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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to learn about Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing practices. In particular, Turkish mothers’ (1) attitudes toward overparenting, (2) democratic parental attitudes, (3) attitudes toward hostility and rejection, (4) attitudes toward marital discord, and (5) authoritarian parental attitudes were investigated here. This study also explored the influence of demographic characteristics on these attitudes. The demographic characteristics examined included mothers’ age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender.

Participants included 401 Turkish mothers with children aged 0–6 years old from five early childhood education centers in Istanbul. The mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices were measured using a Turkish version of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). The validity and reliability of the PARI scale were also ascertained in this study. Additionally, a demographic survey was designed by the researcher to determine mothers’ age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The findings from the descriptive statistics provided information about Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes. Multiple linear regression analysis (MLRA) was also used to understand the influence of demographic characteristics on mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices. The findings revealed that mothers’ monthly family income was the strongest predictor of their attitudes toward childrearing practices. Increased level of monthly
family income was associated with positive attitudes toward childrearing practices. Additionally, participants’ education level was found to influence their authoritarian parental attitudes and attitudes toward overparenting. Specifically, higher levels of education were associated with decreased attitudes toward overparenting and authoritarian attitudes, compared to mothers with lower education levels. Employment status of mothers was found to be related to mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection in childrearing practices. Mothers who were employed possessed a lower level of hostility and experienced fewer feelings of rejection compared to mothers with other employment statuses. Other demographic characteristics, including mothers’ age, marital status, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender, were found not to influence Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices.

This study contributes to the literature by updating research on Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices. Recommendations were also generated for further research. The implications of this study for young children, parents, practitioners, and policy makers in the field of early childhood education in Turkey were provided.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Parental attitudes toward childrearing have been extensively studied in psychology and education and are of great importance in understanding child development and socialization (Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 2002), especially since parental attitudes are often regarded as indicators of parent behavior or parent-child relations. This phenomenon has developed quickly into a key topic in examinations of parent-child interactions (Holden & Edwards, 1989).

A growing number of studies (e.g., Jambunathan & Hurlburt, 2002; Saar & Katrin, 2001) have focused on the reciprocal relationship between parental attitudes and culture. For instance, Suizzo (2002) stated that parental attitudes and in turn a child’s sociocultural development demonstrate differences from culture to culture. Additionally, a number of researchers (e.g., Honig, 2002) have indicated that a close and consistent relationship between mother and child results in positive outcomes on subsequent child development (Hortaçsu, Gençöz, & Oral, 1995; Tulviste, 2001). Thus, the primary objective of this research was to investigate mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing in the Turkish culture and the relationship between these attitudes and demographic variables.

According to Honig (2006), the primary caregiver makes the most significant contributions to the child’s development. In the Turkish culture, mothers are considered to be primarily responsible for childrearing (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). From the beginning of infancy to early childhood, the growth period covered by this study, the mother may be
regarded as the leading figure in her child’s life. Consequently, mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing have been a main topic of research in the Turkish culture (Sunar & Fişek, 2005).

To measure parental attitudes toward childrearing, Schaefer and Bell developed Parental Attitudes Research Instrument (PARI) in 1958; this instrument was adapted to the Turkish culture by LeCompte, LeCompte, and Özer (1978). A number of studies in Turkey have implemented the PARI Scale and demonstrated strong relationships between parental attitudes and several other variables. For example, research has revealed a strong relationship between Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes and children’s better personality characteristics (Küçük, 1987). Also, significant relationships have been revealed between democratic parental attitudes and higher psychosocial problem-solving skills (Arı & Seçer, 2003), and increased moral and social knowledge (Seçer, Sari, & Olcay, 2006). In addition, significant relationships between parental attitudes and socioeconomic status (SES) have been revealed (Ocakçı, Ayyıldız, & Kulakçı, 2006, Sarıoğlu-Büke, Çorduk, Ateşçi, Karabul, & Koltuksuz, 2006).

While some research (e.g., Arı & Seçer, 2003) has been conducted regarding parental attitudes, more research is needed in this area. More specifically, the effects of mothers’ demographic variables, such as their age, marital status, level of education, employment status, income, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender on parents’ childrearing attitudes need further investigation.

Parental attitudes toward childrearing have been extensively studied due to the centrality of parents to the child’s life. What is lacking is investigation of the relationship between Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes and demographic variables. Thus, the major
aim of this research is to examine Turkish mothers’ maternal attitudes and how these attitudes relate to their demographic characteristics.

Statement of the Problem

The description of the statement of the problem is divided into four parts. Following a description of the main problem, the description of each of three sub-problems is provided, to explain one of three aspects of the main research problem.

Major Problem

Bronfenbrenner (1974) claimed that the self situates within the family and the family situates within the larger sociocultural environment. Likewise, parents, children, and on a larger scale, the family is influenced by sociocultural transformations taking place in society. Although some theoretical perspectives (e.g., Castells, 2000) predict change in traditional and past values as a result of modernization and social change, several research studies in the field (e.g., Sommer, 2002; Suizzo, 2002; Sun, 1991; Sunar, 2002) either support or challenge this proposition in various cultures. Turkey, a developing country, has undergone ongoing sociocultural transformations due to rapid urbanization and economic development (Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 2002). The inevitable social transformations and changes in countries like Turkey influence lifestyles, occupations and, parents’ belief systems and attitudes (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990). The latter have been shown to be related to sociodemographic variables (Ocakçı et al., 2006).

Changing Society of Istanbul and Maternal Attitudes: Part 1

Socioeconomic transformations also result in immigration from rural to urban areas within Turkey. One of the most conspicuous examples is Istanbul, the largest city in Turkey, where 12,573,836 people reside, according to census data provided by the
Even though this number accounts for 17.8% of Turkey’s total population, Istanbul still attracts immigrants from all over the country, especially from its rural areas. For this reason, Istanbul has become a city with a more socio-economically diverse and dynamic population, reflecting the transformation of that society’s social, cultural, and economic elements. This type of growth affects the urban population’s experiences of rapid changes in their societal lives in general and in values, norms, attitudes, and beliefs related to the family, in particular. An examination of each of these aspects in detail is crucial to fully understanding social changes. For example, with regard to parents, mothers’ parental attitudes have been affected by the changing society and by dynamic cultural characteristics due to their immersion in these systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Hence, it is critical to investigate and update existing information about mothers’ parental attitudes in a society undergoing change, like Istanbul, Turkey.

*Maternal Attitudes and Demographic Characteristics: Part 2*

Mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing are affected by the dynamics of the society and by their SES circumstances. For instance, LeCompte et al. (1978) conducted a study that involved mothers in Ankara, the capital of Turkey, and found that parental attitudes and socioeconomic variables were strongly associated. Also, Ocakçı et al. (2006) found significant relationships between the parental attitudes of mothers and their SES in Zonguldak, Black Sea Region, Turkey. Therefore, it is essential to analyze the relationship between maternal attitudes and family SES—one of the aims of this study.
**Inadequacy of Research in Istanbul: Part 3**

An examination of the relationship between demographic factors and parental attitudes is crucial to understanding different aspects of parenting. Although some efforts (e.g., Ocakçı et al., 2006) have been made to respond to the need for such inquiries in the Turkish context, few studies have measured relations between mothers’ parental attitudes and demographic variables in Istanbul. Istanbul was chosen for this study because it is the most populated city in Turkey experiencing social, economic, and demographic changes. Further, no study has been conducted with the mothers of children who attend early childhood education centers. The absence of such studies in rapidly changing areas like Istanbul skews understanding of mothers’ parental attitudes and mother-child relationships, resulting in the development of culturally inappropriate early childhood education practices.

In light of the need for research on mothers’ parental attitudes in Istanbul and the relationships between these attitudes and demographic variables, this study investigates the parental attitudes of Turkish mothers with children attending early childhood education settings in Istanbul, and their demographic characteristics.

In summary, mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing are affected by the dynamics of the society. These maternal attitudes are affected by SES. Istanbul, which is a magnet for immigrants predominantly from rural areas of Turkey, is undergoing mass urbanization and witnessing tremendous social changes that in turn are affecting mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing. These attitudes interplay with demographic characteristics, in particular. The lack of research on mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing in a changing society like Istanbul and on the relationship between these attitudes and demographic
characteristics of Turkish mothers in Istanbul, led to the development of a study of Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward and beliefs about rearing young children and how these attitudes are influenced by demographic variables. It is hoped that this study will make significant contributions to the field of early childhood education in Turkey by providing information to scholars, practitioners, parents, and other stakeholders interested in this subject.

Need for the Study

The four specific needs for this research provide the rationale for this study. These four specific needs are: (1) the increasing importance of early childhood education in Turkey, (2) the social transformation underway in Turkish society that influences mothers and their attitudes toward childrearing in particular, (3) the need for more research on the parental attitudes of mothers with children in early childhood education centers, and (4) the lack of adequate research on the effects demographic characteristics on these attitudes. Each need is explained in the following paragraphs.

First, Turkey is a developing country and experiencing a rapid socioeconomic transformation. The Ministry of National Education [MONE] (2007) declared that the schooling rate in pre-school education is 17%. However, this number is increasing day by day as more public and private early childhood education settings are being opened. This explosion in the number of early childhood settings is another reason to conduct more research on early childhood education in Turkey. It is especially important to study Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing to understand the Turkish family and society as well as to fully understand the early childhood education process.
Second, due to the socioeconomic transformations in Turkey, increasing numbers of mothers are joining the workforce as a result of urbanization and social transformations. These decisions are leading to a greater need for early childhood education, and may result in changes to mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing. Some controversial studies have argued about whether this transformation from a traditional culture into a modern one is leading to changes in social values, norms, and attitudes (Ataca, 2006; Sunar & Fişek, 2005). Some theoretical perspectives emphasize fundamental change in childrearing attitudes as traditional values have been lost, while others emphasize the many childrearing options and preferences that stem from modernization processes and impacts (Sommer, 2005). Given the need for a current in-depth investigation of this socioeconomic situation, updated information about changes in mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing must be examined, and the results discussed in the literature. As a result, this study helps to understand these attitudes in a society that is experiencing tremendous socioeconomic transformations.

Third, few studies (e.g., LeCompte et al., 1978) have been conducted on Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes. LeCompte et al. (1978) measured this domain while adapting the PARI Scale into the Turkish culture. Also Ocakçı et al. (2006) implemented this scale in a study of mothers with children aged 0–6 years in Zonguldak. However, none of these studies have targeted mothers with children enrolled in early childhood education schools, highlighting the need for such a study. Consequently, this research also contributes to the area of early child development and education by focusing on mothers of children attending early childhood education centers as research participants.
Fourth, mothers’ demographic characteristics, including age, income, educational level, and marital and employment status have been documented as important influences on parental attitudes (Sarıoglu-Büke et al., 2006). Such a perspective, situating the family in the larger socioeconomic context, helps researchers to provide explanations of childrearing orientations at different socioeconomic levels. This type of perspective also enables the researcher to make connections between sociological and demographic concepts and to situate the family as a social institution within larger sociological systems (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996). Thus, the need to know how families’ demographic factors link to parental attitudes is addressed in this dissertation study.

In sum, the main objective of this study is to provide adequate information on the issues discussed above so that a better picture of mothers’ parental attitudes in Turkey can be attained.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to learn about the Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing and how these attitudes differentiate, if at all, according to particular demographic variables. Accomplishing the purpose of the study requires addressing several research questions, explained below.

In this study, the primary research question focuses on Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices. Thus, the major question is: What are the Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices and how do their demographic characteristics influence these attitudes?

This study aims to answer this research question by investigating several ancillary questions. The ancillary questions are as follows:
1. What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

2. What are Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

3. What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

4. What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

5. What are Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

In sum, the purpose of this dissertation research is to examine Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes and the influence of demographic variables on these attitudes. Answers to a primary research question and several ancillary questions, all focusing on different aspects of mothers’ parental attitudes, such as overparenting, democratic attitudes, attitudes of hostility and rejection, attitudes of marital discordance, and authoritarian attitudes, and their relationships with demographic variables, such as mothers’ age, income and educational levels, marital and employment status, number of children,
youngest child’s age, and children’s gender are sought accordingly. Answering these research questions also helps to address the problems stated earlier in this chapter.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study may be encapsulated in three reasons described in the following paragraphs. These reasons are: (1) the significance of mothers and their parental attitudes in Turkish early childhood education, (2) the socioeconomic transformations experienced in Turkey, and (3) the importance of the relationship between maternal attitudes and demographic variables.

First, early childhood education is a developing area in Turkey, especially as more mothers join the workforce. Governmental (MONE, 2007) and non-governmental (MCEF, 2008) institutions are informing the public about the importance of a child’s early years and encouraging parents to enroll their children in early childhood education schools. Consequently, it is critical to do more research on every aspect of early childhood education in Turkey, especially since mothers are regarded as the primary caregivers for young children in Turkish culture. Hence, this study is very significant because it contributes to early childhood education in Turkey by providing information about Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes.

Second, Turkey is a developing country experiencing rapid socioeconomic transformations resulting in changes to the social values of families. According to Sunar and Fişek (2005), Turkish culture is transforming from a traditional into a modern society. Therefore, this study is of great importance since it provides updated information about mothers’ parental attitudes in a rapidly developing country. Ancillary research
questions address this topic by correlating different dimensions of parental attitudes with
demographic variables.

Third, Turkish society is socio-economically stratified, like most developing
societies, and so socioeconomic variables should be taken into account in research on
maternal attitudes (Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 2002). This study aims to identify variations in
Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes and correlate these differences with well-defined
demographic variables stated in the ancillary research questions. Further, it will provide
theoretical perspectives on parental attitudes and document parental attitudes in Turkey
during rapid socioeconomic transformations. Further, early childhood educators and
policy makers can benefit from this study by gaining a better understanding of mothers’
parental attitudes toward childrearing in the Turkish context. Similarly, the results can
inform other researchers who study parental attitudes in other cultures and those who
investigate the subject at the cross-cultural level.

Limitations

This research was limited to the city of Istanbul, Turkey. Therefore, the findings
from this study cannot be generalized to other cities in Turkey.

Delimitations

This study has two delimitations. First, the study sample only included the
mothers of children aged 0–6 years who attend early childhood education centers.
Second, the participants were limited to mothers of children enrolled in early childhood
education centers in Istanbul, Turkey from May–June 2008.
Definition of Terms

Eight terms need to be defined for this study. These terms are: (1) parental attitudes, (2) overparenting, (3) democratic attitudes, (4) attitudes of hostility and rejection, (5) marital discord, (6) authoritarian attitudes, (7) young children, (8) culture.

Parental Attitudes

Attitudes have been a popular research subject in education and psychology. According to Eagly and Chaiken (1993, p.1), “attitude is a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor”. In this study, psychological tendency refers to the internal states of humans and evaluating refers to overt or covert responses to attitude subjects.

In fact, mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing are manifold because these attitudes relate to interpersonal relationships (Triandis, 1967), and differentiate in accordance with the sociocultural context.

Overparenting

Overparenting is characterized by high parental control and overprotection, which foster dependency of the child on its parents (LeCompte et al., 1978). Also, overprotective parents have been described to think and worry excessively about their children (Anderegg, 2003). Overparenting has been documented to have negative consequences for parent-child relationships and child development (e.g., Aunola and Nurmi, 2005).
Democratic Attitudes

Parents with democratic attitudes tend to maintain egalitarian relationships and generally develop relationships with their children based on comradeship (LeCompte et al., 1978). In literature, democratic parenting also refers to authoritative parenting (Mupinga, Garrison, & Pierce, 2002). Parents who have democratic childrearing attitudes maintain close relationships with their children while moderately controlling them (Baumrind, 1971).

Attitudes of hostility and rejection

Attitudes of hostility and rejection indicate dissatisfaction with the parental role. Parents who are not satisfied with their parental roles also have high levels of parental stress (LeCompte et al., 1978). Rejection of parental role and high parental stress are negatively related to the child’s psychological and emotional well-being (Assel, Landry, Swank, Steelman, Miller-Loncar, & Smith, 2002).

Marital Discord

Marital discord reflects tensions and conflict in marriage which have been shown to negatively affect parents’ attitudes toward childrearing (LeCompte et al., 1978). Patterson (2002) claimed that parents who experience marital discord modeled negative behavior to their children. Consequently, child development is negatively affected by marital discord.

Authoritarian Attitudes

Authoritarian parents want their children to believe in their absolute authority and follow negative childrearing attitudes characterized by strict discipline and harsh punishment (LeCompte et al., 1978). Authoritarian attitudes in childrearing cause the
child to be dependent on family through a socialization process emphasizing obedience and control (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). This type of parenting has been documented as provoking behavioral problems in early childhood and adolescence (e.g. Bronte-Tinkew, Moore & Carrano, 2006).

*Young Children*

According to the National Association for the Education of Young Children [NAEYC], the life span from birth to 8 years is termed “childhood” and children aged 0–8 years are called “young children”. The participants in this study are the mothers of children aged 0–6 years who are enrolled in early childhood education centers in Istanbul. In this manner, this study is involving the mothers of “young children”.

*Culture*

According to Triandis (1994), a classical and very well-known cross-cultural psychologist, culture includes objective and subjective elements shared by the people who can communicate through a common language and live in the same space and time. Objective elements include human-made tools and subjective elements include concepts such as attitudes, norms, roles, and values.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This chapter includes a review of the literature related to: (1) parental attitudes toward childrearing, (2) dimensions of parental attitudes in childrearing, (3) parental attitudes towards childrearing practices and culture, (4) the Turkish context, and (5) demographic factors in parental attitudes towards childrearing practices. First, parental attitudes toward childrearing are explained with a focus on the importance of these attitudes for child development. Second, dimensions of parental attitudes in childrearing are discussed in light of empirical research studies. Third, interrelations between parental attitudes towards childrearing practices and culture are examined by providing descriptions of research studies from different cultures. Then, information about the Turkish context is provided in support of research findings on the Turkish family and childrearing practices. Lastly, the demographic factors of parental attitudes towards childrearing practices are discussed by providing information on related empirical research.

Hence, in accord with the purpose of this study, empirical research findings supporting associations between demographic variables and Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing are provided in this chapter. This chapter also provides empirical research studies from a variety of sociocultural contexts to emphasize the interconnectedness between childrearing attitudes and culture. Overall, empirical and
theoretical information are provided to clarify the relationship between culture and childrearing.

**Parental Attitudes toward Childrearing Practices**

In this section, parental attitudes toward childrearing practices are examined with an emphasis on the importance of these attitudes for child development. Supporting research evidence is also provided in line with the theoretical perspectives explained in this section.

**Importance of Parental Attitudes in Childrearing Practices**

The parent-child relationship is biologically based; however, this relationship affects human development over the lifespan and is influenced by sociocultural surroundings (Trommsdorff, 2006). Parents’ childrearing attitudes are crucial to understanding the structure and functioning of the parent-child relationship. It has also been suggested that parental attitudes toward childrearing are multidimensional, complex and open to individual differentiations depending on various psychological and sociocultural contexts (Rubin et al., 2006). Consequently, parental attitudes toward childrearing have been a popular research area in psychology, sociology, and education over the last few decades.

However, the complex nature of parental attitudes toward childrearing has set the stage for the development of various parenting style typologies. Although parental attitudes are generally classified on the basis of an authoritarian-democratic continuum, there have been some variations in each different model. Here, different aspects of parental attitudes are mentioned specifically in the context of empirical research evidence
provided in this study. Brief information on the classification of parental attitudes and information on important aspects of parenting theories are provided.

**Brief Information on the Classification of Parental Attitudes**

Diana Baumrind, a well-known researcher of parental styles, classified parenting styles into three major groups: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive (Baumrind, 1971). According to Baumrind, authoritarian parents use strict childrearing strategies in accord with an absolute standard of conduct. They value the child’s immediate obedience and devalue the child’s autonomy. On the other hand, authoritative parents have flexible and responsive interactions with their children in accord with a reasonable set of standards. Also, the autonomy and individuality of the child is emphasized in the authoritative parenting style (Baumrind, 1967). Lastly, the permissive parenting style indicates tolerant and accepting parental attitudes toward the child. Children are allowed to use considerable self-regulation in the permissive parenting style (Baumrind, 1991).

On the other hand, Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch (1991) classified parenting attitudes into four groups: authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and neglectful. These groups are based on acceptance/involvement and control/supervision dimensions. Authoritarian parents show control/supervision but not acceptance/involvement (Lamborn et al., 1991) and disvalue children’s autonomy by fostering dependency, obedience and conformity (Kağıtçıbaşi, 2007). Authoritative parents show both acceptance/involvement and control/supervision in childrearing and have warm but firm relationships with their children (Ballantine, 2001). Permissive parents show acceptance/involvement but not control/supervision. Neglectful parents
show neither acceptance/involvement nor control/supervision and devote little time and
energy to their children’s activities (Lamborn et al., 1991).

Additionally, LeCompte et al.’s (1978) model of parental attitudes toward
childrearing explores parental attitudes in multidimensional contexts, including:
overparenting, democratic attitudes, attitudes of hostility and rejection, marital discord,
and authoritarian attitudes. This model has a more comprehensive perspective on parental
attitudes since it does not provide classifications. Instead, LeCompte et al.’s (1978)
model sees parental attitudes as an interactive product among family members. This idea
was supported by Darling and Steinberg (1993), who claimed that, “assessing parental
attitudes would capture the emotional tenor of the family milieu that determined the
parent-child relationship” (p. 488).

Furthermore, classifying parental attitudes in typologies does not provide
explanations for the sociocultural milieus surrounding the family. Since the purpose of
this study is to learn about Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing in
relation to demographic variables, a comprehensive theoretical framework situating
family in the larger sociocultural milieu is required. Thus, this study follows LeCompte et
al.’s (1978) model of parental attitudes in the Turkish context, which explains parental
attitudes in multiple dimensions.

In sum, it is hoped that a brief review of parenting attitudes models may further
understanding of the empirical research results related to the importance of parental
attitudes toward childrearing practices. The importance of parental attitudes toward
childrearing practices is based on two major developmental domains: (1) socioemotional
development and (2) cognitive development. These two domains are delineated in the following sub-sections.

**Socioemotional Development**

Parental attitudes exert significant influence on the child’s socialization process (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Quality of parenting is the best indicator of children’s socioemotional well-being regardless of family structure (Amato, 2005). Several empirical studies support this claim, which is explained below.

Carlo, McGinley, Hayes, Batenhorst, and Wilkinson (2007) found a significant relationship between parenting practices and children’s prosocial behaviors. Their study revealed that the interrelations among parenting practices, sympathy, and children’s prosocial behavior were related to specific parenting practices and children’s prosocial behavior. They also showed that responsive and demanding parenting styles were associated with positive and negative consequences on children’s sociomoral development, respectively (Baumrind, 1991).

In addition, research in child psychology (e.g., Çakır & Aydın, 2005)) revealed the effects of parenting on child psychological well-being. For instance, Aunola and Nurmi (2005) found that childhood maladjustments, such as withdrawn behavior and conduct disorders, were related to excessively high or low parental control as observed in authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, respectively. Additionally, Chen, Dong, and Zhou (1997) reported that authoritarian parental attitudes increased childhood aggression and decreased peer acceptance and social competence. Consistent with these findings, Bronte-Tinkew et al. (2006) indicated that fathers’ positive attitudes toward childrearing lessened children’s antisocial behaviors in intact families.
Furthermore, research (e.g., Chambers, Power, Loucks, & Swanson, 2001) has documented the correlation between childhood stress and parenting practices. For instance, Chambers et al. (2001) found that children who received low parental care had increased levels of psychological distress. Overall, when interactions between maternal and paternal parenting styles were examined, it was revealed that poor parenting by both parents, characterized by careless parenting and affectionless control, resulted in high levels of psychological distress in children (Chambers et al., 2001).

Moreover, studies with young offenders indicated that high parental control was associated with any age of arrest (e.g., Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2006). However, permissive parenting has been shown to decrease adolescents’ risky behaviors, provided that fathers’ attitudes toward their children are positive (Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2006). More to the point, authoritative parents who show both parental affection and firm behavioral control positively affect their children’s social adjustment (Baumrind, 1972).

Additionally, the crucial role of the mother and other primary caregivers in the overall development of the child has been cited by well-known researchers in the area of child development (e.g., Honig, 2006). As a result, the mother-child relationship has been the focus of research on child development and child socialization (Tulviste, 2001). Close, consistent, and supportive interactions between mother and child have positive outcomes on the subsequent development of the child (Honig, 2002). The positive consequences of a close relationship between mother and child have been indicated beginning from infancy to adolescence (e.g., Çakır & Aydın, 2005; Honig, 2002). For example, better communication between mothers and daughters has been associated with lower incidences of conflict in the relationship (Dixon, Graber, & Brooks-Gunn, 2008).
Consistent with this research evidence, Ainsworth (1973) also emphasized the importance of infant attachment to the primary caregiver and proposed that the main caregiver, who is supposed to be the mother, exerts many effects on the subsequent development of the child.

In sum, positive parenting attitudes have positive effects on child socialization and child’s psychological well-being. Specifically, the primary caregiver, who is typically the mother, has lasting effects on child development. The second major domain in parental attitudes toward childrearing practices is the child’s cognitive development, which is the focus of the next sub-section.

Cognitive Development

In the literature, positive parental attitudes have been associated with increased cognitive skills; conversely, negative parental attitudes have been identified as predictors of decreases in cognitive skills (Ballantine, 2001). Empirical research evidence consistent with this claim is provided in the following paragraphs.

For instance, authoritative parental attitudes have been compared to authoritarian or permissive parental attitudes, yielding positive outcomes on adolescents’ academic competence and adjustment (Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989). Authoritarian parenting also has been associated with decreased academic achievement (e.g. Chen et al., 1997). In an empirical study involving 207 students and their mothers, Thergaonkar and Wadkar (2007) found a statistically significant negative association between text anxiety and mothers’ democratic attitudes and child’s acceptance of their parents. They concluded that the democratic attitudes of parents caused children to accept their parents and prevented text anxiety. In addition, rejection of parents has been found to lead to conflict
and anxious attachment, and negative perceptions of judgmental situations (Thergaonkar
& Wadkar, 2007).

Furthermore, the positive emotional climate created by a nurturing parent-child
relationship helps children develop their cognitive skills (Honig, 2002). For instance,
Coley (1998) indicated that warmth and control provided by fathers were related to better
socialization skills and increased academic competence for children. Supporting these
findings, Chao (2001) found that the closeness between a parent and child was positively
associated with children’s academic performance. More to the point, according to
theories of emotion (Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998), parents have positive
effects on children’s literacy skills. The intensity of emotional interactions between
parent and child positively affect children’s identification of emotions and use of emotion
words.

More research evidence (e.g. Assel et al., 2002) supports the positive
developmental outcomes of improved parent-child communication. For example,
Applegate, Burleson, and Delia (1992) conducted a two-year empirical study of the
effects of maternal communication on children’s cognitive and communicative abilities.
They defined reflection-enhancing parenting as encouraging children to consider the
reasons and outcomes of their own and other people’s actions. Study results showed that
the indices of maternal reflection-enhancing communication were positively related with
children’s socio-cognitive and communicative skills. Specifically, in the first year of the
study, maternal communication was found to affect children’s construct differentiation,
receiver-focused communication abilities and persuasive and comforting skills. In the
second year of the study, researchers documented the effect of maternal communication
on children’s construct abstractness, listener-adapted communication skills and affective perspective-taking skills, as well.

In sum, parents’ attitudes toward childrearing were proven to be a crucial element in children’s cognitive development. In particular, the quality of the parent-child relationship was also found to be very influential on the child’s educational life and literacy skills. These findings indicate the interconnectedness of positive developmental effects in cognitive and socioemotional areas, as well.

*Dimensions of Parental Attitudes in Childrearing*

In this section, five dimensions of parental attitudes in childrearing are examined, including: (1) overparenting, (2) democratic attitudes, (3) attitudes of hostility and rejection, (4) marital discord, and (5) authoritarian attitudes. Each dimension of parental attitudes toward childrearing is discussed based on related empirical research findings.

*Overparenting*

Overparenting is characterized by high parental control and overprotection, which foster dependency of the child on its parents (LeCompte et al., 1978). Also, Anderegg (2003) defined overparenting according to his clinical observations, characterizing it as excessive thinking and worrying about their children. He also suggested that parents who perceived the world as unstable and indeterminate are more apt to over-parent. The empirical research concerning different aspects of overparenting is provided below.

Parental control as one of the aspects of overparenting is broken down into behavioral and psychological control in the literature (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). Parents seeking behavioral control of their children regulate their children’s behaviors by managing them; on the other hand, psychological control refers to suppression of a

Empirical research evidence supports the negative effects of high degrees of behavioral and psychological parental control on the child’s internal and external problem behaviors. For instance, Aunola and Nurmi (2005) conducted a longitudinal study with the parents of children in kindergarten to the second grade. They found that mothers’ higher levels of psychological control and affection increased children’s internal and external problem behaviors. Further, mothers’ behavioral control with a low level of psychological control decreased children’s external problem behaviors. Negative effects of parents’ behavioral control on children, such as antisocial behavior, were also documented (Pettit et al., 2001). In addition, psychological control was found to be associated with depressed mood and anxiety in children (Olsen, 2002).

Overprotection, as another aspect of overparenting, results in negative developmental outcomes for children (DeHart, Pelham & Tennen, 2006). Children’s self-esteem and sense of success is negatively affected by parents’ overprotective reactions (Parker, Roussos, Hadzi-Pavlovic, Mitchell, Wilhelm, & Austin, 1997). Moreover, children with overprotective parents have been found to be unable to develop autonomy and competence (Ryan & Deci, 2000) and have been reported to have deficiencies in self-
Self-esteem is comprised of two categories: implicit and explicit self-esteem. (DeHart et al., 2006). Children who reported overprotective parents had lower levels of implicit self-esteem because decreased implicit self-esteem is connected to repeated failures in interpersonal relations (DeHart et al., 2006).

In sum, overparenting characterized by parental control, overprotection and intrusiveness has negative consequences for parent-child relationships and child development. These negative effects include childhood problem behaviors, anxiety, decreased self-esteem and autonomy.

**Democratic Attitudes**

The second dimension of parental attitudes toward childrearing practices is described as democratic attitudes (LeCompte et al., 1978). Parents with democratic attitudes tend to maintain egalitarian relationships and generally develop relationships with their children based on comradeship (LeCompte et al., 1978) which also promotes honest and open communication (Baumrind, 1971). Since children learn how to demonstrate their emotional responses in relationships by observing their caregivers’ behaviors, nurturing and consistent child-caregiver interactions are considered prerequisites of positive child socioemotional development (Ahn, 2005).

Democratic parenting also refers to authoritative parenting in literature (Mupinga et al., 2002). Authoritative parents have nurturance relationships with their children and moderately control them (Ballantine, 2001). They value their children’s autonomy and respect their ideas, feelings, and needs (Baumrind, 1971). They praise their children’s appropriate behaviors rather than criticizing the inappropriate ones (Mupinga et al.,
2002). Flexibility and freedom with certain limits in the child-parent relationship is also other feature of the democratic parenting style (Baumrind, 1971).

Parents with democratic attitudes do not use rigid disciplinary strategies. As indicated by Cox and Harter (2003), parents’ developmentally appropriate strategies for monitoring child behavior and supportive discipline strategies influence children’s’ overall development very positively. Moreover, it has been documented that parents who are responsive in parent-child interactions maintain close, consistent relationships with their children (Bus & van IJzendoorn, 1988). Particularly because responsive parents model their children’s emotion regulation, increased responsiveness has been linked to positive prosocial behaviors in children, as well (Eisenberg et al., 1998). In addition, children who see their parents as more nurturing reportedly exhibited increased self-esteem compared to those with less nurturing parents (DeHart et al., 2006).

In sum, parents who have democratic childrearing attitudes maintain close relationships with their children while moderately controlling them. Children with democratic parents tend to develop better socioemotional skills. The third dimension of parental attitudes toward childrearing practices proposed by LeCompte et al.'s (1978) model is called “attitudes of hostility and rejection”. This dimension is examined in the following sub-section.

Attitudes of Hostility and Rejection

Attitudes of hostility and rejection indicate dissatisfaction with the parental role, accompanied by high parental stress (LeCompte et al., 1978). Research shows that the negative reactions of socializers (e.g., parents, teachers, and siblings) cause children to have less developed socioemotional skills (Eisenberg et al., 1998). Evidence from
empirical research (e.g. Edwards, Shipman, & Brown, 2005) on the negative effects of parents’ attitudes of hostility and rejection and neglectful parenting on child development is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Rejection of parental role and neglectful parental attitudes are generally accompanied by high parental stress (Assel et al., 2002). For instance, Assel et al. (2002) claimed that mothers who had histories of neglectful childrearing were more likely to report higher levels of emotional stress (even milder levels of maternal emotional stress might negatively affect a child’s social development). In addition, mothers experiencing emotional stress reported having difficulties in maintaining close and flexible relations with their children, which in turn causes children to have less well developed social skills (Assel et al., 2002).

Further, Campbell (1994) documented the relationships among psychological dynamics, maternal depression, and childhood behavioral disorders. The association between mother’s and children psychological stand is assumed to occur through effects of childrearing practices. Additionally, parental stress and ineffective parenting in mothers as well as in fathers has been linked to negative cognitive and behavioral consequences for children (Onatsu-Arvilommi, Nurmi, & Aunola, 1998).

Moreover, neglecting parenting has some negative influences on emotional development in childhood (Chambers et al., 2001). For instance, Edwards et al. (2005) examined the mother-child dyads to compare the socialization of emotion between neglectful and nonneglectful mothers and their children. According to their findings, neglectful mothers “were expected by their children to provide less support following their children’s emotional displays, engaged in less discussion reflective of emotional
understanding (i.e., causes and consequences of emotion), and reported experiencing more negative affect” (p. 300). They concluded that neglected children expected less supportive responses; conversely, nonneglected children expected more supportive responses to their emotional displays.

In summary, attitudes toward hostility and rejection are an important dimension of parental attitudes toward childrearing practices. These attitudes are characterized by neglectful parenting and high parental stress that have negative effects on the parent-child relationship. Negative effects of neglectful parenting are specifically negatively related to the child’s psychological and emotional well-being.

*Marital Discord*

Marital discord reflects tensions and conflict in marriage which have been shown to negatively affect parents’ attitudes toward childrearing (LeCompte et al., 1978). According to the spillover hypothesis (Erel & Burman, 1995), “negative affect elicited in the marital dyad may increase parental negativity and deplete parental coping resources, contributing to more irritable and punitive discipline practices” (as cited in Erath, Bierman, & the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 2006, p. 218). Parents who practice harsh and aggressive behaviors in their relationships unwittingly show negative behaviors in relationships with their children (Patterson, 2002). Consequently, child development is negatively affected by marital discord.

According to social learning theory, parents model aggressive behaviors to their children and children exhibit these negative behaviors in their subsequent relationships (Bandura, 1977). Conversely, agreement between parents makes children aware of consistency in the family and model children about social values including respect for
each other, clear communication, negotiation, and compromise. Joint decision-making processes between spouses also cause children to develop a main trust in their mothers and fathers. Children who observe an accord between their parents are also likely to develop healthy relationships with their peers and, in the future, with intimate partners (Amato, 2005).

The quality of the relationship between spouses definitely affects child psychology (Cummings & Davies, 1994). For instance, research results related to the relationship between marital discord and childhood psychological abnormalities revealed that marital discord might cause children to develop psychological problems, including childhood behavioral maladjustment, aggressive-disruptive behaviors and problematic relationships with family members and peers (Cummings & Davies, 1994; Grych & Fincham, 1990, as cited in Erath & Bierman et al., 2006).

Additionally, early childhood has been indicated as a vulnerable period for the negative effects of marital conflict. For instance, Erath and Bierman et al. (2006) conducted a cross-sectional study with 360 kindergarteners to explore the relationship between aggressive-disruptive behavior in early childhood and marital conflict. They found that excessive marital conflict increased the incidences of mothers’ harsh punishment of children, which in turn accelerated the child’s aggressive-disruptive behavior.

Further, the problems experienced by children with parents in marital discord are similar to those of children with divorced parents (Amato, 2005). It has been suggested by Amato (2005) that marital discord between parents negatively affects children, while divorce leads to better outcomes for children. On the other hand, staying together was
indicated as a better choice for families who experience marital discord at lesser degrees (Amato, 2005).

In summary, marital discord between spouses is a significant dimension of parental attitudes. Discord might unwittingly lead to negative childrearing attitudes, which in turn negatively affect child psychological well-being. On the other hand, accord between spouses positively affects childrearing attitudes and child’s psychological well-being.

**Authoritarian Attitudes**

Authoritarian parenting refers to childrearing attitudes and practices in which parents implement strict and absolute disciplinary techniques (Baumrind, 1971). Authoritarian parenting attitudes cause the child to be dependent on family through a socialization process emphasizing obedience and control (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Authoritarian parents want their children to believe in their absolute authority and follow negative childrearing attitudes characterized by strict discipline and harsh punishment (LeCompte et al., 1978). It is also stated in Applegate’s model of parental discipline (1992) that, “power-assertive/authoritarian parenting aims to control the child’s behavior using negative reinforcement” (as cited in Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007, p. 79). Besides, according to Baumrind (1971), authoritarian parents implement strict parental disciplinary strategies that are often associated with negative self-perception (Lamborn et al., 1991).

Strict disciplinary strategies and monitoring of children are the common aspects of authoritarian parenting (Baumrind, 1971). Cummings (2000) asserted that discipline refers to parents’ strategies to impose rules and values in children and monitoring refers to the tracking of children’s activities. In support of that claim, demanding parents have
also been documented to use strict discipline strategies and closely monitor their children
(Carlo et al., 2007).

However, positive disciplinary strategies have been associated with better
developmental outcomes for children (Baumrind, 1971). For instance, Hart, Dewolf, Wozniak, and Burts (1992) conducted an observational study to explore the relationship between preschoolers’ playground behaviors and maternal and paternal disciplinary strategies. They concluded that the children of parents with more developmentally appropriate discipline strategies demonstrated fewer problem behaviors during play-time.

In addition, studies on the effects of fathers’ authoritarian parental attitudes indicated negative effects of those types of attitudes on children and adolescents (Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2006). Bronte-Tinkew et al. (2006) revealed that adolescents of authoritarian fathers were at increased risk of having higher degrees of delinquent behaviors and substance use. They also implied that as authoritarian fathers become more positive in their relationships with their children, the negative consequences of authoritarian parenting decrease accordingly.

In summary, authoritarian parenting has been characterized by strict discipline and close monitoring in all parenting theories. These types of parenting strategies have been documented as provoking behavioral problems in early childhood and adolescence. Although authoritarian parental attitudes are generally associated with negative outcomes for children in Western culture (Lamborn et al., 1991), contradictory results are also documented in studies involving other cultures (e.g., Ang & Goh, 2006) and minorities (e.g., Baumrind, 1972). They are delineated in the following sections.
Parental Attitudes toward Childrearing Practices and Culture

Culture is one of the most important elements of family structure. Families pass social norms and values to their offspring through their attitudes toward childrearing (Kağıtçibaşı, 2007). Parenting styles vary depending on the sociocultural contexts wherein parent-child interactions take place, which lead to some differentiations in childrearing practices (Çakır & Aydın, 2005). Therefore, attitudes toward childrearing practices cannot be investigated independently from cultural context as indicated by the huge number of studies conducted in various sociocultural settings.

Given the importance of culture on parents’ childrearing attitudes, this section is devoted to examination of interconnectedness between childrearing attitudes and culture. Empirical research studies in various sociocultural contexts are represented in two topics: (1) individualistic cultures and (2) collectivistic cultures. However, before introducing these studies, the concept of “value of children”, which is frequently used in the research represented in the following sections, needs to be defined.

Value of Children

Hoffman and Hoffman (1973) identified the concept of “value of children” (VOC) as “the functions children serve or the needs they fulfill for parents” (as cited in Trommsdorff & Nauck, 2005, p. 9). VOC has both theoretical and practical importance in understanding a child’s position in the family and on the larger scale in society (Kağıtçibaşı, 2007). VOC influences parents’ behaviors and attitudes toward children and is open to variation according to sociocultural context (Trommsdorff & Nauck, 2005) and social change (Ataca & Sunar, 1999). Cultural variations in VOC also provide valuable
insights into family dynamics, beliefs, and attitudes specific to culture (Ataca, Kağıtçıbaşı, & Diri, 2005).

Studies of VOCs in international contexts (e.g., Mayer, Albert, Trommsdorff, & Schwarz, 2005; Suckow, 2005) are described in the next sections. But, in order to understand VOC studies better, two main concepts need to be defined: economic-utilitarian VOC and psychological-emotional VOC. Economic-utilitarian VOC refers to expectations that children will contribute to the family economy and household help and that children are expected to secure parents’ old-age insurance (Trommsdorff & Nauck, 2005). In the literature, economic-utilitarian VOC is generally used in the context of authoritarian and traditional childrearing attitudes (Hoffman, 1988). On the other hand, psychological-emotional VOC refers to the strengthening of emotional ties among family members through interactions with children in an expressive and simulative manner (Trommsdorff & Nauck, 2005). Psychological-emotional VOC is related to democratic childrearing attitudes, including higher respect for a child’s autonomy (Hoffman, 1988). These concepts are well investigated in cross-cultural studies and migration research and have been proven to vary according to sociocultural contexts (Nauck & Klaus, 2005).

The VOC studies and other empirical studies regarding culture and parental attitudes are examined according to individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Hence, the most important identifier of culture has been described as the individualism-collectivism syndrome (Triandis, 2001). Suh (1999) estimated that over 100 publications per year use this continuum in discussing culture-related issues (as cited in Triandis, 2001, p. 907). However, Triandis (2001) warned that people from individualistic and collectivistic cultures should not be supposed to be familiar with all aspects of their cultures.
Therefore, research findings provided in the next sections should not be generalized for all individuals of that particular culture; however, they help in understanding the connections between culture and childrearing.

In sum, since culture and parenting are strongly related, parental beliefs about childrearing attitudes cannot be investigated independent of the sociocultural context. Provided that there are many differentiations in parental attitudes to childrearing depending on culture, supporting research from various cultures is represented based on the individualism-collectivism syndrome described in the next sections.

**Individualistic Cultures**

In individualistic cultures such as North European, Western European, and North American, the personal, separate (Triandis, 1989), and independent self (Kağıtçıbaşi, 2007) is emphasized. People from individualistic cultures value their individual goals over group goals and self-adjustment over group adjustment (Triandis, 2001). Distinct features of individual cultures include competition, emotional distance from in-groups, self reliance, and hedonism (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

The aspects of individualistic culture are also observable in family structure and functioning. In individualistic societies, material and emotional investments are made on the child (Kağıtçıbaşi, 2007). Psychological-emotional value of child implicates democratic parental attitudes. Socioeconomic development and modernization also affect children’s values (Ataca & Sunar, 1999). Hence, a child’s psychological importance is stressed in individualistic cultures, while parents in collectivistic cultures consider the child to be economically valuable. Accordingly, a child’s economical-utilitarian value
decreases and psychological-emotional value increases with socioeconomic advancement and modernization (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

Consequently, the increased psychological-emotional value of the child in individualistic cultures causes parents to have democratic and authoritative attitudes toward childrearing. For instance, Knight, Elfenbein, and Ferus (2000) revealed that authoritative parenting was the most common style of parenting among middle-class, intact, European American families, which is also associated with better academic performance and socioemotional skills. Chao (2001) reported that the positive effects of authoritative parenting (e.g., better academic success) were explained through closeness in the parent-child relationship.

Other studies in western cultures (e.g., Carlson, Uppal, & Prosser, 2000) also demonstrated the positive effects of authoritative parental attitudes on children’s self-esteem and happiness, and negative effects of authoritarian parental attitudes on children’s self-perceptions (Lamborn et al., 1991; Pawlak & Klein, 1997). Authoritative parental attitudes were also associated with increased scholastic outcomes in European–American families (Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992).

However, some studies (e.g., Ang & Goh, 2006) conducted in different cultural contexts have not yielded the negative findings associated with authoritarian parental attitudes. For instance, Park and Bauer (2002) found a significant relationship between authoritative parenting style and academic achievement of high school students only for European Americans, but not for Asian Americans, Hispanics, and African-Americans (Park & Bauer, 2002). Interestingly, Baumrind’s study (1972) with African-American
families documented the positive correlation between authoritarian parental attitudes and prosocial maturity of preschool children.

Additionally, Dixon et al. (2008) claimed that the relationship between mothers and daughters varies according to sociocultural context. Dixon et al. (2008) conducted a study with African American, European American, and Latin American girls and their mothers and found that African American and Latina girls had more respect for parental authority than did European American girls. Further, in the presence of low parental authority, arguments between mothers and daughters were more intense among Latin Americans but not among European Americans. They also reported that higher degrees of discipline and better communication were associated with lower incidences of conflict, independent of ethnicity.

Moreover, Mayer et al. (2005) revealed research results on the value of the child in the German context. They focused on the dimensionality of children’s value, mothers’ parenting goals, and prospective expectations of children. Findings indicated a positive association between a child’s economic value and his/her obedience. However, emotional VOC was positively associated with a child’s independence, which is promoted in modern societies.

In sum, the high prevalence of authoritative and democratic parental attitudes and the increased psychological-emotional value of a child are commonly present in individualistic cultures. However, variations in parental attitudes toward childrearing may be due to the cultural backgrounds of families.
Collectivistic Cultures

Collectivistic cultures such as Asian, African, and South American emphasize the collective (Triandis, 1989), related, and interdependent self (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). In collectivistic cultures, people have strong group identities, focus on context rather than content in communications, and pay attention to external rather than internal processes in the social sphere (Triandis, 2001). Family integrity, sociability, and interdependence have been documented as the most important signifiers of a collectivistic culture (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

In collectivistic cultures, families are either structurally or functionally extended and the material and emotional interdependence within the extended family is noteworthy (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) also indicated that especially in agrarian/traditional societies, joint work is preferable and the family is interdependent with kin. Similarly, Inglehart (1997) noted that in traditional societies, loyalty to family, parents, and fatherland was greatly emphasized and traditional societies were relatively authoritarian. For instance, Rudy and Grusec (2001) found that collectivism was related to authoritarian parenting for Egyptian parents.

Moreover, Assadi et al. (2007) believed that socioeconomic status was a significant determinant of parenting style in Iranian society. Accordingly, families with lower economical status displayed more authoritarian attitudes than families with higher economic status. However, they also reported that the academic achievement of children and parenting style were found to be related independent of sociocultural context. Findings from another study in Iran (Alizadeh, Applequist, & Coolidge, 2007) noted the differences in parenting style as a function of gender. Iranian mothers were warmer and
more involved in their interactions with their children and fathers were more authoritarian toward their children.

In addition, differences in the value of a child can emerge according to religion. For instance, Suckow (2005) investigated the differences in the value of children for Jews and Muslims in Israel. The results of Suckow’s (2005) study showed that although Jews and Muslims were subject to similar institutional regulations, the value of a child varied according to differences in religion. That is, the economic value of the child was higher for Muslim parents, a variable also associated with increased reproductive behavior. In another study done by Kim, Park, Kim, Lee, and Yu (2000), the high value placed on family was due to Confucianism and the view that the family is the most important in all aspects of life.

Furthermore, a value-of-child study from India (Mishra, Mayer, Trommsdorff, Albert, & Schwarz, 2005) revealed that the emotional and traditional (economic-utilitarian) value of a child was important across generations and districts in India. This finding was considered to be related to the social and emotional importance of having a child in the Indian cultural context. However, urban residents across generations reported high emotional value of a child as compared to those in the rural sample. Also, younger generations in urban residences reported lower traditional values regarding childrearing.

Research with Asian parents (e.g., Chao, 1994) revealed results about childrearing practices that were not similar to those for Western individualistic cultures, especially with respect to authoritarian-authoritative parenting. Ang and Goh (2006) claimed that “the benefits of authoritative parenting style has been documented vastly in Western cultures, on the other hand, authoritative parenting style in Asian context could possibly
had a different meaning” (p. 132). Although parenting styles in Asian countries, especially in China, have been described as authoritarian and controlling in the literature (e.g. Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992), Ang and Goh (2006) indicated differences in interpretations of the meaning of strictness in Western and Asian cultures. Accordingly, while strictness had been associated with parental hostility in the Western context, it was associated with parental concern in the Asian context (Chao, 1994). More to the point, Chao (1994) stated that because the authoritative-authoritarian dimension was not capturing the essence of Chinese culture, Chinese childrearing practices could not be examined on the authoritative-authoritarian dimension, especially when explaining children’s academic success. For instance, Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, and Fraleigh (1987) found that authoritative parenting was positively associated with academic success in European American, but not in Asian American families. Ang and Goh (2006) also concluded that authoritarian parenting style is linked with positive adolescent outcomes in some Asian samples. Consistent with that idea, Chao (2001) found that authoritative parenting explained through close relationships between parent and child were associated with better academic performance by European Americans, and to a degree, second-generation Chinese, but not first-generation Chinese.

However, there are contradictions in the research findings with regard to authoritarian-authoritative parenting attitudes and outcomes of these attitudes for children in the Asian context. For example, another study in the Chinese context indicated positive influences of authoritative parenting on a child’s social and school adjustment and negative influences of authoritarian parenting on a child’s socioemotional development.
and academic achievement (Chen et al., 1997). Therefore, it was concluded that authoritative and authoritarian childrearing practices were applicable to Chinese parents.

Additionally, the value-of-child study in the Republic of Korea pointed out the need to preserve strong relational interpersonal bonds despite socioeconomic and political changes (Kim & Park, 2005). It was also indicated that the psychological value of a child is a reason to have a child, and personal and financial constraints were reasons not to have a child (Kim & Park, 2005). Also, Kim et al. (2000) indicated that harmonious family life was the most important purpose across research participants of different sexes and SES in Korea. Moreover, newer generations have been found to place greater importance on family life compared to older generations. In contrast, the value-of-child study from China documented a child’s economic value among migrant and rural parents (Zheng, Shi, & Hong Tang, 2005). These parents were found to be dependent on their children for their old age security due to deficiencies in the social security system.

In sum, research on collectivistic cultures indicates differences in childrearing practices in association with variations in gender, religion, and sociocultural and economic structures. Research in the Asian context also provides challenging results about the applicability of parenting constructs across all cultures, though parenting is highly influenced by sociocultural realm and additional care should be taken in studies involving culturally diverse samples. Thereby, it is essential to examine the cultural context of the current study as well.

The Turkish Context

This section of the literature review introduces an overview of the cultural context of this study, which is needed to understand Turkish parents’ attitudes toward
childrearing practices. Information about: (1) family structure in Turkish culture, (2) social change and family in the Turkish context, and (3) parental attitudes toward childrearing practices in Turkey, is also provided and is based on current research as reported in related literatures in the field.

The Republic of Turkey was founded by Ataturk in 1923 as a secular state with a parliamentary democracy. At the same time, compulsory education was introduced and civil law systems were derived from various European systems, such as the Swiss Civil Code. Turkey became a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1952; the United Nations (UN) in 1945; and an associate member of the European Community and European Court of Human Rights in 1964. Although its central government has been playing a major role in providing social services (e.g., education, health, communication, banking, basic industry, and transport), there is a strong tendency toward privatization (Central Intelligence Agency, 2008). Beginning in the 1980s, neoliberal economic policies have furthered industrialization and urbanization, which had significant effects on Turkish society (Dedeoglu, 2004).

Turkey has experienced demographic changes over the last fifty years due to industrialization, urbanization and migration. Turkey’s experiences with social change have been “from a traditional, rural, agricultural, and patriarchal society to a modern, urban, industrial, and egalitarian one” (Ataca et al., 2005, p. 97). This social change has been accelerated by rapid immigration toward cities due to industrialization and the proliferation of job opportunities, construction of railways and highways throughout the country, electrification of rural areas, introduction of telecommunication and mass media, and improvement of educational opportunities (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). Today, compulsory
elementary education takes eight years and early childhood education and higher education are promoted by the state.

The current population of Turkey is 70,586,256, with 70.5% residing in cities (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2007a). Due to westernization and modernization, cultural values and beliefs are changing, especially in cities (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). However, Turkish society still holds dear its rural traditional values (Sunar, 2005) and is still defined as traditional, authoritarian, and patriarchal despite social movement toward modernization in values and beliefs (Sunar & Fişek, 2005).

In accord with The Swiss Civil Code, 18 is the official marriage age, and partners’ legal consent is required for marriage (Ataca et al., 2005). Affinal marriage is based on romantic love and free choice of partner. However, families influence marriage decisions and may make arrangements for meetings of prospective spouses (Hortaçsu, 1995).

In Turkey, social security is generally provided by the government; however, the coverage and efficiency are generally inadequate. These institutional and cultural conditions, as well as aspects of collectivism and social change, have had many impacts on family structure and functioning (Nauck & Klaus, 2005). These are delineated in detail in the following sections.

*Family Structure in Turkish Culture*

The majority of Turkish families are structurally nuclear and functionally extended in the company of interaction and social support among close relatives (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990). Relationships among children, parents, and siblings are very close and continue to be close after marriage. Children often live with their parents until they
get married (Bastug, 2002). Most adolescents, even those over the age of 18, live with their parents, which is typical in the Turkish context (Çakır & Aydın, 2005).

According to Kağıtçıbaşı (2007), individuals are part of the culture of relatedness in the Turkish context, which refers to “contexts and relational patterns identified by relations between connected, expanding, and therefore partially overlapping selves with diffuse boundaries” (p. 65). This means that individuals do not define themselves as separate selves but as a part of their societal groups, primarily with their families. Therefore, extended family type is still culturally ideal in many geographic areas (Bastug, 2002).

Further, Kağıtçıbaşı (1990) classified the intergenerational dependencies in Turkish family into two groups: material and psychological. Material interdependencies indicate the individual’s economic dependency on his parents in childhood and the individual’s material responsibilities to parents in adulthood. The material dependencies of older parents on their children intensify with the shortage and deficiencies of the Turkish social insurance system (Nauck & Klaus, 2005). This concept is also called “old-age security” (Ataca et al., 2005, p. 99). Material interdependencies receive more emphasis among rural residents with low education and income levels. Since children are regarded as a manpower resource in the rural areas in Turkey, children’s, especially sons’, economic value is generally high in those areas. Children work in the fields or in the family-owned businesses in rural areas. Additionally, rural children are seen as a source of security against unemployment, sickness, and old age. Further, compared to girls, boys have more of the physical power and endurance required to work in rural areas; women’s status increases as they give birth to boys (Nauck & Klaus, 2005).
On the other hand, psychological interdependencies refer to persisting emotional bonds among family, even though older parents independently survive without depending on their adult children for old-age security (Ataca et al., 2005). Psychological and emotional interdependencies among family are higher and continue to increase in urban areas (Ataca & Sunar, 1999).

However, in the traditional Turkish family, gender and generational hierarchies are strongly emphasized, leading the Turkish family to be defined as patriarchal, authoritarian, and traditional (Çakır & Aydın, 2005). But these aspects are subject to change, especially in urban areas. In Turkish culture, the gender hierarchy reveals itself in role-sharing between spouses in a family (Sunar & Fişek, 2005) and in regulating sexual behavior (Bastug, 2002). For instance, men feel responsible for controlling their close female relatives’ sexual behavior for the sake of “honor”, a concept also common in other Mediterranean cultures (Bastug, 2002). The preservation of family honor reinforces “male dominance and female subordination” and “closely-knit relationships of the traditional family” by dictating responsibilities for other members of the family (Ataca et al., 2005, p. 100). Likewise, spouses in the family interact in a social sphere that consists of same-sex friends and same-sex relatives, especially in rural areas (Ataca et al., 2005).

Additionally, the socialization of children differs according to gender-roles (Sunar, 2002). Education is considered to be more important for sons than daughters. While aggressiveness and independence is more tolerated in boys, supervision and limitation of activity is more common in girls (Sunar, 2002). Gender and generational hierarchies are also observable in family functioning in general (Ataca et al., 2005) and in marriage and wife-husband relationships, in particular (Olson, 1982). In the traditional
Turkish family, the relationship between spouses is based on economic maintenance rather than emotional friendship (Olson, 1982). In the next paragraphs, the roles of the traditional mother and father are described.

*Mother Role and Spousal Relationship in Turkish Culture*

Gender hierarchy is effective in the distribution of family roles. Mothers are primarily responsible for housekeeping and childrearing (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). Hence, it can be claimed that mothers are the primary caregivers and the most influential agents in child development in Turkish culture. Also, mothers are perceived as less dominant and more supportive compared to fathers (Cuhadaroglu et al., 2004). For instance, some studies have revealed that Turkish adolescents share more of their problems with their mothers (Gure, Ucanok, & Sayil, 2006). Men develop their most meaningful relationship with their mothers, which are even more intense than those with their spouses. This finding is clarified further by the emotional distance between spouses and the mother’s need for emotional closeness from her son (Olson, 1982).

On the other hand, Turkish fathers play authoritarian roles in the family. They are mainly responsible for decision-making and establishing discipline among children (Nauck & Klaus, 2005). Obedience is a highly respected value in Turkish culture (Kağıtçıbaşi, 1996). Although fathers engage in their small children’s play activities and show affection for them, obedience dominates the father-child relationship as children grow up. There is a certain communication distance between father and adolescents (Ataca et al., 2005). Overall, gender and generational hierarchy cause fathers to be stronger in families than mothers and children (Fişek, 1995).
In accord with the generational and gender hierarchy, expressions of anger towards parents are not tolerated, especially by fathers (Ataca et al., 2005). Additionally, Fişek (1995) revealed that the generational hierarchy characterized by parental control and nurturance was highly independent of the family’s clinical and educational status, family size and mother’s employment status. This finding points to the importance of emotional interdependencies in the family, although material interdependencies loosen with socioeconomic advancement (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

Another concept that requires examination is violence in the family, which has been documented to significantly affect attitudes toward childrearing (Erath & Bierman et al., 2006). Regretfully, violence against wives by husbands is a reality in Turkish society as in other patrilineal societies (Nauck & Klaus, 2005). However, violence against women in families has been justified by women as dependent on “reasonable” circumstances. Rittersberg-Tilic and Kalaycioglu (1999) reported that Turkish women justified their husband’s violence as the outcome of an argument (35%), or as due to neglect of childcare (25%), talking to other men (24%), spending money needlessly (23%), rejection of intercourse (17%), and burning food (7%), according to findings from the Turkish Demography and Health Survey (1998). These findings indicate the strong existence of patriarchal dominance and gender hierarchy. Women even justify violence against them (Rittersberg-Tilic & Kalaycioglu, 1999). Taken together, these findings indicate the effects of gender hierarchy, preservation of honor, and economic hardship on the relationship between spouses.

Moreover, the Population, Housing, and Demography Survey (2007) revealed the most frequently cited reasons for problems with spouse. Responsibilities in the home and
for children (34.8 %), insufficient income (31.6 %) and expenditures (31.2 %) (TSI, 2007b) were found to be the top reasons for spousal conflicts. These findings point out the negative effects of economic hardships on the spousal relationship.

General aspects of the traditional Turkish family have been provided in this section. Variations in family structure occur depending on regional, ethnic, and sociocultural differences (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996). However, economic factors in Turkish society also influence spousal relationships. Further, social change has some effects on Turkish family structure and functioning. These will be examined in the next section.

**Social Change and Family in the Turkish Context**

According to the World Value Survey (1999), which covers 65 countries, social changes throughout the world were preceded by modernization. The survey indicated a shift from support of survival values (economic and physical security, loyalty to authority) to well-being values (life quality, openness to change) (Inglehart & Baker, 2000). Social change accompanied by sociodemographic changes (Trommsdorf & Nauck, 2005) also form the foundation of international research programs on changes in the value of children. Modernization and socioeconomic development have led a number of researchers (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007) to state that change in the family structure is inevitable.

A growing number of women have joined the workforce as a result of modernization and social change in the world (Amorim & Rossetti-Ferreira, 2004). A growing numbers of studies focus on the problems experienced by women who have double roles as mothers and workers (Drew, Emerek, & Mahon, 1998). Employment of mothers and increased education status have been also found to affect childrearing
attitudes (Ocakçı et al., 2006). Additionally, there are few studies of the effects of modernization on parental attitudes in non-western countries (Assadi et al., 2007). Therefore, an exploration of changes in the Turkish family structure and functioning stemming from modernization is crucial.

Turkey is experiencing a social change “from a traditional, rural, agricultural, and patriarchal society to a modern, urban, industrial, and egalitarian one” (Ataca & Kağıtçibaşı, 2005, p. 97). The social changes experienced in Turkey are manifold and include economic advancement, industrialization, westernization, and a rapid increase in population (Ataca & Sunar, 1999). This social change also brings changes in the family structure and functioning that are further explored in the next paragraphs.

Modernization has changed traditional Turkish family values (Sunar, 2002), especially gender roles and women’s status in society and the family. The status of women increases in line with modernization. For instance, recent studies indicate a decrease in the significance of “honor”, especially for educated middle-class urban residents (Ataca et al., 2005). Hence, romantic relationships are freer, permitting dating and cohabitations without marriage (Sunar & Fişek, 2005).

Ataca and Sunar (1995) also claimed that parents preferred daughters. Increased preferences for girls and decreased preferences for sons also have been associated with a significant decline in fertility. Daughters are viewed as more helpful and supportive by mothers. Also, daughters contribute to their mother’s old age security through their prospective roles as caregivers in old age. Therefore, it can be inferred that girls’ economic value has increased during the modernization process (Nauck & Klaus, 2005).
Moreover, social change influences husband-wife relationships (Imamoğlu, 1994). For instance, recent studies have pointed out women’s increasingly active role in decision-making processes and the decreasing dominance of men in the family. Ataca and Sunar (1999) indicated that urban middle-class mothers were more effective in decision-making processes now than had been found in previous investigations. They also revealed that the decisions about children’s education and discipline were often made by the mothers rather than the fathers. Further, mothers’ increased intrafamily status has been accompanied by more equalitarian relationships between spouses (Ataca & Sunar, 1999). It has also been shown that equalitarian relationships between spouses characterized by joint decision making and role sharing were associated with decreased fertility. On the other hand, male dominance and limited communication were found to be related to increased fertility (Ataca & Sunar, 1999).

Nauck and Klaus (2005) pointed to ongoing patriarchal dominance of the family despite modernization. They explained this dominance in light of the strength and effectiveness of patrilineal ideology despite modernization and social change. Kandiyoti (1988, p. 117) explained that “the male role seems to have been least affected by change, bolstered as it is by socialization practices, ideology and structural reports”; also, she pointed to the significance of the intergenerational permanence of women’s nurturing and domestic roles in the family (as cited in Nauck & Klaus, 2005).

In addition, modernization not only affects gender roles and relationships between spouses, but also brings some changes to the value of children (Ataca et al., 2005). In Turkey, the forbidding of child labor, introduction of eight years of compulsory education, and increased cost of having many children, including education expenses,
have led to a decrease in the child’s economic-utilitarian value (Nauck & Klaus, 2005).

This decrease in children’s economic value is also accompanied by a decrease in material dependencies within the Turkish family, although psychological dependencies among family are still important. For example, Ataca and Sunar’s (1999) study reported the continuities and changes in the childrearing attitudes of urban middle-class mothers due to the social changes experienced in Turkey. Findings indicated that the economic value of children was decreasing and psychological value of children was increasing. Further, Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) claimed that socialization values continued to emphasize feelings of belonging in a family and psychological interdependence within the family. According to Nauck and Klaus (2005), parents are still effective in the child’s socialization, while their contribution to parents’ old age security is still noteworthy. Together with the ongoing psychological interdependencies between parent and child, the insufficiencies in the Turkish social insurance system are another reason for parents’ dependence on children for old-age security (Nauck & Klaus, 2005).

Parents’ effectiveness on child socialization (Nauck & Klaus, 2005) and psychological interdependencies in the family (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007) also influence the prevalence of authoritarian parental attitudes in the family. However, some values required by the modernistic lifestyle, such as autonomy and individual loyalties, have gained in importance in the Turkish family and society (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). On the other hand, Gure et al. (2006) reported that change in socialization sources and individualistic values brought some challenges for urban children. They concluded that children had some conflicts with the authoritarian father figure during the transition to adolescence. It
was suggested that close and consistent mother-child relationships might support adolescents with their developmental needs during that period (Gure et al., 2006).

Overall, social change positively affects Turkish family structure and functioning. Ataca et al. (2005, p. 115) concluded that “An emerging coexistence of traditional and modern/western characteristics is seen in the Turkish urban family, which embodies a synthesis of the more positive aspects of both collectivistic and individualistic cultures”. Positive aspects include emotionally close relationships and increased respect for individual autonomy.

In sum, modernization and the subsequent social change in Turkish society have considerable effects on all aspects of life. In particular, change in family structure and functioning is characterized by the increased status of women and increased importance of psychological interdependencies in the family. Social change also affects parent’s attitudes toward childrearing and the concepts related to childrearing practices. These are examined further in the next section.

Parental Attitudes towards Childrearing Practices in Turkey

The social change experienced in Turkey has led to socioeconomic and demographic changes that have influenced childrearing practices. As a result of modernization, Turkish society has experienced proliferations in individualistic tendencies, but it is still regarded as a collectivistic culture.

A recent study comparing childrearing practices in three generations of urban middle-class Turkish families well documented changes and continuities in parenting (Sunar, 2002). Findings indicated some changes in childrearing attitudes due to social change and modernization together with preservation of some aspects of the traditional
family. For instance, all three generations were found to emphasize the value of the family over the individual. However, each generation was found to encourage emotional openness; yet parent-child conflict was still restrained. In addition, compared to previous generations, autonomy received greater emphasis in new generations, and influenced disciplinary methods. Overall, compared to previous generations, new generations were found to be more democratic and less authoritarian in childrearing practices.

Moreover, several cross-cultural comparisons provide insights into Turkish parents’ childrearing values (e.g., Taylor & Oskay, 1995). For instance, Okman-Fişek (1982) noted that although there is democratization in childrearing values among middle-class Turkish parents, this process has not been accompanied by increased guidance about autonomy. However, these two processes have been found to co-vary in western societies (Çakır & Aydın, 2005). Hence, Çakır and Aydın (2005) noted that current Turkish childrearing values represented “culturally modified authoritative parenting or soft authoritarian parenting” (p. 855). Further, in comparison with U.S. parents, Turkish parents have been found to exert greater control in childrearing (Taylor & Oskay, 1995). Similarly, Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) reported that although no significant difference was found in perceived parental affection, Turkish adolescents’ perception of parental control was found to be higher than that of U.S. adolescents.

Additionally, according to findings from the Population, Housing, and Demography Survey (2007), the highest rated reasons for problems according to parents with children were choice of friends (30.5 %), consumption, expenditure habits (28.1 %), and dressing style (26.1 %), while the lowest rated reasons were relationships with relatives (13.8 %), religious attitudes/behavior (12.2 %), and political opinions (7.2 %)
(TSI, 2007b). These findings suggest that social change and modernization initially have effects on daily life practices. Hence, problems between parent and child are mostly experienced in these areas. However, cultural beliefs and values are more resistant to change and consequently relationships with relatives and religious and political opinions are less often indicated reasons for problems between parent and child.

In addition, according to findings from the first Turkish value-of-children study (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982), parents were found to emphasize “obedience” as the most and “independence and self esteem” as the least anticipated features needed by a child. Imamoğlu (1987) also indicated that “independence and self esteem” were more important to upper-class families than to families with middle and low socioeconomic status. It was also revealed that Turkish parents had protective attitudes towards their children during the early childhood period and that these protective attitudes changed into authoritarian attitudes in the late childhood and adolescent period (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982).

The recent Turkish VOC study (Ataca et al., 2005) documented a decrease in the economic value of children, and an increase in the psychological value of children in Turkey. Consistent with that finding, another study with urban middle-class women reported that, “having someone to love” and “being loved” were the most important two reasons for having children, while the economic contribution of the child was not a reason for having a child (Ataca & Sunar, 1999, p. 84). Likewise, a comparative study of three generations documented the continuing effect of love on the decision to have children (Sunar, 2002).

Above and beyond, the recent Turkish VOC study revealed that the most important parenting goal was being a good person, followed by “success at school”,
“popularity”, “minding parents (being obedient)”, and “independence” (Ataca et al., 2005, p. 112). However, in the previous Turkish VOC, “minding parents (being obedient)” was indicated as the most important parenting goal together with “being a good person” (Ataca et al., 2005, p. 112). Although being a good person was indicated as the most important parenting goal in both the first and second Turkish VOC studies, the increasing importance of school success and decreasing importance of minding parents reflects a change in parenting goals toward modernistic values. Autonomy, which is required for success in school and work, seems to be valued more highly in Turkish society as socioeconomical advancement occurs.

Accordingly, the significant increase in the psychological value and decrease in the economic value of the child constitute the most important finding from the Turkish VOC study (Ataca et al., 2005). Although the child’s economic contribution to the family is still important in the low SES urban and rural samples, the psychological value of the child is stressed by the whole sample independent of generational and socioeconomic variables. Ataca et al. (2005) also associated this change in the value of children with the social transformation in Turkish society and further explained that preferences regarding the sex of the child were also related to this transformation. For the urban sample in the study, the son preference decreased; on the other hand, the girl preference together with the psychological value of child increased. Also, daughters were perceived as providing more emotional fulfillment than boys (Ataca et al., 2005). Additionally, the decrease in son preference also was associated with the decrease in the child’s economic value, since traditional values regarding male children as valuable manpower in the rural lifestyle were replaced with the modern values of urban lifestyle.
Beyond what has been explained so far, findings from the Population, Housing, and Demography Survey from the Turkish Statistical Institute (2007b) provided significant information about child-related values in the Turkish cultural context. It was found that 89.3% of males and 87.4% of females agreed that children should be responsible for providing for parents’ old age security. In addition, 75.8% of males and 77.4% of females reported that children should support the family financially when they grow up. These findings indicate the existence of material interdependencies in the Turkish family; however, parents’ financial dependence on their children is not explained only by the economic value of the child. According to Nauck and Klaus (2005), the deficiencies in the Turkish social insurance system and economic hardships also cause parents to depend on their children in the future. On the other hand, the survey also found that 84.0% of males and 85.9% females agreed that families should consider financial conditions in making decisions to have a child. Also, 87.0% of males and 81.4% of females agreed that children brought spouses together. These findings reveal the psychological value of the child, since parents consider their financial conditions before having a child and indicate the child’s role in unifying the family.

In sum, it is apparent that the social change undergone in Turkish society affects parenting beliefs, attitudes, and values. In general, the increase in the child’s psychological value is accompanied by more democratic parental attitudes emphasizing individual loyalties and child’s autonomy. Consequently, parents’, specifically mothers’, attitudes toward childrearing practices have been subjected to change by the social, economic, and cultural changes in Turkish society. Demographic factors also affect parental attitudes, and are explained in detail in the next part of this literature review.
Demographic Factors in Parental Attitudes toward Childrearing Practices

Demographic factors influence structural variables of families, including family type, wealth flows, family ties, fertility, and woman’s status (Kağıtçibaşı, 2007). Also, demographic factors such as parents’ socioeconomic status (SES), age, education level, marital status, employment status, and number of children in the household affect parents’ attitudes toward childrearing practices (e.g., Ocakçı et al., 2006). According to research (e.g., Ömeroğlu, 1996), education level is the most significant predictor of parental attitudes. Increases in education level are associated with more democratic and less overparenting attitudes toward childrearing; conversely, decreases in educational level are linked to more authoritarian attitudes (Mızrakçı, 1994). Additionally, research with the primary caregivers of urban Head Start children revealed that low education level and single parenthood were linked to active-restrictive (authoritarian) and passive-permissive (permissive) parenting (Coolahan, McWayne, Fantuzzo, & Grim, 2002).

In a longitudinal study, Benasich and Brooks-Gunn (1996) found that maternal knowledge of child development was significantly associated with the quality of the home environment and the child’s cognitive and behavioral development. They also found that as mothers’ sociodemographic characteristics, such as age, education, and income, increased, maternal knowledge of child development and quality in the structuring of the home environment increased accordingly. In addition, parent education is associated with sharing companionship with children (Kağıtçibaşı, 2007).

Further, Imamoğlu (1987) claimed that SES level was a significant predictor of intrafamily dependencies. She reported that the child’s independence was valued by upper SES mothers, whereas the child’s dependence on parents was valued by middle and
lower SES mothers. However, all mothers in the study, regardless of their SES levels, pointed out the importance of love and emotional interdependence between parent and child. In addition, Pehlivanoğlu (1998) found that low SES parents were more authoritarian, less encouraging of a child’s independence, and less affectionate with their children. Also, the Turkish VOC study revealed that the economic value of child was more important for the low SES sample than for the high SES sample (Ataca et al., 2005).

Moreover, research (Ocakçı et al., 2006) indicates that many other variables related to childrearing are highly correlated with socioeconomic variables. For instance, in a longitudinal study with 51 children from a low socioeconomic class from preschool to grade 3, low SES was found to correlate with factors that included “harsh discipline, lack of maternal warmth, exposure to aggressive adult models, maternal aggressive values, family life stressors, mother's lack of social support, peer group instability, and lack of cognitive stimulation” (Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1994, p. 649). Also, Applegate et al. (1992) indicated that the relationship between children’s socio-cognitive and communicative skills was moderated by maternal social class.

Research also indicates the effect of marital status on parental attitudes toward childrearing (e.g., Sandra & Suzan, 1991). Although the literature on the influences of divorce on child outcomes provides contradictory results (e.g., Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1982; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980), a meta-analytic review of research indicates that children with divorced parents have less developed cognitive and socioemotional skills (Amato, 2001). Further, Amato (2005) claimed that children whose parents are divorced have a broad range of problems during adulthood.
There are contradictory research results regarding the effect of maternal employment on childrearing. For instance, employment of the mother is negatively correlated with physical, mental (Hong & White-Means, 1993) and cognitive development of children (Baydar & Brooks-Gunn, 1991). On the other hand, Ocakçı et al. (2006) found positive effects of maternal employment on parenting attitudes. They concluded that because maternal employment was linked with higher educational level, employed mothers had more democratic attitudes toward childrearing and better relationships with their husbands.

Additionally, research on the relationship between parenting attitudes and parents’ age presents contradicting results. For instance, Benasich and Brooks-Gunn (1996) indicated that there was no significant relationship between childrearing attitudes and mother’s age. Also Imamoğlu (1996) found no relationship between parents’ age and childrearing attitudes. However, Mayer et al. (2005) found that increases in the age and education level of mothers were related to decreased expectations for the child’s obedience. Also, according to a generational comparison of the child’s value (Ataca et al., 2005), younger and older mothers were found to emphasize the psychological benefits of having a child, while grandmothers stressed economic and traditional values.

Moreover, some studies yielded significant results about the relationship between mothers’ sociodemographic characteristics and childrearing attitudes. For instance Ocakçı et al. (2006) investigated the relationship between mothers’ sociodemographic characteristics and attitudes toward childrearing. Results indicated that increases in mother’s age were associated with decreased hostility and rejection, and authoritarian attitudes. It has also been documented that increases in education level were associated
with increases in democratic attitudes, and decreases in authoritarian attitudes. Additionally, an increase in the number of children was linked to increased authoritarian attitudes and attitudes of hostility and rejection. Non-working mothers have been documented to have increased overparenting, attitudes of hostility and rejection, marital discord, and authoritarian attitudes; on the other hand, working mothers have been documented to have increased democratic attitudes. Also, there was a link between decreased socioeconomic status and increased overparenting and authoritarian attitudes; conversely, increased socioeconomic status was associated with increased democratic attitudes. These findings were discussed in the context of modernization and the changing role of mothers in Turkey.

Child’s gender is also a determining factor on parents’ attitudes toward childrearing (Sunar, 2002). Mızrakçı (1994) conducted a study of the factors that influenced Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing. She found that overparenting attitudes were higher among mothers with daughters than mothers with sons. Also, Pehlivanoğlu (1998) found that sons were less likely to be controlled by their parents, discouraged from emotional displays, and encouraged to try novel things. Overall, these findings indicate an increase in overparenting attitudes toward daughters compared to sons.

In sum, parents’ attitudes toward childrearing are influenced by demographic variables. Although there are conflicting results regarding the relationship between demographic variables and parental attitudes in the related literature, increases in socioeconomic level are associated with increases in democratic attitudes. Faced with this information and these findings, it is essential to examine the relationship between
demographic variables and Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices—one of the major purposes of this study.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This chapter presents a description of the methodology followed in this study. The description is comprised of six sections: (1) design of the study, (2) population and sample, (3) instrumentation, (4) pilot study, (5) data collection for the main study, and (6) data analyses. Each part of the methodology is explained in detail below.

Design of the Study

This study comprised five steps. In the first step, the literature review was used to identify features of mothers’ attitudes toward child-rearing practices by taking a cultural perspective and considering the elements of the Turkish context. This step also involved one main research question and five relevant secondary questions. Developing these research questions and documenting the related literature was a critical phase in setting up this study.

The second step included the evaluation of resources for evidence of instrument validity. This step also involved conduct of a pilot study to examine reliability issues relating to the Turkish version of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), which was the main instrument in this study. The PARI scale was originally developed by Schaefer and Bell (1958) and adapted to the Turkish context and language by LeCompte et al. (1978) (see Appendix A). Moreover, a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B) was also developed and translated into Turkish by the researcher to be used
in this study. This demographic questionnaire was developed to detect the characteristics of the research participants and address the research questions successfully.

In the third step, five early childhood education settings in Istanbul, Turkey, were selected for recruiting participants. Distribution of the research instruments to the participants followed. This step also included gathering the completed surveys from the participants through the administrators at each early childhood setting.

The fourth step focused on analysis of the data collected from Turkish mothers. Suitable statistical techniques were used. Descriptive statistics were utilized to understand the participants’ attitudes toward childrearing practices. This step also included using a multiple regression technique to ascertain the influences of each demographic variable on each domain of mothers’ parental attitudes. The data analysis particularly considered the participants’ attitudes toward childrearing practices and how their demographic characteristics affected these attitudes.

The last step involved interpreting the findings and translating them into narrative form. Further, the researcher formulated the proposed suggestions and implications according to the findings of the current study. This study also provided advice about further related research topics for other interested people in this field.

Population and Sample

This dissertation study’s population included Turkish mothers over the age of 18 years residing in Istanbul, Turkey, with a child aged 0–6 years old. From among this population, the researcher recruited a sample of 401 mothers as participants. These participants were selected from among mothers with children in one of five early childhood education settings in Istanbul. Three of these institutions were private and the
other two were public early childhood settings. Participation was on a voluntary basis. Mothers who decided to participate answered two surveys: the PARI scale and the demographic questionnaire.

Instrumentation

The researcher collected data by using two instruments: (1) the Turkish version of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) and (2) a demographic questionnaire.

Schaefer and Bell developed the PARI in 1958. This instrument has been used to measure parental attitudes toward childrearing. The PARI scale was adapted for use in the Turkish culture by LeCompte et al. (1978) and has been employed in a number of studies (e.g., Ocakçı et al., 2006; Sarıoğlu-Büke et al., 2006) in Turkey. The PARI scale consists of five dimensions. These dimensions are overparenting, democratic attitudes, attitudes of hostility and rejection, marital discord, and authoritarian attitudes.

Validity

According to the 1999 Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing by the American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association (APA), and National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME) Joint Committee, validity refers to “the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretation of the test scores entailed by the proposed uses of test” (p. 9).

There are five sources of validity evidence as explained by the AERA, APA, and NCME (1999). Because validity is a unitary concept, these sources do not represent types of validity; instead, they clarify different features of validity. These five sources are: (1) evidence based on test content, (2) evidence based on response process, (3) evidence based on internal structure, (4) evidence based on relations to other variables, and (5)
evidence based on consequences of testing. In this section, these five sources of validity are explained with appropriate examples within the context of the PARI scale.

According to AERA, APA, and NCME (1999), “a sound validity argument integrates various strands of evidence into coherent account of the degree to which existing evidence and theory support the intended interpretation of the test scores for specific uses” (p. 17). Therefore, in this section, many of the current studies and earlier research that implemented the PARI scale are presented and the relationship between the theory and the interpretation of the PARI scale is documented as well.

Additionally, some types of validity evidence might be more important than others in some specific cases. There is a need to specify the validity sources that are important to validate the scale and support future interpretations for the specific purposes of testing (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999). Therefore, in the following paragraphs, the most important validity sources supporting the future interpretation of the Turkish version of the Parental Attitudes Research Instrument (PARI) are represented.

**Evidence Based on Test Content**

According to AERA, APA, and NCME (1999), test content refers to “the themes, wording and the format of the items, tasks, or questions on a test, as well as the guidelines for procedures regarding administration and scoring” (p. 11). Therefore, “When providing evidence related to test content, the procedures followed in specifying and generating the test content should be described and justified in reference to the construct the test is intended to measure or the domain it is intended to represent” (p. 18).

In accord with these statements, Schafer and Bell (1958) claimed that the current scales measuring parental attitudes toward childrearing did not cover the test construct
completely; thus, they developed the PARI scale by selecting some of the items from other parental attitude scales and wrote the rest of the items by depending on the existing literature. Then, they applied factor analysis to this scale and found 23 subscales, each consisting of 5 items. There are 115 items in total.

Similarly, in improving the Turkish version of the PARI scale, LeCompte et al. (1978) used some statistical methods that are related to test content validity. For instance, they used the back translation method in translating the scale from English into Turkish. In using this method, first; they translated the original 115 items into Turkish, second; independent judges translated the Turkish items back into English. Third, the Turkish version was applied to a pilot group consisting of 10 people—items not understood correctly by the Turkish test takers were adjusted. In doing so, the content validity of the Turkish version of the PARI scale was strengthened for the Turkish-speaking sample.

Evidence Based on Response Process

Theoretical and empirical evidence based on individuals’ test responses provides proof about the match between the test construct and the nature of the response. AERA, APA, and NCME (1999) stated that, “Evidence of response process can contribute to questions about differences in meaning or interpretation of test scores across relevant subgroups of examinees” (p. 12). Therefore, one way to collect evidence based on the response process for the PARI scale might be to gather evidence about the differences in the meanings of the questions for the subgroups. Since this study’s purpose was to compare the subscale scores for the PARI across different demographic subgroups, it is important to gather evidence about possible differences in question interpretation by different demographic representatives. Accordingly, the previous studies (e.g., Ocakçı et
al., 2006) contributed to the validity of the PARI scale by looking at these differences across diverse demographic subgroups. For the study described in this thesis, the researcher also investigated the influences of the demographic characteristics of Turkish mothers on their attitudes toward childrearing practices. Hence, this interpretation of the study also helped to strengthen the validity of the PARI by making evidence based on the response process available.

Evidence Based on Internal Structure

According to AERA, APA, and NCME (1999), analyses of the internal structure of a test can specify “the degree to which the relationships among test items and test components conform to the constructs on which the proposed test score interpretations are based” (p. 13). Further, the theoretical framework of a test may entail a single aspect of a construct, or several elements that are expected to be homogenous but also distinct from each other. As suggested by AERA, APA, and NCME (1999), if the use or interpretation of a test depends on the relationships among the components of a test, evidence concerning the internal structure of the test needs to be provided. One of the ways to collect evidence on the internal structure of a test is to use factor analysis.

According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), in using factor analysis, the researcher believes that answers to a group of questions are determined by an essential structure, called a factor. Further, according to AERA, APA, and NCME (1999), factor analysis could be defined as a multivariate statistical analysis “showing that the score variability attributable to one major dimension was much greater than the score variability attributable to any other identified dimension” (p. 20). Here, factor analysis
was applied to both the original version (Schafer & Bell, 1958) and the Turkish version of the PARI scale (LeCompte et al., 1978).

For the original version of the PARI scale, Schafer and Bell (1958) found 23 subscales of five items, 115 items in total, through the factor analysis, which was applied to the scores of 560 participants. LeCompte et al. (1978) also implemented a principal component factor analysis to the Turkish version of the PARI scale. Factor analysis was applied to the scores on the Turkish translation of the PARI scale as gathered from a random selected group of 179 mothers representing three different socioeconomic statuses. Five subscales were found that covered some of the other subscales of the original instrument:

PARI 1) Attitude of overparenting: martyrdom, dependency of the mother, and fostering dependency.

PARI 2) Democratic attitude: equalitarianism, nonpunishment, comradeship and sharing.

PARI 3) Attitudes of hostility and rejection: ignoring the child, fear of harming the baby, and irritability.

PARI 4) Marital discordance: marital conflict, and inconsiderateness of the husband.

PARI 5) Authoritarian attitude: strictness, intrusiveness, suppression of sexuality, and harsh punishment (LeCompte et al., 1978).

LeCompte et al. (1978) followed several steps while applying the factor analysis. First, scores from the 23 subscales for the 179 participants were summed. Second, correlation was applied to a 179*23 data matrix and factor analysis was applied to the
correlation matrix. As a result of the factor analysis, four orthogonal factors were found that explained 57% of the total variance. Last, after the rotation, the items with high correlations with the subscales and the subscales with high correlations with these four factors were documented (PARI 1, PARI 2, PARI 3, and PARI 4). Additionally, the items that did not have high correlations with these four factors but had high correlations with each other were grouped under a different factor (PARI 5).

Evidence Based on Relations to Other Variables

According to AERA, APA, and NCME (1999), external variables might include “measures of some criteria that the test is expected to predict, as well as relationships to other tests hypothesized to measure the same constructs, and tests measuring related or different constructs” (p. 13). Evidence based on relationships to other variables raises concerns about consistency among these relationships and the construct underlying the proposed test interpretations.

Since the Turkish version of the PARI scale is one of the few scales in Turkey available to measure parental attitudes toward childrearing, it has been widely used in clinical and social studies and its statistical correlations with other scales have been well documented. For instance, Küçük (1987) conducted an investigation of the relationship between parental attitudes toward childrearing and the personality characteristics of high school-aged children in middle socioeconomic level families. She used the subscales PARI 2 (democratic attitudes), PARI 3 (attitudes of hostility and rejection), and PARI 4 (marital discord) with mothers (N=152) and fathers (N=138), and other subscales of the Turkish versions of Piers-Harris Children’s Self Concept Scale, State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI), Mooney Problem Check List – Junior High School Form,
and the Minnesota Counseling Inventory with the children (N=160). She applied stepwise regression analyses and found that parental attitudes toward childrearing as measured by the PARI 2, PARI 3, and PARI 4 subscales had a high predictive power for the child’s personality. Thus, the construct validity of the PARI 2, PARI 3, and PARI 4 has been supported.

Furthermore, Ari and Seçer (2003) examined the effects of parents’ attitudes toward children’s psychosocial-based problem-solving capabilities. They used the PARI scale and the Psychosocial Based Problem Solving Instrument (PBPSI). Study findings revealed that parental attitudes significantly affected children’s psychosocial-based problem-solving capability. In another study conducted by Seçer et al. (2006), a significant relationship was found between the parental attitudes of mothers as measured by the PARI Scale and preschool children’s moral and social knowledge as measured through the use of pictures, as developed by Smetana (1981) (cited in Seçer et al., 2006).

Similarly, Kapçı and Küçük er (2006) conducted a study of the psychometric properties of the Parental Bounding Instrument (PBI) with a Turkish sample. They proved the criterion-related validity of the PBI by examining the correlation between the PBI and two other instruments: the PARI Scale and the Parenting Style Inventory (PSI). The PBI demonstrated high correlations with the PARI scale and PSI. Additionally, the PBI demonstrated high reliability as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, test-retest, and split-half reliability statistics.

In addition, two other studies (e.g., Akay-Pekcanlar, Cakaloz, Berk, & Pasa, 2005) from the field of medicine provided evidence based on relations to other variables. Sarioglu-Buke et al. (2006) investigated corrosive ingestion in relation to family
functioning, behavior, attitude and knowledge of mothers of children who ingested corrosives. The mothers in this study were asked to reply to a Family Assessment Device (FAD) and the PARI scale. It was found that the affective involvement dimension of the FAD and the overparenting and democratic attitude dimensions of the PARI tests differed significantly for mothers in the corrosive group with low educational levels. In another study, Akay-Pekcanlar et al. (2005) examined the psychological profiles of mothers of children with strabismus by measuring their parental attitudes and family functioning. All mothers in the study received the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), the PARI scale, and Family Assessment Device (FAD). Mothers of children diagnosed with strabismus had high BDI scores, low scores on the PARI 2 (democratic attitudes), and high scores on the PARI 3 (attitudes of hostility and rejection). The mothers also demonstrated poor role functioning, affective responses, and general functioning in the family.

Further, several other studies (e.g., Ocakçı et al., 2006) inquired into the relationship between SES and parenting attitudes and revealed statistically significant results. As indicated in the previous section, LeCompte et al. (1978) reported significant relationships between the SES level of the mothers and subscale scores on the PARI scale. Additionally, in another study that aimed to explore the relationship between the SES level and the parental attitudes, Ocakçı et al. (2006) found a significant relationship between the PARI 1 (overparenting) score and mothers’ age, education level, occupation, number of children, and SES; PARI 2 (democratic attitudes) score and mothers’ education level and occupation; PARI 3 (attitudes of hostility and rejection) score and mothers’ age, and education level, occupation, and number of children; and PARI 5
(authoritarian attitudes) score and mothers’ age, education level, occupation, and number of children and SES.

Thus, all of these studies documenting relations between the PARI scale and the other scales and related constructs provided information about the evidence based on relations to other variables. As understood from these studies, the PARI scale has high correlations with the other scales intending to measure some related constructs with parental attitudes, as well.

Evidence Based on Consequences of Testing

Generally, some who use tests in research studies believe that some benefits will accrue from the proposed use of test scores (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999). However, according to AERA, APA, and NCME (1999), “a fundamental purpose of validation is to indicate whether these specific benefits are likely to be realized” (p. 16). Intended and unintended social consequences of test use can be relevant to validity or to social policy that falls outside the concept of validity (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999).

Social consequences become very important when differential consequences of test use are observed for different subgroups (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999). In this case, the results of the PARI scale might have social consequences depending on the utilization of the test results such that differentiation in terms of parental attitudes for different demographic groups might lead to the development of different educational and social policies. If the differentiation in PARI subscale scores for different demographic characteristics is due to differentiation in parental attitudes for subgroups and these subscales are important contributors to the parental attitudes, then the findings about group differences do not imply any lack of validity.
However, if the PARI scale measures differences unrelated to the parental attitudes or if the differences are due to the scale’s sensitivity to some participant characteristics that are not parts of the test construct, then validity can be questioned. Thus, if the consequences of testing are directly associated with the sources of invalidity such as construct under-representation or construct-irrelevant components, they might be related to validity, otherwise, if differences in test scores are valid, they can be crucial in affecting the policy decisions but they cannot be a part of technical arguments of the validity (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999).

Consequently, the results provided in previous studies show that the PARI scale does not demonstrate any source of evidence related to invalidity. However, additional care should be taken in score interpretation and then using results to make social policies, since the social consequences of testing are the ultimate effects of testing on society (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999). Hence, this study generated significant contributions to the validity of the PARI scale.

Reliability

AERA, APA, and NCME (1999) defined reliability as, “the consistency of such measurements when the testing procedure is repeated on a population of individuals or groups” (p. 25). The reliability of the adapted Turkish version of the PARI scale was determined by using the Spearman Correlation Coefficient. The calculated correlation range among the subscales of this instrument was between .58 and .88 (LeCompte et al., 1978). However, there was a need for more research on the reliability of the PARI scale in updating information. The researcher conducted a pilot study that is described in the next section.
Pilot Study

The researcher conducted a pilot study on the reliability issues of the PARI scale. All participants in the pilot study were recruited from a nursery school in Istanbul, Turkey. The sample included the mothers of children aged 0–6 years old. The phases of the data collection and analysis are explained in the following paragraphs.

Two weeks before the study, the researcher contacted the school administrator and asked for permission to conduct the pilot study in that early childhood setting. The school administrator was informed about the study via an information sheet (see Appendix C) provided by the researcher. The investigator asked the administrator to deliver the implied informed consent form (see Appendix D) and the recruitment letter (see Appendix E) to the potential participants. The survey was to take place after the first parent-teacher meetings of the 2008 spring semester at the school. An implied informed consent and a recruitment letter were sent to potential participants one week before their participation.

The investigator visited the first parent-teacher meetings of the 2008 spring semester. At the end of that meeting, the principal investigator used both the oral and paper surveys in two classrooms with mothers who had decided to participate in the study. Fifty mothers participated and were randomly assigned to two groups, using the random number functioning method. Twenty-five received the PARI scale in written form, while the other 25 received the scale in oral form. Because the sample for this study consisted of mothers who shared similar socioeconomic backgrounds, it was hypothesized that the results would reveal whether there was a statistically significant difference between the scores obtained from the oral and written forms of the scale.
After conducting the study, the researcher analyzed the data by using independent samples T-tests to determine the significance of the difference between the means for two groups for each item and found no statistically significant difference between the item means for the two groups. Additionally, as a result of the statistical analysis, there were two different reliability coefficients (one for each group). The Cronbach’s alpha value for the oral group was 0.89; for the written group, 0.88; and for the overall group, 0.89 (see Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1**

*Reliability Analysis of Pilot Study (n=50)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To compare the two independent Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients obtained from the oral and written groups, the Feldt test was used:

\[ W = \frac{1 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{1 - \hat{\alpha}_1} \]

The result obtained for the W value was 1.16, which indicated that the reliabilities for the oral and written groups were equal since the obtained value of W did not deviate greatly from 1.0 (Feldt & Kim, 2006).

The researcher also calculated the Cronbach’s coefficient for each of the subscales of the Turkish version of the PARI. It was found that the Cronbach’s alpha value for the subscales ranged between 0.64 and 0.81, as shown in Table 3.2.
Consequently, these Cronbach’s coefficients were considered to indicate acceptable to sound reliability (Isaac & Michael, 1997, pp. 131–136).

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher also asked questions of five of the participants after they completed the surveys to learn whether the items in the PARI scale were clear, comprehensible, and representative of the construct. The construct of the PARI scale was attitudes toward childrearing practices. The respondents stated that all of the items were clear, comprehensible to them, and representative of the construct to be measured. Therefore, this pilot study contributed to the validity of the instrument in a positive way, as well.

Research Hypotheses

On the basis of previous research findings (e.g., Ocakçı et al., 2006) and theoretical perspectives (e.g., LeCompte et al., 1978), five research hypotheses are postulated regarding the relationship between Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices and demographic variables. Demographic variables represent the independent variables in this study, and include Turkish mothers’ age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices
constitute the dependent variables in this study including overparenting, democratic attitudes, attitudes of hostility and rejection, marital discord, and authoritarian attitudes. Accordingly, the five hypotheses of this study were as follows.

Hypothesis 1: Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender.

Hypothesis 2: Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender.

Hypothesis 3: Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender.

Hypothesis 4: Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender.

Hypothesis 5: Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender.

Data Collection for the Main Study

Three months prior to the study, the researcher contacted the administrators of five early childhood education centers in Istanbul (three private and two public). The investigator explained the purpose, scope, and needs of the study to the administrators. The administrators were also provided an information sheet about the study (see
Appendix F) in person and were asked for their assistance in recruiting mothers with children in those preschool settings. All five administrators decided to help and were given copies of surveys, implied informed consent forms (see Appendix G), recruitment letters (see Appendix H) and envelopes to be distributed to potential participants. Surveys included the PARI scale and the demographic questionnaire. The recruitment letters and implied informed consent forms were also attached to the surveys to explain the study.

The participants were asked to fill out the PARI scale and the demographic survey. The PARI scale consists of 60 items about the mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing. Answers to the demographic survey provided insights into the data obtained from the PARI scale. Potential participants were given a week after reading the consent form and recruitment letter to decide if they wished to participate in the study. One week was adequate for the investigator, who was available to answer potential questions from participants regarding the study. The mothers who agreed to join the study answered the PARI scale and the demographic questionnaire. Participants returned the completed PARI scale and demographic survey in an envelope to the administrators. These envelopes were provided by the investigator and delivered by the administrators. Then the administrators returned these envelopes to the principal investigator.

Of the 650 surveys distributed to the potential participants, 451 were returned to the investigator. Following elimination of spoiled surveys, 401 were retained for data analysis. Spoiled surveys had one or more incomplete scales or an obvious response bias (e.g., all items on the scales were scored the same, despite having reverse scored items).

Participants’ names were not used; they were assigned numbers. The numeral identifiers were indexed and only known to the researcher and her advisor, and kept in a
password-protected computer. The survey was not conducted in a public place and children were not used as participants. The data were analyzed, coded, categorized, and interpreted by the investigator. Participation in this study was confidential. The survey questions did not ask for any information that would identify respondents. In the event of publications or presentations on this research, no personally identifiable information was shared because participants' names were not linked to their responses.

*Data Analysis*

The data analysis procedures were conducted and completed using SPSS 16.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for Windows. Demographic data included variables such as mothers’ age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender.

Also, overparenting, democratic attitudes, attitudes of hostility and rejection, marital discord, and authoritarian attitudes comprised five dimensions of mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices were measured in this study. The major question was: What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices and how do their demographic characteristics influence these attitudes? This study sought to answer this research question by investigating several ancillary questions. These ancillary questions were as follows:

1. What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?
2. What are Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

3. What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

4. What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

5. What are Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?

The researcher employed both descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze data and answer the research questions. First, descriptive statistics obtained information about mothers’ demographic variables and attitudes toward childrearing practices. For categorical variables, the study used frequencies and percentage. Calculations of frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency (mean) and variability percentages, and standard deviation for interval data were also utilized. Second, inferential statistics were employed to analyze how demographic characteristics of participants (independent variables) predicted mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices (dependent variables). A preliminary correlation analysis was conducted by the investigator to determine the type of multiple regression technique to use in analyzing the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Thus, the researcher analyzed
this relationship statistically by applying multiple regression procedures. Furthermore, the Cramer’s V-statistic was employed to explore the relationships among the IVs of education, monthly family income, and employment status. The results indicated that the Cramer’s V values for these three IVs ranged from .195 to .417 (see Appendix I). Tabachnick and Fidell states that there is a chance for multicollinearity problem if the variables are highly correlated (.90 and above) (2007, p. 88). Therefore, there is no multicollinearity problem in the study.
CHAPTER 4

Results

This chapter presents results of data analyses regarding Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices and the relationships of these attitudes to their demographic characteristics. It is comprised of seven parts. The first part summarizes the reliability analysis of the main study for the subscales. The second part includes an overview of demographic information on participants. The following five parts summarize the results for the five research questions listed in chapter 1.

Reliability Analysis of Main Study Scales

This section presents the reliability analysis of the main study for the PARI subscales. The researcher conducted a pilot study and examined the reliability analysis of the pilot study (see previous chapter). The investigator also computed the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha values for the items in each subscale of the main study. The computed coefficients were critical in determining the reliability (internal consistency) of each subscale’s summated score.

As presented in Table 4.1, the reliability coefficient for the PARI 1 subscale was .86. The alpha coefficients were .63 for the PARI 2 and .80 for the PARI 3. The alpha reliabilities for the PARI 4 and PARI 5 were .73 and .81, respectively. The Cronbach’s alpha value for the overall instrument was found to be .92.
Table 4.1
Reliability Analysis of Main Study for Each Subscale (n=401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI 1</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI 2</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI 3</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI 4</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARI 5</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the PARI 1, PARI 3, PARI 4, and PARI 5 subscales indicated satisfactory reliabilities, suggesting that the items within each subscale were internally consistent. The alpha value for the PARI 2 subscale was found to be lower but still acceptable. Lastly, the reliability coefficient for the overall instrument demonstrated satisfactory reliability (Isaac & Michael, 1997, pp. 131–136).

Demographic Information on Participants

This section presents demographic information on participants. The investigator utilized a questionnaire (see Appendix B) to collect information on eight demographic characteristics of participant mothers, including their age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. The summary of demographic information on participants is shown in Table 4.2. The first column in the table contains the demographic variables for this study. The second column presents the number of mothers who responded to the item shown in the first column. Also, the valid percentages of the respondents for each corresponding level of each demographic characteristic are shown in the third column of the table. Some respondents did not provide answers to several demographic variables. Therefore, the valid percentage was used since it gives information on the proportion of actual
respondents for each characteristic by excluding participants who did not answer that particular item on the questionnaire.

Of the 401 mothers in the study, 16 (4 %) ranged in age from 18 to 25 years. The majority of the participants—299 (74.6 %)—were between the ages of 26–34 years. The ages of 85 (21.2 %) respondents ranged from 35–45 years. One (.2 %) mother reported her age to be between 46 and 55.

Data gathered on marital status showed that the mothers were from four marital status groups. The majority of the participants—97% ($n = 389$) — were married. A total of 1.5% of the mothers ($n = 6$) were separated. On the other hand, the numbers and valid percentages of divorced and widowed mothers were the same—three (.7 %). None of the participants were classified as single-never married. Additionally, data on the participants’ employment status revealed that the preponderance of mothers (54.3%, $n = 216$) were employed. One hundred seventy five (44%) were unemployed or homemakers; 4 (1%) were retired; and three (.8%) were students. Three participants did not respond to the question on employment status.

All participants except for two mothers reported on the highest level of their education. The results showed that only four (1%) were simply literate. There were 89 (22.3%) elementary school graduates and 163 (40.9%) high school graduates among the participants, while 143 (35.8%) mothers reported completing a university or higher level of education. None of the participants were classified as illiterate. Data gathered on family income per month indicated that 43.2% ($n = 169$) of the mothers in this study had incomes less than YTL 1200; 26.6% ($n = 104$) had incomes between YTL 1200 and YTL
and 30.2% \((n = 118)\) had incomes above YTL 1700. Ten participants did not respond to the question regarding their income level.

Data regarding the participants’ number of children under the age of seven living in their home showed that the majority of the mothers in this study—77.8% \((n = 312)\)—had only one child and 22.2% \((n = 89)\) had two children living in their home under the age of seven. Additionally, 136 (34.1%) mothers reported their youngest child’s age was six. Eight nine (22.3%) mothers had a five-year-old child; 59 (14.8%) had a four-year-old child; 61 (15.3%) had a three-year-old child; 23 (5.8%) had a two-year-old child; and 31 (7.8%) had a one-year-old child. Two participants did not give information about their youngest child’s age. Lastly, of the 401 mothers in the study, 41.9% \((n = 168)\) had only daughter(s); 48.1% \((n = 193)\) had only son(s); and 10% \((n = 40)\) had both daughter(s) and son(s) under the age of seven living in the household.
Table 4.2  
Demographic Information on Participants (n = 401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-34</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, Homemaker</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers’ Highest Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or Higher</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income per Month</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTL 0-1200</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTL 1200-1700</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTL 1700-Above</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of Youngest Child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender of Children

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Daughter(s)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Son(s)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, study participants were predominantly between the ages of 26–34 years and married with one child. The dispersion of the three income levels was almost equal. An overview of demographic data also indicated that most of the parents were either high school or university graduates, which makes them an educated group of people in Turkey (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2007b). Additionally, the data revealed that the mothers participating in this study were from two major groups of employment status. The first group with the largest number of respondents (54%) was employed and the second largest group consisted of mothers who were unemployed or homemakers (44%). For the ‘youngest child’s age’ variable, the number of participants whose youngest child was six years old was the largest group (34%). The mothers whose youngest child’s age was five comprised the second largest group (22%), while those with younger children (ages 1–4 years) followed in decreasing order. Lastly, it appears that most of the participants had only daughter(s) or son(s) and only one-tenth had children of both genders.

**Research Question One**

This section summarizes the data analysis for research question one. Research question one was: What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes?
The researcher gathered data to answer research question one by using the
Turkish version of the PARI 1, a subscale of the Parental Attitudes Research Instrument
(PARI) (see Appendix A), that measures parental attitudes toward overparenting. The
investigator also used a demographic survey (see Appendix B) to gain an understanding
of how mothers’ demographic characteristics—Independent variables—affect their
attitudes toward overparenting—the dependent variable.

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to address research
question one. Descriptive statistics yielded results for addressing Turkish mothers’
attitudes toward overparenting. The application of multiple linear regression analysis
(MLRA) helped in analyzing the relationships between participants’ demographic
characteristics and these attitudes.

The descriptive results for mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting are
summarized in Table 4.3. Of the 401 participants, 381 mothers responded to all PARI 1
items in the instrument. The results indicated that the mothers’ mean score for this
subscale was 2.59/4.00 with an SD of .57.

Table 4.3
Descriptive Statistics for Mothers’ Attitudes toward Overparenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI 1</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: strongly disagree = 1, mildly disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly
agree = 4

When the correlations between each independent variable (IV) and the dependent
variable (DV) were examined separately, it appeared that the IVs of mothers’ age ($r_{pt.bis} = -.107, p < .05$); education level ($r_{pt.bis} = -.328, p < .001$); employment status ($r_{pt.bis} = -.106, p < .05$); and income ($r_{pt.bis} = -.386, p < .001$) were negatively correlated with the
DV of their attitudes toward overparenting. On the other hand, the IV of the youngest child’s age was found to be positively correlated with the DV ($r_{ptbis} = .153$), significant at the $p < .05$ level. Moreover, Huck (2004) described the significance values between $p < .09$ and $p > .05$ as “close” to being significant (pp. 169–171). Thus, the negative correlations found for number of children ($r_{ptbis} = -.080, p = .061$) and gender of children ($r_{ptbis} = -.083, p = .053$) with attitudes toward overparenting were close to being significant.

However, as summarized in Table 4.4, when all of the IVs are combined and their relationships with the DV are evaluated accordingly, the regression results indicated that the only IVs found to be related to the DV were mothers’ education ($b = -.290, S. E. b = .069, \beta = -.214$) and income ($b = -.337, S. E. b = .061, \beta = -.291$). Both relationships were negative and at the $p < .001$ significance level. No relationships were found between the other demographic characteristics (mothers’ age, marital and employment status, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender) and their participants’ attitudes toward overparenting. The results also revealed that the overall regression model is statistically significant ($F = 11.396; p < .001$) and 19.9% of the variance in mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting is explained by the full regression model ($R^2 = .199$).
Table 4.4  
*Regression Results for Mothers’ Attitudes toward Overparenting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S. E. $b$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.906</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = ≤ 34 yrs.</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = ≥ 35 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Separated</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Unemployed, Homemaker Retired</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Literate</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = High School University or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Monthly Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = &lt; 1200 YTL</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = ≥ 1200 YTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Youngest Child</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Only Daughter(s) Only Son(s)</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 11.396$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df = 7 / 375$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .199$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = .182$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the descriptive results showed that mothers’ mean score for attitudes toward overparenting was 2.59/4.00, indicating that they neither support nor believe in high parental control and overprotection. It was also found that Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting are explained by their education and income level. Mothers with higher education and income levels are more likely to have lower levels of overparenting attitudes as compared to mothers with lower education and income levels. This partially supports hypothesis one: Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. However, the results demonstrated that no statistically significant relationships exist between the other demographic characteristics and Turkish mothers’ overparenting attitudes.

Research Question Two

This part contains the data analysis results for research question two. Research question two was: What are Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes? Data gathering for research question two occurred through the use of the Turkish version of the PARI 2, a subscale of the Parental Attitudes Research Instrument (PARI) (see Appendix A), that assesses democratic parental attitudes toward childrearing. A demographic questionnaire was also employed to analyze how demographic characteristics of the mothers (IVs) related to their democratic parental attitudes (DV). Descriptive statistics produced results for mothers’ democratic parental attitudes toward
childrearing, and inferential statistics yielded information about how these attitudes were influenced by the demographic variables.

As summarized in Table 4.5, the descriptive results for mothers’ democratic parental attitudes indicated that 388 of 401 participants answered all items in the PARI 2 subscale. The mean score for Turkish mothers on this subscale was found to be 3.26/4.00. Also, the $SD$ was calculated as .40.

Table 4.5
Descriptive Statistics for Mothers’ Democratic Parental Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI 2</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Response Scale: strongly disagree = 1, mildly disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly agree = 4

Besides, when the correlations between each of the IVs with the DV were examined separately; no significant correlations were found between any demographic variable and mothers’ democratic parental attitudes. Moreover, as presented in Table 4.6, the regression results revealed statistical results for the relationship between the IVs—when combined—and the DV of this research question. The results indicated no significant relationships between the demographic characteristics of the mothers and their democratic parental attitudes. In addition, the results showed that the overall regression model is not statistically significant ($F = 1.354, p = .215$) and only 2.8% of the variance in the mothers’ democratic parental attitudes is explained by the full regression model ($R^2 = .028$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$S. E. b$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.423</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Mother</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = \leq 34$ yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \geq 35$ yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = \text{Separated, Divorced, Widowed}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \text{Married}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = \text{Unemployed, Homemaker, Retired}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \text{Employed}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = \text{Literate, Elementary}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \text{High School, University or Higher}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Monthly Income</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = &lt; 1200$ YTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \geq 1200$ YTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Youngest Child</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Children</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = \text{Only Daughter(s)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \text{Both}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 1.354$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df = 7 / 382$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .028$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = .007$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. = .215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the descriptive results indicate that the mean score for Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes was 3.26/4.00 and they tend to maintain egalitarian relationships and generally develop relationships with their children based on comradeship, which also promotes honest and open communication. Furthermore, the MLRA results reveal that no significant relationships exist between the demographic characteristics (mothers’ age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender) and participants’ democratic attitudes. This does not support hypothesis two: Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. Thus, study results showed that the Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes toward childrearing practices were not explained by any demographic variable.

Research Question Three

This section presents the data analysis for research question three. Research question three was: What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes? The researcher gathered the data by using the PARI 3 subscale of the PARI (see Appendix A) that measures parental attitudes toward hostility and rejection in childrearing practices, such as ignoring the child, fear of harming the baby, and irritability. The demographic questionnaire was also used to obtain data for this research question. The IVs for this research question were participants’ demographic
characteristics and the DV was their attitudes of hostility and rejection. Both descriptive
and inferential statistics were utilized to address this research question.

The descriptive results for mothers’ attitudes of hostility and rejection are
reported in Table 4.7. Of the 401 participants, 388 mothers responded to all PARI 3
items. The results indicated that the mean score of participants for this subscale was
2.12/4.00 with a $SD$ of .53.

Table 4.7
Descriptive Statistics for Mothers’ Attitudes toward Hostility and Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI 3</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Response Scale: strongly disagree = 1, mildly disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly
agree = 4

When the zero-order correlation results for the relationships between each IV with
the DV were evaluated separately, it appeared that the IVs of mothers’ highest education
level ($r_{pt\ bis} = -.105, \ p < .05$); income level ($r_{pt\ bis} = -.204, \ p < .001$); and employment
status ($r_{pt\ bis} = -.183, \ p < .001$) had significant negative correlations with their attitudes of
hostility and rejection. Additionally, the gender of participants’ children was negatively
correlated ($r_{pt\ bis} = -.081$) and the age of respondents’ children was positively correlated
($r_{pt\ bis} = .079$) with their attitudes of hostility and rejection at the $p = .057$ and $p = .060$
levels, respectively, which are close to being statistically significant. However, as
presented in Table 4.8, when the IVs were taken together and their relations to the DV
were analyzed accordingly, the regression results indicated that only mothers’ family
monthly income ($b = -.179, S. E. \ b = .059, \ \beta = -.167$) and employment status ($b = -.137,$
$S. E. \ b = .055, \ \beta = -.129$) were associated with their attitudes of hostility and rejection in
childrearing. Both relationships were negative and significant at the $p < .05$ level. No
relationships were found between other demographic variables (mothers’ age, marital status, education level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender) and participants’ attitudes of hostility and rejection. Further, the results demonstrated that the overall regression model is statistically significant ($F = 3.987, p < .001$) and 7.8% of the variance in mothers’ attitudes of hostility and rejection is explained by the full regression model ($R^2 = .078$).
Table 4.8
Regression Results for Mothers’ Attitudes toward Hostility and Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S. E. $b$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = \leq 34$ yrs.</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \geq 35$ yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 =$ Separated Divorced Widowed</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 =$ Unemployed, Homemaker Retired Student</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 =$ Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 =$ Literate Elementary</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 =$ High School University or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Monthly Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = &lt; 1200$ YTL</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \geq 1200$ YTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Youngest Child</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 =$ Only Daughter(s) Only Son(s)</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 =$ Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Summary
$F = 3.987$
$df = 7 / 383$
$R^2 = .078$
Adjusted $R^2 = .059$
Sig. < .001
In sum, the results indicated that the mean score for Turkish mothers’ hostility and rejection attitudes was 2.12/4.00. This finding proposes that the Turkish mothers in the study do not have dissatisfaction problem with their parental role. Also, regression results showed that Turkish mothers’ hostility and rejection attitudes toward childrearing practices are significantly influenced by their income level and employment status. Higher monthly family income is associated with decreased hostility and rejection attitudes. Additionally, mothers who are employed possess a lower level of hostility and have fewer rejection attitudes compared to mothers with other employment statuses. This partially supports hypothesis three: Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. No significant relationships existed between other demographic characteristics (mothers’ age, marital status, education level, number of children, youngest child’s age and children’s gender) and mothers’ hostility and rejection attitudes toward childrearing practices.

**Research Question Four**

This part presents the data analysis results for research question four: What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes? Data for this question were gathered using the PARI 4, a subscale of the PARI (see Appendix A), which measures maternal attitudes toward marital discord such as marital conflict and inconsiderateness of the husband in relation to childrearing practices. The demographic questionnaire for the main study was used to provide information for this research question as well. For research
question four, the IVs included the mothers’ demographic characteristics and the DV represented their attitudes toward marital discord. The investigator used both descriptive and inferential statistics to answer this research question.

As summarized in Table 4.9, the descriptive results revealed that 393 participants responded to all items in the PARI 4 subscale. The participants’ mean score for marital discord items was 2.13/4.00. The SD was computed as .69.

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI 4</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Response Scale: strongly disagree = 1, mildly disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly agree = 4

When each IV was taken singly, the results revealed that participants’ education ($r_{pt bis} = -.087$) and income ($r_{pt bis} = -.228$) were negatively correlated with their marital discord attitudes at the $p < .05$ and $p < .001$ significance levels, respectively. Also, the IV of the youngest child’s age was positively associated to mothers’ marital discord attitudes ($r_{pt bis} = .081, p = .055$). However, when the IVs were combined and evaluated accordingly, as shown in Table 4.10, the only predictor variable found to be related to the DV was mothers’ income level ($b = -.307, S. E. b = .078, \beta = -.221$). This relationship was negative and statistically significant at the $p < .001$ level.

The MLRA results also provided some other information on the overall regression model. For instance, it was found that the overall regression model for research question four was statistically significant ($F = 2.910, p < .05$). Further, the results indicated that 5.8% of the variance in mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord is explained by the full regression model ($R^2 = .058$).
Table 4.10
*Regression Results for Mothers’ Attitudes toward Marital Discord*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>S. E. $b$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.498</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = \leq 34$ yrs.</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \geq 35$ yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = $Separated, Divorced, Widowed</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = $Unemployed, Homemaker, Retired</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = $Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = $Literate, Elementary</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Monthly Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = &lt;$1200 YTL</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = \geq 1200$ YTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = $1</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.0128</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Youngest Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = $Only Daughter(s), Only Son(s)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = $Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 = $Only Daughter(s), Only Son(s)</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 = $Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 2.910$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df = 7 / 387$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .058$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = .038$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequently, the descriptive results suggested that the mean score for Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord was 2.13/4.00. The regression results for research question four also posited that Turkish mothers’ marital discord attitudes are influenced by their income level. A higher level of monthly family income is associated with decreased marital discord attitudes. This partially supports hypothesis four: Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. No significant relationships existed between other demographic characteristics (mothers’ age, marital and employment status, education level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender) and mothers’ marital discord attitudes with regard to childrearing practices.

Research Question Five

This section contains the results of the data analysis for research question five: What are Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender these attitudes? The researcher gathered data to address this question by employing PARI 5 (see Appendix A) which assesses parents’ authoritarian attitudes toward childrearing. The demographic questionnaire was also used. The IVs for this research question were the Turkish mothers’ demographic characteristics and the DV was their authoritarian parental attitudes. Both descriptive and inferential statistical methods were applied to address this research question.

As summarized in Table 4.11, the descriptive statistics addressed Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes. The results show that 379 of 401 participants
answered all items in the PARI 5 subscale. The mean score for Turkish mothers on this subscale was calculated as 2.12/4.00 with an SD of .50.

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI 5</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Response Scale: strongly disagree = 1, mildly disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly agree = 4

It was also reported that when each IV is taken singly and the correlation to the DV is computed, mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes were correlated with their age ($r_{pt \ bis} = -.131$, $p < .05$); employment status ($r_{pt \ bis} = -.162$, $p < .05$); education ($r_{pt \ bis} = -.293$, $p < .001$) and income ($r_{pt \ bis} = -.420$, $p < .001$); number of children ($r_{pt \ bis} = -.105$, $p < .05$); and children’s gender ($r_{pt \ bis} = -.096$, $p < .05$); and the youngest child’s age ($r_{pt \ bis} = .196$, $p < .001$). However, as shown in Table 4.12, the MLRA results indicate mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes were associated only with their education ($b = -.192$, $S. E. b = .078$, $\beta = -.221$, $p < .05$) and income level ($b = -.337$, $S. E. b = .052$, $\beta = -.334$, $p < .001$), when the IVs are combined. The overall regression model of this research question is statistically significant ($F = 13.046$, $p < .001$), and 22.2% of the variance in the mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes is explained by the regression model ($R^2 = .222$).
### Table 4.12

*Regression Results for Mothers’ Authoritarian Parental Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>S. E. ( b )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.469</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = ≤ 34 yrs.</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = ≥ 35 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Separated, Divorced, Widowed, Married</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Unemployed, Homemaker, Retired, Student</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Literate, Elementary</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = High School, University or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Monthly Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = &lt; 1200 YTL</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = ≥ 1200 YTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Youngest Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Only Daughter(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Only Son(s)</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F = 13.046 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( df = 7 / 373 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 = .222 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 = .205 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the results indicated that the mean score for Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes was 2.12/4.00. In addition, the regression results suggested that the Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes are influenced by their education and income levels. An increase in mothers’ education and family monthly income was associated with decreased authoritarian parental attitudes. This partially supports hypothesis five: Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes are predicted by their age, marital and employment status, education and income level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. No significant relationships were found between other demographic characteristics (mothers’ age, marital and employment status, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender) and mothers’ authoritarian attitudes with regard to childrearing practices.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to discover Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing practices and the influences of particular demographic variables on these attitudes. This study examined a major question and five ancillary questions to address the major question. Quantitative data analysis techniques were used to address the research questions and thus accomplish the purpose of the study.

The sample included 401 Turkish mothers with a child attending one of the five early childhood education centers in Istanbul, Turkey, from which the participants were recruited. The mothers responded to the PARI scale (see Appendix A) and a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B). The PARI scale was employed to understand Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing practices and the demographic questionnaire was used to examine the influences of demographic factors on these attitudes.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics aided in understanding Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing practices. To examine the influences of demographic factors on parental attitudes toward childrearing practices, the MLRA was used. The following section includes discussion of the findings from this study.
Discussion of the Findings

This section includes a discussion of the findings from this study. The related literature and findings from other research studies focusing on parental attitudes toward childrearing practices are also presented in this section to fully understand and evaluate the findings from the current study. Major findings for each research question are represented in the following subsections.

Research Question One

Research question one was: What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes? The first research question focused on describing Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting. The influences of demographic characteristics on these attitudes were examined through this question.

LeCompte et al. (1978) explained that overparenting was characterized by high parental control and overprotection, which in turn foster a child’s dependence on its parents. Several studies suggested that overparenting has negative consequences for the parent-child relationship and child development (e.g., Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). Therefore, it was crucial to understand Turkish mothers’ overparenting attitudes and the influences of demographic variables on these attitudes.

In this study, Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting were measured via the PARI 1 scale. Participants’ demographic characteristics were measured with a demographic questionnaire. The data were analyzed by applying descriptive statistics and the MLRA.
Findings indicated that Turkish mothers’ mean score on the PARI 1 scale was 2.59/4.00, indicating that they hold attitudes that neither support nor indicate high parental control and over-protection. This finding is significant since overparenting has been documented to have negative consequences for the parent-child relationship and child development (e.g., Aunola & Nurmi, 2005).

However, other research at the cross-cultural level implies the existence of higher levels of overparenting attitudes for Turkish parents compared to U.S. parents. For instance, Taylor and Oskay (1995) indicated that Turkish parents use more parental control in childrearing than U.S. parents. Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) also reported that Turkish adolescents’ perceptions of parental control were greater than those of U.S. adolescents.

Additionally, the MLRA results from this study revealed that Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting were influenced by their family’s monthly income and education level. Higher education and income levels are associated with lower levels of overparenting; conversely, lower education and income levels are associated with higher levels of overparenting. No statistically significant relationships were found among Turkish mothers’ age, marital and employment status, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender and their overparenting attitudes.

The literature contains descriptions of other studies focused on the association between demographic characteristics and parental attitudes in the Turkish context (e.g., Pehlivanoğlu, 1998). For instance, in line with this study, Ocakçı et al. (2006) reported that lower socioeconomic status was associated with higher levels of overparenting. Further, and similar to this study, Mızrakçı (1994) found that increases in mothers’ education level were linked to lower levels of overparenting attitudes. However, she
indicated that mothers with daughters were more likely to hold overparenting attitudes than mothers with sons, a finding not supported by this study.

Overall, the findings from this study concerning the association between Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward overparenting and their demographic characteristics were very significant in terms of highlighting lower overparenting attitudes and increased education and income levels. Therefore, it can be claimed that increases in the education and income levels of Turkish mothers that lead to socioeconomic advancement on a larger scale may be effective in developing positive parental attitudes toward childrearing. As claimed by Sunar (2002), this socioeconomic advancement is associated with decreased interdependencies between parent and child. This change in the parent-child relationship is more noticeable in urban areas within Turkey, where social change is more discernible. Thus, as documented by this study, the moderate level of overparenting held by Turkish mothers can also be interpreted as influencing social change in parental attitudes toward childrearing practices.

Research Question Two

The second research question was: What are Turkish mothers’ democratic parental attitudes and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes? This research question sought descriptions of Turkish mothers’ democratic attitudes toward childrearing practices. The influences of demographic characteristics on these attitudes were also examined through this question.

LeCompte et al. (1978) indicated that parents with democratic attitudes maintain egalitarian relationships with their children based on comradeship and respect for their
children’s autonomy. In the literature, democratic parenting and authoritative parenting are used interchangeably (Mupinga et al., 2002). Baumrind (1971) reported that parents who have democratic childrearing attitudes maintain close relationships with their children while moderately controlling them.

In this study, Turkish mothers’ democratic attitudes were measured via the PARI 2 scale and demographic characteristics were measured via a demographic survey. The data were analyzed by applying descriptive statistics and the MLRA. In the following paragraphs, the findings are discussed in the light of other studies’ findings and the related literature.

Findings from this study revealed that Turkish mothers’ mean score on the PARI 2 scale was 3.26/4.00. Therefore, it can be claimed that Turkish mothers tend to maintain egalitarian relationships with their children based on comradeship with open and honest communication. This finding is so important because it documents an increase in Turkish mothers’ democratic childrearing attitudes compared to other studies in the past conducted with a Turkish sample (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982).

Moreover, other research (e.g., Sunar, 2002) indicated an increase in democratic parental attitudes and a decrease in authoritarian parental attitudes when comparing childrearing practices across generations of urban middle-class Turkish families. Further, Sunar (2002) claimed that a child’s autonomy received greater emphasis in new generations, compared to previous generations. The findings from the current study were consistent with Sunar’s (2002) research in confirming increased democratic parental attitudes for Turkish parents. In addition, a comparison of first (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982) and second Turkish VOC studies (Ataca et al., 2005) documented the increase in parents’
democratic parental attitudes, a finding that is in line with this study. According to the second Turkish VOC study, the most significant parenting goal was being a good person, followed by “success at school”, “popularity”, “minding parents (being obedient)”, and “independence” (Ataca et al., 2005, p. 112). However, in the first Turkish VOC, “minding parents (being obedient)” was indicated as the most important parenting goal together with “being a good person” (Ataca et al., 2005, p. 112). Although being a good person was indicated to be the most important parenting goal in both studies, the increasing importance of school success and decreasing importance of minding parents reveals a change in parenting goals toward modernistic values. Child’s independence and autonomy, which are required for success in a modern lifestyle (Mayer et al., 2005), seem to be valued more highly in Turkish society as socioeconomic advancement occurs. Therefore, it can be claimed that socioeconomic advancement and acceptance of modern values, which are the main characteristics of social change in Turkey (Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 2002) accelerate the increase in Turkish mothers’ democratic attitudes toward childrearing.

On the other hand, some other research (e.g., Mızrakçı, 1994) indicates a significant relationship between parents’ democratic attitudes toward childrearing practices and their demographic characteristics. For instance, employment and increased education level were linked with higher levels of democratic parental attitudes (Ocakçı et al., 2006). Likewise, Mızrakçı’s (1994) study also revealed that increases in education level were associated with more democratic attitudes toward childrearing. However, in contrast with these studies, the researcher found no significant relationships between demographic characteristics (mothers’ age, marital and employment status, education and
income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender) and mothers’ democratic parental attitudes toward childrearing practices. Hence, it can be inferred that none of these demographic characteristics influence Turkish mothers’ democratic childrearing attitudes. This finding supported Imamoğlu’s (1987) research in which she found that although Turkish mothers highly valued love and emotional interdependence between parent and child, this was independent from mothers’ SES levels.

Overall, the findings from this study are significant in terms of underscoring Turkish mothers’ democratic attitudes toward childrearing practices independent from their demographic characteristics. Compared to previous research (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982), democratic parental attitudes emphasizing child’s autonomy and independence seem to be more important for Turkish mothers of young children. This increase in democratic parental attitudes might be explained by the social change in Turkish society, since increased respect for a child’s autonomy is a positive aspect of the modern lifestyle for Turkish urban families.
Research Question Three

Research question three was: What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes? The third research question investigated Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection of childrearing practices. An indication of the influence of democratic characteristics on these attitudes was also sought in this question.

LeCompte et al (1978) stated that attitudes of hostility and rejection signify dissatisfaction with the parental role. The rejection of the parental role is also accompanied by high levels of parental stress (LeCompte et al., 1978). In the literature, rejection of the parental role and high parental stress are negatively associated with the child’s psychological and emotional well-being (Assel et al., 2002). Therefore, it was crucial to learn about Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection and particularly about the democratic characteristics that influence these attitudes.

In this study, Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward hostility and rejection were measured via the PARI 3 scale. Participants’ demographic characteristics were measured via a demographic questionnaire. The data were analyzed by applying descriptive statistics and the MLRA. Discussion of the findings from these analyses are represented in the following paragraphs.

Descriptive findings indicated that the Turkish mothers’ mean score on the PARI 3 scale was 2.12/4.00, which indicates that Turkish mothers in this study do not have dissatisfaction problems with their maternal roles. Also, it can be claimed that the parental stress associated with hostility toward and rejection of the maternal role is also
low for Turkish mothers in this study. This finding is significant in documenting the low level of hostility toward and rejection of childrearing, since rejection of parental role and accompanying parental stress have been documented to negatively affect children’s emotional (Assel et al., 2002), behavioral and cognitive well-being (Onatsu-Arvilommi et al., 1998).

On the other hand, the MLRA results from this study revealed that Turkish mothers’ attitudes of hostility and rejection were influenced by mothers’ monthly family income level. This means that higher levels of monthly family income were associated with decreased hostility and rejection attitudes; conversely, lower levels of family income were associated with increased hostility and rejection attitudes. Consistent with these findings, Dodge et al. (1994) claimed that low SES level was found to correlate with “lack of maternal warmth” and “maternal aggressive values” in a longitudinal study of 51 low-socioeconomic children from preschool to grade 3 (p. 649). Therefore, this study’s findings are significant in pointing out the relationship between family income level and mothers’ attitudes of hostility and rejection.

Additionally, the MLRA results showed that mothers who were employed had lower levels of hostility and rejection attitudes compared to mothers of other employment statuses. This finding is also supported by Ocakçı’s study (2006), which documented increased attitudes of hostility and rejection among unemployed mothers. This study’s finding about the influence of maternal unemployment on attitudes of hostility and rejection toward childrearing is very important. As a reflection of gender hierarchy in the traditional Turkish family structure, Turkish mothers are primarily responsible for housekeeping and childrearing (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). Therefore, it can be inferred that
mothers’ intense homemaking roles might influence their hostility toward and rejection of childrearing.

Lastly, the MLRA results revealed no significant relationships between mothers’ age, marital status, education level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. Therefore, this study indicated that unemployment and low income level were the only predictors of attitudes of hostility toward and rejection of childrearing practices. This finding is very significant since rejection of maternal role and accompanying parental stress have been shown to be detrimental to a child’s psychological well-being (Assel et al., 2002).

**Research Question Four**

The fourth research question was: What are Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes? The fourth research question of this study is focused on describing Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord. The influence of democratic characteristics on these attitudes is also examined in this question.

LeCompte et al (1978) claimed that marital discord reflected tensions and conflict in marriage that negatively affected parents’ attitudes toward childrearing. Additionally, Patterson (2002) asserted that parents who have discord in their marriages modeled negative behavior toward their children. Consequently, child development is negatively affected by marital discord. Therefore, it was crucial to understand Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord and the democratic characteristics that influence these attitudes.
In this study, Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward marital discord were measured via the PARI 4 scale and demographic characteristics were measured via a demographic scale. The data were analyzed by applying descriptive statistics and the MLRA. The findings are discussed here.

Turkish mothers’ mean score on the PARI 4 scale was found to be 2.13/4.00. This finding is very significant in terms of highlighting the level of marital discord between spouses. According to Fişek (1995), gender and generational hierarchy cause fathers to be stronger in families than mothers and children in the traditional Turkish family structure. However, women’s increasing status in the family and decreasing male dominance in the family are documented in recent studies (e.g., Ataca & Sunar, 1999). Ataca and Sunar (1999) also pointed out the increased decision-making power and intrafamily status of urban middle-class mothers compared to findings from previous research. They also claimed that the increased intrafamily status of mothers has been accompanied by more egalitarian relationships between spouses. Hence, Turkish mothers’ level of marital discord, which is documented in this study, signifies a positive change in marriages characterized by more egalitarian spousal relationships. This level of marital discord also might be related to the increasing intrafamily status of women and decreasing autonomy of men in the family. These changes in the urban family structure might be related to socioeconomic advancement and social change toward modernism in Turkey.

Moreover, the MLRA results for research question four revealed that Turkish mothers’ marital discord attitudes were influenced by their monthly family income level, and not influenced by mothers’ age, marital and employment status, education level, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. That is, increased
monthly family income is associated with decreased marital discord; conversely, decreased monthly family income is associated with increased marital discord. This finding is in line with the results of the Population, Housing, and Demography Survey (2007), which revealed the most frequently cited reasons for problems with the spouse (TSI, 2007b). Accordingly, this survey found that the main reasons for spousal conflicts were responsibilities in the home and for children (34.8%), insufficient income (31.6%) and expenditures (31.2%) (TSI, 2007b). Therefore, it might be claimed that economic hardships and insufficient income negatively affect marital accordance.

Additionally, Dodge et al. (1994) indicated that low SES level of mothers correlated with factors that included “exposure to aggressive adult models, maternal aggressive values, family life stressors, mother's lack of social support, peer group instability, and lack of cognitive stimulation” (Dodge et al., p. 649). Hence, the aggression and discord experienced in spousal relationships might be detrimental to a child’s social and cognitive development.

In sum, the negative effects of marital discord on a child’s social and cognitive development should be considered. For that reason, the findings from this study are very important. This study documents the level of marital discord experienced in Turkish families in regard to childrearing practices, and negative effect of monthly family income level on marital accord. Thus, it can be argued that economic hardships and insufficient income negatively influence marital accord with respect to childrearing practices.
Research Question Five

Research question five was: What are Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes and how do their age, marital and employment status, education and income levels, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender affect these attitudes? The fifth research question focused on Turkish mothers’ authoritarian parental attitudes. The influences of democratic characteristics on these attitudes were also sought in this question.

Authoritarian parenting refers to parents’ absolute authority, negative childrearing attitudes and strict discipline and harsh punishment (LeCompte et al., 1978). Authoritarian parental attitudes cause the child to be dependent on parents through a socialization process emphasizing obedience and control (Kağıtçibaşı, 2007). This type of parenting has been documented to result in behavioral problems in early childhood and adolescence (e.g. Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2006). Therefore, it was critical to explore Turkish mothers’ authoritarian attitudes toward childrearing practices and the influences of democratic characteristics on these attitudes.

In this study, Turkish mothers’ authoritarian attitudes were measured via the PARI 4 scale. Participants’ demographic characteristics were measured via a demographic questionnaire. The data were analyzed by utilizing descriptive statistics and the MLRA. The following paragraphs present the findings from the statistical analysis for this study, and discussion of these findings in light of related literature.

Findings showed that Turkish mothers’ mean score on the PARI 5 scale was 2.12/4.00, indicating that Turkish mothers tended to have negative attitudes toward implementing strict and absolute disciplinary techniques in childrearing. Since
authoritarian parenting has been documented to lead to behavioral problems from early childhood to adolescence (Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2006), this study’s finding is of great significance in indicating a low level of authoritarian parental attitudes of Turkish mothers.

The MLRA results for research question five also revealed that Turkish mothers’ authoritarian attitudes were influenced by their education and income levels and not influenced by their age, marital and employment status, number of children, youngest child’s age, and children’s gender. Increased education level and monthly family income were associated with decreased authoritarian parental attitudes; on the other hand, decreased education level and monthly family income were associated with increased authoritarian parental attitudes. This finding is also supported by other research conducted in other societies (e.g., Assadi et al., 2007) and Turkish culture (e.g., Pehlivanoglu, 1998). Assadi et al. (2007) indicated that socioeconomic status was a significant determinant of parenting style in Iranian society. Accordingly, families of lower economical status were found to display more authoritarian attitudes than families of higher economic status. Also, Mizrakçı (1994) revealed that decreased education level was linked to more authoritarian parental attitudes in the Turkish context. Further, Pehlivanoglu (1998) found that low SES parents were more authoritarian, less encouraging of a child’s independence, and less affectionate with their children.

Moreover, other research supports this study’s findings in Western cultures. For instance, Coolahan et al. (2002) indicated that low education level of parents was linked to active-restrictive (authoritarian) and passive-permissive (permissive) parenting in their research with primary caregivers of urban Head Start children. Further, Dodge et al.
(1994) showed that low SES level was linked with harsh disciplinary techniques in parenting.

Overall, the findings for research question five are similar to those from other studies conducted both in Turkish and other cultures. These findings are of great significance in documenting Turkish authoritarian attitudes toward childrearing practices and particular demographic characteristics that influence these attitudes. It is also crucial to examine these findings in light of the social change experienced in Turkish society.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study explored Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices in Istanbul, Turkey, and contributed to the parenting and early childhood education literature. However, this study’s findings need to be regarded for their sociocultural relevance and in light of the social change in Turkish society. This study provides significant information for researchers and every interested individual who wishes to understand the relationship between parenting attitudes and culture at the cross-cultural level. Thus, this study contributes to the literature by providing updated research results on the relationships among parenting, parental attitudes, and social change in the Turkish context. It is hoped that this study’s results will provide an important source of information for researchers interested in parental attitudes toward childrearing practices at the cross-cultural level, and teachers, policy makers, and practitioners in the field of early childhood education in Turkey.

However, this study has some limitations. For instance, the sample for this study included Turkish mothers of children aged 0–6 years who attended early childhood education centers in Istanbul, Turkey. Therefore, future research needs to be conducted in
different geographical regions, cities, and villages in Turkey, to consider the population’s
different sociodemographic characteristics.

Moreover, this study only included the mothers of young children, given the
importance and centrality of mothers in childrearing and homemaking chores in Turkish
culture (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). However, considering the increasing intrafamily status of
women and more egalitarian relationships between spouses preceded by social change in
Turkey (Ataca & Sunar, 1999), fathers’ roles in childrearing and their parental attitudes
need to be investigated in future research. More to the point, teachers’ attitudes toward
young children’s education also need to be taken into consideration. Therefore, further
studies might focus on teachers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices and their
influences on teachers’ beliefs and practices in early childhood education.

Additionally, this study included the mothers of young children who attended
early childhood education centers. Therefore, the mothers of young children who do not
receive early childhood education were excluded from this study. Future research needs
to be done with mothers of young children who do not attend early childhood education
centers for personal reasons, inaccessibility of these centers, or financial reasons.
Considering the importance of family monthly income (Pehlivanoğlu, 1998) and parents’
education level (Ömeroğlu, 1996) on parental attitudes, a finding that is also supported by
this study, future research needs to be done with parents who have low income and
education levels. More to the point, the children of these parents are believed to be at risk
for optimal education (Guralnick, 1997). Therefore, future research needs to focus on
parents and their at-risk children with limited income and education levels.
Another limitation of this study is relevant to the quantitative methodology followed here. This study employed the PARI scale and a demographic survey to investigate Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes and collected numeric descriptions of these attitudes. However, other qualitative inquiry methods, such as interviews, observation, and artifact analysis (Creswell, 2003), might be implemented in future studies. Hence, these methods provide detailed information on participants’ childrearing attitudes through interviews and present actual behaviors of parents through observations.

This study is related to the nature of the PARI scale. The PARI scale was developed by Schaefer and Bell in 1958 in the U.S., and was adapted to the Turkish culture by LeCompte et al. in 1978. This scale is widely used in Turkey by many researchers from a variety of scientific fields and has been proved to have sound reliability (LeCompte et al., 1978) and validity (Küçük, 1987). However, future research needs to focus on developing a parental attitudes research instrument that is based on existing research in the Turkish context. Therefore, parental attitudes toward childrearing practices should be measured in accordance with the Turkish culture and language.

Overall, this study provided significant results about Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing practices and demographic characteristics that influence these attitudes. This study provides a significant source of information for every interested individual at the cross-cultural level. Moreover, this study has important implications for parents, researchers, policy makers, and teachers in the field of early childhood education in Turkey. These implications are presented in the next section.
**Implications for Early Childhood Education**

This section includes a discussion of the significant implications of this study’s findings for early childhood education. Since parental attitudes toward childrearing practices significantly influence young children’s development and socialization (Kağıtçibaşı & Sunar, 2002), this study’s findings help to indicate the quality of early childhood education in Turkey. Parents, administrators, and teachers may play important roles in formulating necessary regulations based on the implications of this study. Moreover, since educational policy and planning is regulated by the central government in Turkey, the implications of this study are also beneficial for policy makers.

This study revealed that the monthly family income and education level of Turkish mothers were the most significant variables influencing parental attitudes toward childrearing practices. In particular, decreased monthly family income was associated with increased overparenting, hostility and rejection, marital discord, and authoritarian attitudes. Further, decreased education level was associated with lower overparenting and authoritarian attitudes. Hence, it is clear that the increased income and education levels of mothers are linked with more positive attitudes toward childrearing practices. Therefore, there is a need to consider the influence of parents’ income and education levels on the education of young children. In particular, additional care needs to be taken with parents of young children who have low income and education levels, since these children are considered to be at risk for optimal education (Guralnick, 1997). Therefore, early childhood education programs targeting families with low income and education levels need to be developed in Turkey. These programs need to provide educational resources both for children and families. Initiatives such as Head Start and Even Start constitute
successful examples of these programs and should be brought to the attention of policy makers in Turkey.

Parents and children need to be supported by home-based early intervention programs. These programs, such as Parent–Child Home Program (Levenstein, Levenstein & Oliver, 2002) and Turkish Early Enrichment Project (Kağıtçibaşı, 1991), in Turkey seek to enrich the relationship between mothers and young children through play materials and books and yield significant effects in developing the mother-child relationship. Home-based intervention programs are effective ways to develop parent-child interactions in their natural environment. Thus, home-based intervention programs need to be developed for low-income families with young children in Turkey.

Furthermore, mothers with low income and education levels need to be educated about how to develop meaningful and nurturing relationships with their children, beginning in infancy. Kağıtçibaşı (2007) asserted that parent education was associated with sharing companionship with children. Therefore, early childhood education centers need to develop parent education programs and assist parents about how to interact with their children in developmentally appropriate ways.

Another significant result of this study was the negative effect of low income and non-employment of mothers on their hostility toward and rejection of childrearing practices. Since mothers are primarily responsible for childrearing and homemaking chores in Turkish culture, having children might constitute a reason for the non-employment of mothers. Taking care of home and children might heighten parental stress and lead to rejection of the parental role. Therefore, some intervention programs that aim to socialize non-employed mothers and young children might help in nurturing mother-
child interactions. Play groups, recreational programs, and support groups may help in socializing mothers and children by enabling them to meet other mothers and children. Also, through these programs, mothers and children can learn numerous ways to play together and enrich their relationships.

Moreover, since the non-employment of mothers heightens their attitudes of hostility and rejection in parenting, fathers also might be encouraged to become involved in childcare and help mothers. For instance, early childhood education centers can initiate programs that focus on involving fathers in their children’s education. Parent education sessions that aim to involve fathers in their children’s play might also help.

Overall, parental attitudes toward childrearing practices are significant determinants of child development. This study’s findings about Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing practices and significant demographic factors influencing these attitudes need to be considered in developing policies, programs, and curricula in the field of early childhood education. The researcher believes that understanding parental attitudes toward childrearing practices and developing appropriate strategies to foster the relationship between mother and child will help improve the effectiveness of early childhood education programs in Turkey.
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Appendix A

English and Turkish Version of Parental Attitude Research Instrument
Parental Attitude Research Instrument

Read each of the statements below and then rate them as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate your opinion by drawing a circle around one of these numbers. There are no right or wrong answers, so answer according to your own opinion. Many of the statements will seem alike but all are necessary to show slight differences of opinion.

1. A child should be protected from jobs which might be too tiring or hard for him.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

2. Parents who start a child talking about his worries don't realize that sometimes it's better to just leave well enough alone.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

3. The sooner a child learns that a wasted minute is lost forever the better off he will be.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

4. A mother should do her best to avoid any disappointment for her child.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

5. The sooner a child learns to walk the better he's trained.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

6. Raising children is a nerve-wracking job.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

7. There are so many things a child has to learn in life there is no excuse for him sitting around with time on his hands.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

8. Mothers would do their job better with the children if fathers were more kind.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

9. One of the bad things about raising children is that you aren't free enough of the time to do just as you like.  
   - Strongly Agree: 4  
   - Agree: 3  
   - Mildly Disagree: 2  
   - Strongly Disagree: 1

10. Children who are held to firm rules grow up to be the best adults.  
    - Strongly Agree: 4  
    - Agree: 3  
    - Mildly Disagree: 2  
    - Strongly Disagree: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. A mother must expect to give up her own happiness for that of her child.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A child who is &quot;on the go&quot; all the time will most likely be happy.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Laughing at children's jokes and telling children jokes makes things go more smoothly.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A mother should make it her business to know everything her children are thinking.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. More parents should teach their children to have unquestioning loyalty to them.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. All young mothers are afraid of their awkwardness in handling and holding the baby.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Children will get on any woman's nerves if she has to be with them all day.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Parents should adjust to the children some rather than always expecting the children to adjust to the parents.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If mothers could get their wishes they would most often ask that their husband be more understanding.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It's natural for a mother to &quot;blow her top&quot; when children are selfish and demanding.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Children should be encouraged to tell their parents about it whenever they feel family rules are unreasonable.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Mothers very often feel that they can't stand their children a moment longer.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. A child will be grateful later on for strict training.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. A young child should be protected from hearing about sex.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. A mother has a right to know everything going on in her child's life because her child is part of her.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. An alert parent should try to learn all her child's thoughts.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Children should realize how much parents have to give up for them.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. If you let children talk about their troubles they end up complaining even more.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Strict discipline develops a fine strong character.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. A young mother feels &quot;held down&quot; because there are lots of things she wants to do while she is young.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Mothers sacrifice almost all their own fun for their children.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Husbands could do their part if they were less selfish.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. A good mother should shelter her child from life's little difficulties.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The child should be taught to revere his parents above all other grown-ups.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. A child should never keep a secret from his parents.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Children are too often asked to do all the compromising and adjustment and that is not fair.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Most mothers are fearful that they may hurt their babies in handling them.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. A child should be taught to always come to his parents or teachers rather than fight when he is in trouble.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. There are some things which just can't be settled by a mild discussion.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. One of the worst things about taking care of a home is a woman feels that she can't get out.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Taking care of a small baby is something that no woman should be expected to do all by herself.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. It is very important that young boys and girls not be allowed to see each other completely undressed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The trouble with giving attention to children's problems is they usually just make up a lot of stories to keep you interested.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. If parents would have fun with their children, the children would be more apt to take their advice.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Children should be more considerate of their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. A child soon learns that there is no greater wisdom than that of his parents.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. When a mother doesn't do a good job with children it's probably because the father doesn't do his part around the home.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. There is nothing worse for a young mother than being alone while going through her first experience with a baby.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. There is no good excuse for a child hitting another child.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Parents should teach their children that the way to get ahead is to keep busy and not waste time.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. A wise woman will do anything to avoid being by herself before and after a new baby.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. A mother has to do the planning because she is the one who knows what's going on in the home.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Sometimes it's necessary for a wife to tell off her husband in order to get her rights.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Having to be with the children all the time gives a woman the feeling her wings have been clipped.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. The whole family does fine if the mother puts her shoulders to the wheel and takes charge of things.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Children should be kept away from all hard jobs which might be discouraging.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Children are actually happier under strict training.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Parents who are interested in hearing about their children's parties, dates and fun help them grow up right.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Loyalty to parents comes before anything else.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Çocuk Yetiştirme Tutumu Ölçeği

İlişikte aile hayatı ve çocuk yetiştirme tutumlarıyla ilgili bazı ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadeleri okuyup, şu şekilde değerlendiriniz:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Çok uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Biraz uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Çocuk yorucu veya zor işlerden korunmalıdır.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anne ve babalar, çocuklarını dertlerini anlatmaya teşvik ederler. Fakat bazen çocukların dertlerinin hiç açılmamasını gerektğini anlayamazlar.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Çocuk boşa geçen dakikaların bir daha hiç gelmeyeceğini ne kadar çabuk öğrenirse, kendisi için o kadar iyi olur.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bir anne çocuğunun düş kırıklığına uğramaması için elinden geleni yapmalıdır.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Çocuk ne kadar erken yürümeyi öğrenirse o kadar iyi terbiye edilebilir.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Çocuk yetiştirmek sinir bozucu, yıpratıcı bir iştır.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Çocuğun hayatta öğrenmesi gereken o kadar çok şey vardır ki, zamanını boşa geçirmesi affedilmemelidir.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Babalar, biraz daha şefkatli olsalar, anneler çocuklarını daha iyi yönetebilirler.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Çocuk yetiştirmenin kötü taraflarından biride anne ya da babanın istediğini yapabilmesi için yeter derecede özgür olmanasızdır.  4 3 2 1

10. Sıkı kurallarla yetiştirilen çocuklardan en iyi yetişkinler çıkar.  4 3 2 1

11. Bir anne çocuğunun mutluluğu için kendine mutluluğunu feda etmesini bilmelidir.  4 3 2 1

12. Daima koşuşurança, hareketli bir çocuk büyük bir olsa olmasa mutlu bir kişi olacaktır.  4 3 2 1

13. Büyükler çocukların şakalarına gülerek, onlara eğlendirici öyküler anlatarsa evdeki düzen daha düzgün, daha akıcı olur.  4 3 2 1

14. Çocuğun en gizli düşüncelerini kesinlikle bilmek, bir annenin görevidir.  4 3 2 1

15. Anne babalar çocuklarına, sorgusuz sualsız kendilerine sadık kalmalarını görmelidir.  4 3 2 1

16. Bütün genç anneler, bebek bakımında beceriksiz olanların korkarlar.  4 3 2 1

17. Eğer bütün gününü çocuklarla geçirerek zorunda kalırsar, hangi anne olursa olsun onu bunda çocuklar sinirine dokunur.  4 3 2 1

18. Anne ve babalar her zaman çocukların kendilerine uymasını beklememeli, birazda kendileri çocuklarına uymalıdır.  4 3 2 1

19. Eğer anneler dileklerinin kabul edileceğini bilserlerdi, babaların daha anlayışı olmalarını dilerdiler.  4 3 2 1
20. Bir çocuğa ne olursa olsun dövüşmekteki kaçırmaları gerektiği öğretilmelidir.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Çocuklar bencil olduklarında, hep bir şeyler istediklerinde, annenin tepesinin atması çok normaldir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Eğer çocuklar ailedeki kuralları uygun bulmuyorsa, bunu anne babalarına söylemeleri hoş karşılamanmalıdır.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Anneler çoğu zaman çocuklarına bir dakika daha dayanamayacakları duyğusuna kapatırlar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Çocuğun sıkı terbiye edersiniz sonra size teşekkür eder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Bir annenin çocuğunun hayatı hakkında her şeyi bilmesi hakkıdır. Çünkü çocuğunu onun bir parçasıdır.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Uyanık bir anne-baba çocuğun tüm düşüncelerini öğrenmeye çalışmalıdır.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Çocuklar, anne babalarının kendileri için neler feda ettiklerini düşünmelidirler.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Eğer çocukların dertlerini söylemelerine izin verilirse bısbıtyın şikayetçi olurlar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Sert terbiye, sağlam ve iyi karakter geliştirir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Öldükça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Anneler çocukları için hemen hemen bütün eğlencelerini feda ederler.</td>
<td>Çok uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Biraz uygun buluyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33. Babalar daha az bencil olsalar kendilerine düşen görevi yaparlardı.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34. İyi bir anne çocuğunu ufak tefek güçlüklerden korumalıdır.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. Bir çocuğa anne ve babasını herkesten üstün görmesi öğretilmelidir.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36. Çocuk hiçbir zaman ailesinden sir saklamamalıdır.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37. Çocuklardan sık sık ödın vermelerini, anne babaya uymalarını istemek doğru değildir.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38. Çoğu anneye bebeklerine bakarken onu inciteceklerinden korkarlar.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Bir çocuğa başı derde girdiğinde dövüşmek yerine büyüklerle baş vurması öğretilmelidir.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40. Anne baba arasındaki bazı konular hafif bir tartışma ile çözümlenemezler.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41. Ev bakımında ve idaresinde en kötü şeylerden biride, kişinin kendi evinde tutulanmış gibi hissetmesidir.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42. Hiçbir kadından yeni doğmuş bir bebeğe tek başına bakması beklenmemelidir.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43. Öğlan ve kız çocuklarının birbirlerini soyunurken görmemeleri gerekir.</th>
<th>Çok uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Biraz uygun buluyorum</th>
<th>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sıra</td>
<td>Konu</td>
<td>Çok uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Biraz uygun buluyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Çocukların sorunlarına eğilirseniz sizi oyalamak için bir çok masal uydururlar.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Eğer anne babalar çocukları ile şakalaşıp beraber eğlenirlerse, çocuk onların öğütlerini dinlemeye daha çok yönelirler.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Anneleri kendileri yüzünden zorluk çektiği için çocuklar, onlara karşı daha anlayışlı olmadrular.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Bir çocuk eninde sonunda anne-babasınınckinden daha üstün bir akıla sahip olmâyacağını öğrenir.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Eğer bir anne çocuklarını iyi yetiştirmeysorsa belki de bu, babanın evde kendine düşen görevi iyi yapmasından ileri geliyordur.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Genç bir anne için ilk bebeğin bakımı sırasında yalnız kalmaktan kötü bir şey olamaz.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Bir çocuğun diğer bir çocuğa vurması hiçbir şekilde hoşgörüyle karşılanamaz.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Anne babalar çocuklarına hayatta ilerleyebilmeleri için hep bir şeyler yapmaları ve boş zaman geçirmemeleri gerektiğini öğretmelidirler.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Akıllı bir kadın yeni bir bebeğin doğumundan önce ve sonra yalnız kalmamak için elinden geleni yapar.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Evde olup bitenleri sadece anne bildiği için ev hayatını onun planlaması lazım.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Kendi haklarına sahip olabilmesi için, bazen bir kadının kocasını terslemesi gerekir.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Çok uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Oldukça uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Biraz uygun buluyorum</td>
<td>Hiç uygun bulmuyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Bütün zamanımı çocuklarıyla geçirmek, bir kadına kanadı kopmuş kuş duygusunu verir.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Eğer anne kollarnı sıvar, bütün yükü sırtına alırsa tüm aile rahat eder.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Anne babalar çocuklarını kendi kendilerine oluşturdukları güveni sarsabilecek bütün güç işlerden sakınamalıdır.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Çocuklar aslında sıkı disiplin içinde mutlu olurlar.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Çocukların toplantılarıyla, kız-erkek arkadaşlıklarıyla ve eğlenceleriyle ilgilenen anne-babalar onların iyi yetişmelerini sağlarlar.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Anne ve babaya sadakat her şeyden önce gelir.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

English and Turkish Version of Demographic Questionnaire
Demographic Questionnaire

The researcher understands that the following information may be of a sensitive nature. The researcher asks for this information because it helps with describing the nature of families in total group. Please mark the response for each item that best describes you and your family.


2. Your marital status:
   Single, Never Married □  Married □  Separated □  Divorced □  Widowed □

3. Your level of education (please mark your highest level completed):
   Illiterate □  Literate □  Elementary School □  High School □  University or higher Degree □

4. Your employment status:
   Unemployed, homemaker □  Retired □  Student □  Employed □

5. Family income per month (mark one):
   Less than 1200 YTL □  1200-1700 YTL □  More than 1700 □

6. How many children under the age of 7 live in your home?
   1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 or more □

7. Gender of your child(ren):
   I have only daughter(s) □
   I have only son(s) □
   I have both daughter(s) and son(s) □

8. Please indicate the ages of your children under the age of 7.
   ........
   ........
   ........
   ........
   ........
Demografi Anketi

Aşağıda istenen bilgiler araştırmacıya anketi dolduran bütün gruptakiler hakkında istatistiksel bilgi vermek ve bu grubu bilimsel olarak tanımlayabilmek imkani sağlayacaktır. Lütfen her maddeyi kendinize uygun olan şıkkın yanındaki kutucuğu işaretleyerek yanıtlayınız.

1. Yaşınızı:
- 18-25
- 26-34
- 35-45
- 46-55
- 55 ten büyük

2. Medeni halınız:
- Bekar, Hiç evlenmiş
- Evli
- Ayrı yaşighbır
- Boşanmış
- Dul

3. Eğitim seviyeniz (lütfen bitirdiğiniz en yüksek seviyeyi işaretleyiniz):
- Okur yazar değil
- Okur yazar
- İlköğretim
- Lise
- Üniversite ve Daha Yukarı

4. Çalışma durumunuz:
- İşsiz, ev hanımı
- Emekli
- Öğrenci
- Çalışıyor

5. Ailenizin toplam aylık geliri (birini işaretleyiniz):
- 1200 YTL’den az
- 1200-1700 YTL
- 1700 YTL’den fazla

6. Evinizde 7 yaşından küçük kaç çocuk yaşıyor?
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 veya daha fazla

7. Çocuklarınızın cinsiyetleri nedir?
- Sadece kız çocuk var
- Sadece erkek çocuk var
- Hem kız hem erkek çocuk var

8. Evinizde yaşayan 7 yaşından küçük çocukların yaşlarını yazınız.

...........
...........
...........
...........
Appendix C

English and Turkish Version of Information Sheet for Pilot Study
Information Sheet for School Administrators

Dear School Administrator,

My name is Gokce Tekin. I am a Ph.D. Candidate in Curriculum and Instruction Department here at Penn State, University Park campus. My option area is Early Childhood Education and my adviser is Dr. Thomas Daniel Yawkey.

I am planning to use PARI Scale (Parental Attitude Research Instrument) which is developed by Schaefer and Bell in 1958 and adapted to Turkish culture by Lecompte, Lecompte, and Ozer (1978) to examine Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices in Turkey with Turkish sample. I am planning to use this scale with the mothers who have preschool aged children.

Since I am planning to apply this instrument in oral and written forms for illiterate and literate mothers, respectively, there are some validity and reliability issues I need to deal with and do a pilot study. Hence, this study is being conducted for research.

Applying PARI Scale in oral and written forms is an important step in order to have a strong validity and reliability argument before using it with a larger population for my dissertation. In this study, oral and written forms of PARI Scale will be applied to two groups that are randomly sampled and the data will be used to compare the reliabilities.

In this case, I would be very glad if you could help me in my research study for piloting the instrument by assisting with recruiting the participants. You will be asked to send the attached informed consent form and a recruitment letter to the each potential participant one week before their participation. This study will be conducted in your school with the volunteer participants, at the end of the first parents-teachers meeting of 2008. For paper survey, the mothers will be given a written copy of PARI scale to be completed. For oral survey, the investigator will read each item of PARI scale to the mothers and their responses will be indicated on the hard copy of the scale by the principal investigator. Participation also includes filling out the attached demographic survey. The demographic survey does not include any information that might reasonably lead to the identification of individual participants. After completing the surveys, participants will need to return the completed surveys.

Recruiting 50 mothers of preschoolers in your school as participants will be a fundamental contribution to my adaptation study. 25 of them will receive the PARI Scale in oral form, and the other 25 will receive the scale in written form. By implementing the scale in oral and written forms, a decision will be made about the utility of the scale with illiterate population.

Please contact me at 814-3214937 or gzk112@psu.edu if you have any questions or if you need more information.
Sayın Okul Yöneticisi


Ölçek okuma yazma bilen ve bilmeyen gruplara uygulanacağından, yazılı ve sözlü uygulama sonucu ölçeğin geçerliliğini ve güvenirliğini değiştiremeyeceğini öğrenmek zorundayım. Sonuç olarak bu bir araştırma çalışmasıdır.

Ölçeği yazılı ve sözlü uygulayarak, güçlü bir geçerlilik ve güvenirlik argümanı geliştirebilmem ve ölçeği iki formuyla da doktora tezimde kullanılabilmem için bana fırsat verecektir. Bu çalışmada, PARI ölçeğinin yazılı ve sözlü formları rastgele örneklemeye ile oluşturulmuş iki gruba verilecek ve data güvenirlik katsaylarının karşılaştırılmasında kullanılabilecektir.


Bu çalışmaya katılacak en az 50 tane anaokulu öğrencisinin annesi gerekmektedir. 25 anne ölçeği yazılı forma alırken, diğer 25 anne ölçeği sözlü forma alacaklardır. Ölçeğin yazılı ve sözlü uygulanması ölçeğin okur yazar olmayan popülasyonlara uygulanabilirliği üzerine ciddi bir very sağlayacaktır.

Konuyla ilgili daha fazla bilgi veya sorularınız için lütfen 814-3214937 no’lu telefondan ya da gzk112@psu.edu olan e-mail adresinden araştırmacıya ulaşınız.
Appendix D

English and Turkish Version of Implied Informed Consent Document for Pilot Study
Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices
Principal Investigator: Gokce Tekin, Graduate Student
460 Waupelani Dr. Apt # 201
State College, PA, 16801, USA
(814) 321-4937; gzk112@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Thomas Daniel Yawkey
204 Chambers Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-2937; tdy1@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research study is to understand whether there is a difference between the oral and written forms of PARI Scale.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will complete a survey which is consisted of 60 items and fill out a demographic survey. You will be asked answer questions about your childrearing practices. You may be asked to complete the survey in a paper or oral format.

3. Duration: It will take about 30-50 minutes to complete the surveys.

4. Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. The survey does not ask for any information that would identify who the responses belong to. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared because your name is in no way linked to your responses.

5. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Gokce Tekin at (814) 321-4937 with questions or concerns about this study.

6. Voluntary Participation: Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. Completion and return of the survey implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in the research. Please keep this form for your records or future reference.
1. Çalışmanın amacı: Bu araştırma çalışmasının amacı PARI Ölçeği’nin sözel ve yazılı formları arasında bir farklaşma olmadığını ortaya koymaktır.

2. İzlenen Prosedürler: Bir demografik anket ve 60 maddeden oluşan Aile Hayatı ve Çocuk Yetiştirme Tutumu Ölçeği dolduracaksınız. Çocuk yetiştirmeyle ilgili sorulara yanıt vereceksiniz. Bu sorulara sözlü veya yazılı olarak cevap vermeniz istenebilir.


4. Gizlilik Bildirimi: Bu araştırma katılmanızın tamamen gizli tutulacağını ve mülakaten kime ait olduğunu göstereceğiniz bir sorunun dışında olmayacağını belirtmektedir. İsiminiz hiçbir şekilde verdiğiniz cevaplara bağlı olmayacaktır ve istenmesi gereken hiçbir kişisel bilgilerini saklayacaktır.


Bu araştırmaya katılabilmek için en az 18 yaşında olmalısınız. Anketin doldurmanız ve mülakata katılmanız buradaki bilgileri okuduğunuz ve kabul ettiği anlamına gelmektedir. Lütfen bu formu kendi kayıtlarınız için saklayın.
Appendix E

English and Turkish Version of Recruitment Letter for Pilot Study
Recruitment Letter for a Research Study

Dear Mother,

Ms. Gokce Tekin, a graduate student at Penn State University, PA, USA in education field and is conducting a research about “Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices”. Research volunteers are being sought for Ms. Gokce Tekin’s research study. Would you be interested in being a volunteer for participating in this research where you will be asked to fill out a demographic survey and respond to a parent involvement survey related to the topic in oral or written format? This study will be taking place at the end of first parents-teachers meeting of 2008 spring semester at our school.

If you have any questions or I may provide additional information, please feel free to let me know.

Sincerely,

(Name, Title, and Contact Information of School Administrator)
Sayın Anne,


Eğer bu araştırma çalışması hakkında bir sorunuz olursa veya daha fazla bilgi edinmek istseniz lütfen iletişime geçmeye çekinmeyin.

Saygılarımla,

(Okul Yöneticisinin
Adi, Pozisyonu ve
İletişim Bilgileri)
Appendix F

English and Turkish Version of Information Sheet for the Main Study
Information Sheet for School Administrators

Dear School Administrator,

My name is Gokce Tekin. I am a PhD. Candidate in Curriculum and Instruction Department here at Penn State, University Park campus. My option area is Early Childhood Education and my adviser is Dr. Thomas Daniel Yawkey.

I am planning to do a research study and examine Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices in Turkey with Turkish sample. I am planning to conduct this study with the mothers who have preschool aged children.

In this case, I would be very glad if you could help me in my research study by assisting with recruiting the participants. You will be asked to send the attached informed consent form, a recruitment letter, surveys, and envelopes to the each potential participant. Participation will be on voluntarily basis. Hence, this study will be conducted with the volunteer participants in 2008. Participation includes filling out the PARI scale and demographic questionnaire which are the instruments of this research study. The demographic survey does not include any information that might reasonably lead to the identification of individual participants. After completing them, participants will need to return the completed surveys in an envelope supplied to the mothers of children.

Recruiting around 100 mothers of preschoolers in your school as participants will be a fundamental contribution to the study.

Please contact me at 814-3214937 or gzk112@psu.edu if you have any questions or if you need more information.
Sayın Okul Yöneticisi,


Türkiye’de ve Türk örneklemle Türk annelerinin çocuk yetiştirme pratiklerine karşı tutumlarını incelemek için bir araştırma çalışması yapmayı planlıyorum. Bu çalışma 0-6 yaş grubu çocukların annelerine uygulanacaktır.


Bu çalışmaya yardımcı olacak 100 civarında anaoku öğrencisinin annesi gerekmektedir. Böyle bir katılımcı oranı çalışmaya büyük bir katkı sağlayacaktır.

Konuyla ilgili daha fazla bilgi veya sorularınız için lütfen 814-3214937 no’lu telefondan ya da gzk112@psu.edu olan e-mail adresinden araştırmacıya ulaşınız.
Appendix G

English and Turkish Version of Implied Informed Consent Document for the Main Study
Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices-Actual Study

Principal Investigator: Gokce Tekin, Graduate Student
460 Waupelani Dr. Apt # 201
State College, PA, 16801, USA
(814) 321-4937; gzk112@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Thomas Daniel Yawkey
204 Chambers Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-2937; tdy1@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research study is to learn about the Turkish mothers’ parental attitudes toward childrearing and how these attitudes differentiate, if any, according to particular socioeconomic variables.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will complete a survey which is consisted of 60 items and fill out a demographic survey. You will be asked answer questions about your childrearing practices.

3. Duration: It will take about 30-50 minutes to complete the surveys.

4. Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. The survey does not ask for any information that would identify who the responses belong to. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared because your name is in no way linked to your responses.

5. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Gokce Tekin at (814) 321-4937 with questions or concerns about this study.

6. Voluntary Participation: Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. Completion and return of the survey implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in the research. Please keep this form for your records or future reference.
Sosyal Bilimler Arastirmasi icin Bilgilendirici Izin Formu
Pennsylvania Eyalet Universitesi

Proje Basligi: Türk Annelerinin Çocuk Yetiştirme Pratiklerine Karşı Tutumları- Asıl Çalışma

Araştırmada birinci isim: Gökçe Tekin, Doktora Öğrencisi
460 Waupelani Dr., Apt # 201
State College, PA, 16801, USA
(814) 321-4937; gzk112@psu.edu

Danisman: Dr. Thomas Daniel Yawkey
204 Chambers Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-2937; tdy1@psu.edu

1. Çalışmanın amacı: Bu araştırma çalışmasının amacı Türk annelerinin çocuk yetiştirmeye dair tutumlarını ve bu tutumların sosyoekonomik özelliklerine göre nasıl değişiklik gösterdiklerini ortaya koymaktır.

2. İzlenen Prosedürler: Bir demografik anket ve 60 maddeden oluşan Aile Hayatı ve Çocuk Yetiştirme Tutumu Ölçeği dolduracaksınız. Çocuk yetiştirmeyle ilgili sorulara yanıt vereceksiniz.


Bu araştırmaya katılabilmemeniz için en az 18 yaşında olmalısınız. Anketin doldurmanız ve mülakata katılımınız buradaki bilgileri okuduğunuz ve kabul ettiği anlamına gelmektedir. Lütfen bu formu kendi kayıtlarınız için saklayınız.
Appendix H

English and Turkish Version of Recruitment Letter for the Main Study
Recruitment Letter for a Research Study

Dear Mother,

Ms. Gokce Tekin, a graduate student at Penn State University, PA, USA in education field and is conducting a research about “Turkish mothers’ attitudes toward childrearing practices”. Research volunteers are being sought for Ms. Gokce Tekin’s research study. Would you be interested in being a volunteer for participating in this research where you will be asked to fill out a demographic survey and complete a parent involvement survey related to the topic? If you decide to participate, please fill out the attached Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) and demographic survey and return the completed surveys to our administration by June 3, 2008 in the envelope provided to you.

If you have any questions or I may provide additional information, please feel free to let me know.

Sincerely,

(Name, Title, and Contact Information of School Administrator)
Sayın Anne,


Eğer bu araştırma çalışması hakkında bir sorunuz olursa veya daha fazla bilgi edinmek isterseniz lütfen iletişime geçmeye çekinmeyin.

Saygılarımla,

(Okul Yöneticisinin Adı, Pozisyonu ve İletişim Bilgileri)
Appendix I

Cramer’s V-statistic
### Symmetric Measures for Employment Status and Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominal by Nominal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Symmetric Measures for Employment Status and Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominal by Nominal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Symmetric Measures for Education and Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominal by Nominal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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