 3(7), 643-657.
- Irons, C., Gilbert, P., Baldwin, M. W., Baccus, J. R., & Palmer, M. (2006). Parental recall, attachment relating and self-attacking/self-reassurance. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 45(3), 297–308.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: *Implications for self and family*. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36(4), 403–422.
- Kausar, R., & Qayyum, A. (2018). How Cash Flow News and Discount Rate News Impact the Unexpected Stock Returns of Energy Firms of Pakistan.
- Khan, M. F. A., Haq, A. U., Naseer, M., Farooq, M., Khan, A., Haq, A., ... & Farooq, M. (2019). Effects of counterfeits on branded products in garments industry: A perspective of consumer behavior. *Global Journal of Emerging Sciences*, 1(1), 66-85.
- Li, Y., & Cui, H. (2022). On the value of the Chinese pre-Qin Confucian thought of “harmony” for modern public mental health. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 870828.
- Masih, S., Naqshbandi, M. M., Ahmed, F., Eswari Panchanathan, U., & Ng, B. K. (2026). Toxic roots, bitter fruits: how dark leadership breeds workplace incivility. *Management Decision*, 1-24.
- Phan, H. P., Ngu, B. H., Chen, S. C., & Hsu, C. S. (2025). How cultural beliefs and rituals may help alleviate grief and despair: a four-dimensional framework. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 10, 1620016.
- Rabbani, S., & Sarmad, M. (2019). Revealing mediating role of creative self-efficacy between climate for creativity and creativity: empirical evidence from R&D of IT sector, Pakistan. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(1).
- Rana, A. M. (2015). Inter Relationship between Team Conflict Management, Employee Satisfaction and Organizational Performance. *Information Management and Business Review*, 7(2), 93-99.
- Shehzad, M., Khan, M. L., & Noor, H. S. (2023). Sentiments, Attitudes and Concerns toward Inclusion of Public School Teachers about Disabilities. *Global Educational Studies Review*, 8(2), 454-466.
- Waqas, M., Khan, M. L., & Saeed, M. U. (2024). Self Determination, Decision Making and Social Functioning as a Prognostic Factor among Hepatitis ‘B’ and ‘C’ Patients. *Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research*, 4(1), 531-536.