PARENTAL ETHNOTHEORIES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL BEHAVIORS AMONG TURKISH PARENTS

by
SELEN ESMER KOÇALİ

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Science

Sabancı University
July 2022

PARENTAL ETHNOTHEORIES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL BEHAVIORS AMONG TURKISH PARENTS

Approved by:

Prof. Nebi Sümer .....
(Thesis Supervisor)

Asst. Prof. Asuman Büyükcan Tetik .....

Prof. Feyza Çorapçı .....

Date of Approval: July 22, 2022

ABSTRACT

PARENTAL ETHNOTHEORIES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL BEHAVIORS AMONG TURKISH PARENTS

SELEN ESMER KOÇALI

Psychology M.SC. Thesis, July 2022

Thesis Supervisor: Prof. Nebi Sümer

Keywords: parental ethnotheories, socialization goals, parental beliefs, psychological control

The adverse effect of parental psychological controlling behaviors has been extensively documented. However, the ethnotheoretical antecedents (socialization goals and parenting beliefs) of psychological control have been relatively unexamined. This study aims to explore the associations between ethnotheories and psychological control behaviors among Turkish parents. First, qualitative data was used to develop culturally relevant measures which were later applied to parents in a quantitative study. Participants were 414 parents with 3 to 18-year-old children. Results showed that parents' socialization goals and parenting beliefs varied based on the parents' level of education and socioeconomic status (SES). Parents with higher education and SES reported more benign, and less dysfunctional parenting beliefs. The most common psychological control strategy was overprotection, and the least common was guilt induction. Parents who promoted interdependent socialization goals reported higher psychological control. Benign parental beliefs predicted lower levels, and dysfunctional parental beliefs predicted higher levels of psychological control. The association between ethnotheories and culturally relevant psychological control strategies such as overprotection and guilt induction were stronger compared to the limiting self-expression dimension of psychological control. Results suggested a multidimensional conceptualization of culture-specific psychological control, which is systematically associated with specific parenting goals.

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE'DEKİ EBEVEYNLERİNİN ETNOTEORİLERİ VE PSİKOLOJİK KONTROL DAVRANIŞLARI

SELEN ESMER KOÇALI

Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Temmuz 2022

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer

Anahtar Kelimeler: ebeveyn etnoteorileri, sosyalizasyon amaçları, ebeveyn inanışları, psikolojik kontrol

Geçmiş araştırmalarda ebeveyn psikolojik kontrol davranışlarının olumsuz etkisi kapsamlı olarak incelenmişken psikolojik kontrolün etnoteorik öncülleri (sosyalizayson amaçları ve ebeveynlik inanışları) görece ihmal edilmiştir. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de ebeveynlerin etnoteorileri ve psikolojik kontrol davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Nitel veri kullanılarak geliştirilen kültüre özgü ölçekler daha sonra nicel bir çalışmada ebeveynlere uygulanmıştır. Çalışmaya 3 ila 18 yaşları arasında çocuğu olan 414 ebeveyn katılmıştır. Sonuçlar, ebeveynlerin sosyalizasyon amaçları ve ebeveynlik inançlarının, ebeveynlerin eğitim düzeyine ve sosyoekonomik durumuna (SES) göre değiştiğini göstermiştir. Yüksek eğitimli ve SES'li ebeveynler, daha fazla çocuğu koruyan ve daha az disfonksiyonel ebeveynlik inançları bildirmiştir. Bulgular, en yaygın kullanılan psikolojik kontrol stratejisinin aşırı koruma, en az kullanılanın ise suçluluk duygusu yaratma olduğunu göstermiştir. Karşılıklı bağımlı sosyalizasyon amaçlarını destekleyen ebeveynler daha yüksek psikolojik kontrol bildirmişlerdir. Çocuğu koruyan ebeveyn inançları düşük psikolojik kontrol düzeylerini, disfonksiyonel ebeveyn inançları ise yüksek psikolojik kontrol düzeylerini yordamıştır. Etnoteoriler ile aşırı koruma ve suçluluk duygusu yaratma gibi kültürel psikolojik kontrol boyutları arasındaki ilişkinin, kendini ifade etmeyi sınırlama boyutuna kıyasla daha güçlü olduğu bulunmuştur. Sonuçlar, belirli ebeveynlik amaçları ile sistematik olarak ilişki gösteren kültüre özgü psikolojik kontrolün çok boyutlu kavramsallığına işaret etmiştir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my advisor Prof. Nebi Sümer for his endless patience, support and guidance through this journey. This project would not be possible without your precious help and guidance. Thank you for taking me on as a student and giving me this opportunity, for sharing your valuable experience and wisdom, for offering assistance at every moment despite your busy schedule; but most importantly, thank you for believing in me and my abilities. It was such a pleasure and valuable experience to be able to work with you.

I would also like to thank my committee members Prof. Feyza Çorapçı and Asst. Prof. Asuman Büyükcan Tetik for their time, valuable and inspiring comments, as well as encouraging words.

This study was carried as a part of a TUBITAK research project (118K050). Many thanks to the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK), for their financial assistance towards my education and our research. Also special thanks to all my professors and colleagues from our project for their contributions.

Finally, I am grateful to my family and friends for their unconditional love and support. For creating space for happiness and laughter in the midst of a stressful process. A special mention for my sister, Yaren, because even though she complained about me, my thesis and my stressed mood, us arguing brought a sense of normalcy; and because if I do not mention her, she will haunt me forever as most little sisters do. But most of all, I would like give my most sincere gratitude and love to my mom, Yeliz Koçali, who have been with me through it all. Thank you for listening to me talk about my thesis day and night without ever complaining, for hugging me and smiling at me encouragingly whenever you woke up early and saw me tired from working through the night, for reminding me to eat, for showing genuine interest in my work and passion, and for believing in me. Words cannot express how much I appreciate you.

This thesis is dedicated to:
Me... because I did a good job.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

Parental psychological control has been studied for over half a century. This concept was first introduced by Shafer (1965) as autonomy restricting parental behaviors. Later Barber (1996) further refined the concept and suggested a multidimensional structure of psychological control by distinguishing its specific characteristics.

There have been many attempts to define psychological control operationally. Early conceptualization by Barber (1994) emphasized the difference between behavioral and psychological control, in which psychological control refers to parents' attempts at controlling their child's thoughts and feelings. Recent research, however, refrains from such harsh limitations and suggests that the psychological aspect of parental control could be about the parenting tools or the goals. Other studies raised the issue of cultural differences in parental psychological controlling behaviors (Chen-Bouck et al. 2019; Nelson et al. 2013; Olsen et al. 2002; Wu et al. 2002). While debates about the structure of psychological control and what constitutes psychological control have not reached a decisive conclusion, most researchers seem to agree on the harmful effects of psychological control with some cultural debates (e.g., Pomerantz et al. 2009). Extensive research has investigated the adverse effect psychological control has on the child's optimal development. Studies show that psychological control can lead to anxiety, depression (Barber et al. 2005; Pettit et al. 2001; Soenens et al. 2012), internalizing problems (Barber et al. 1994), low self-esteem (Barber and Harmon 2002; Soenens et al. 2005) and many more dysfunctional developmental outcomes. Because of its potential harm, past studies have focused on identifying the psychological control strategies parents use as well as the outcomes of those strategies. Surprisingly, despite the dysfunctional nature of psychological control, its ethnotheoretical antecedents have been left unexamined. While it is important to detect the ways it is implemented to prevent the adverse outcomes related to psychological control; it is also important to understand the motivation behind using psychological control in varying cultural contexts. What type of parents use more psychological control than others? Why? These important questions need

to be answered to understand the reasons behind psychological control. Namely, the critical precursor of psychological control may lie in the parental ethnotheories (Super and Harkness 2006).

Parental ethnotheories amalgamate culturally shared opinions regarding parenting, children, and family. Ethnotheories reflect the cultural approach to parenting and influence parental behavior choices, including psychological control. One of the most studied aspects of ethnotheories is socialization goals, which represent desired child characteristics and outcomes (Harwood et al. 1996). Previous studies show that socialization goals could be the main motivation behind psychological control, where parents use psychological control to manipulate their children into desired developmental paths (Pettit and Laird 2002). Parental beliefs are another aspect of ethnotheories that could factor into psychological control. Although studies suggest that parental beliefs play a significant role in shaping parent behavior (Smetana 1994), in comparison to socialization goals, the relationship between parental beliefs and psychological control has been mainly left unexamined. Especially parental beliefs about the child's nature and behavioral intentions have been shown to be strong predictors of parental control (Smetana 1994). However, given that parental beliefs and socialization goals indeed reflect cultural values with large cross-cultural variation, it is important to explore parental ethnotheories using both etic, via cross-cultural comparisons and emic approach focusing on the idiosyncratic cultural characteristics in-depth (Harkness and Super 2020).

This study aims, first, to explore the pattern of parental belief and socialization goals among Turkish parents, and then, to examine how the observed parental beliefs and socialization goals are related to parental psychologically controlling behaviors. This study employs both quantitative and qualitative approaches to capture the ethnotheories and associated culture-specific psychological control behaviors. Data collection was completed as a part of a research project on parental ethnotheories in Turkey (118K050) and, qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed at different stages. Qualitative data was used to build culturally relevant measures, and quantitative data were used to explore parental tendencies as well as the relationship between psychological control and ethnotheories.

In the following chapter, theoretical background and relevant findings from the previous studies will be presented. First, the importance of culture as a factor in parenting will be discussed. Then, parental ethnotheories and theoretical models that explain how ethnotheories influence development and parental behaviors will be elaborated. Past studies examining the relationship between socialization goals, parental beliefs, and parent behavior will be presented. Afterward, conceptualization

and measurement of psychological control and the relationship between psychological control and cultural factors, including ethnotheories, will be discussed. Lastly, the overview and the objectives of the current study will be stated.

2. LITERATURE BACKGROUND

2.1 Parenting and Culture

Children are not brought up in isolation, and development occurs in a cultural and social ecosystem. According to Bronfenbrenner's (1986) ecological systems theory, children exist in and are affected by multiple systems of social environment simultaneously. This theory describes the ecosystem of children starting from the microsystem that includes the people children regularly have direct interactions with, which in most cases refers to the immediate family but can also include peers, teachers, or babysitters to give some examples. Then follows the mesosystem, which refers to interactions between multiple microsystems. Macrosystem comes last, encompassing all the others, and refers to the laws and the culture. Culture can be described as distinct models of behavior, beliefs, values, and knowledge transferred through socialization (Boyd and Richerson 2005). As this system encompasses the others, all factors of development in previously mentioned smaller systems, such as parenting, are consequently affected by culture (Kil et al. 2021).

The effect of culture on parenting can manifest in different circumstances, with different purposes. One of the ways culture influences parenting is through the goal of cultural transmission. Parents want to pass on the cultural values and beliefs of the previous generation to their children and make sure that their child conforms to the culture of the present, which will then ensure the social adaptation of the children (Bornstein et al. 2011). Another way is through parents simply existing in a cultural environment; therefore, their beliefs, values, and expectations being shaped by the culture they are surrounded by (Durgel 2011). Culture-specific beliefs regarding the development process, the nature of family and child as well as parenting attitudes, build ethnotheories (Harkness, Super, and Van Tijen 2000). Ethnotheories implicitly shape the expectations, goals, and behaviors of the parent, as it influences perceptions regarding what is normal or abnormal and what is desirable or

not (Rubin et al. 2006).

Parenting behaviors are, by nature, cultural constructions, and there are no universal parenting patterns. Although there are universally studied parenting factors such as attachment, certain aspects of these factors change culturally (Belsky 1984). Even emotion socialization, which is a universal human behavior is shown to be influenced by culture (Cole and Tan 2007). Literature suggests that culture influences which emotions are socialized by parents under which circumstances as cultural norms might deem one emotion more important or appropriate to express than others (Friedlmeier et al. 2011). Consequently, parental responses to similar emotion socialization vary between cultures. Studies show that emotional reactions to child transgressions can differ between cultures (Özdemir and Cheah 2013). So, if the goal is to have a comprehensive understanding regarding the factors of development, parenting in particular, both universal theories of parenting and culture-specific parenting ethnotheories should be examined. As there are a great number of studies examining universal parenting factors and not enough focusing on cultural factors, the present study will focus on the cultural aspects of parenting.

Harkness and Super's (1992) developmental niche framework, with its three components, describes the interaction between culture and parenting surrounding the child. The first component consists of the environment the child socializes and plays, including physical materials like toys that vary culturally. The second component refers to the child-rearing practices and customs that are guided by the culture. Factors such as how much a child receives control, discipline, or training behavior are included in this component. The last component refers to the cultural cognitions of the parent, which encompasses parental ethnotheories that guide parenting styles, behaviors, and practices. According to Harkness and Super (2020), cultural cognitions that are shared within the community can regulate other components. The present study will target the second and the third components of the developmental niche to investigate how ethnotheories, such as socialization goals and parental beliefs in the third component affect parental behaviors, namely psychological control behaviors in the second component.

2.2 Parental Ethnotheories

Culture is the combination of knowledge, beliefs, behaviors, and values of a particular society that is transmitted through socialization. Child-rearing is a socialization process where parents transmit cultural values to their children and raise them ac-

cordingly. As the third component of Harkness and Super's (1992) parental niche framework, parental ethnotheories reflect parents' cultural customs, beliefs, and values regarding child-rearing practices. Shared with the other community members, ethnotheories generate cultural norms of a child's development, family life, and parenting practices (Harkness and Super 2006). Then these norms shape the expectations of development goals and outcomes for a child that is brought up to belong to and thrive in that specific culture (Rubin et al. 2006). Parents adjust their behavior and parenting strategies according to their cultural parenting beliefs to avoid unwanted child outcomes and successfully raise a child with desirable developmental outcomes (Super and Harkness 1997; Ziehm et al. 2013).

These beliefs are usually intuitive and implicit (Ziehm et al. 2013). Parents can pick up these values and beliefs intergenerationally from their own parents' behaviors, attitudes, and observations of others in the community. While some studies suggest these parental beliefs are considerably stable over time even when crucial life changes such as divorce happen (McNally et al. (1991) as cited in Barber et al. 2005), others claim that the child's characteristics and responses to parental behavior can shape and modify parental beliefs about child-rearing (Rubin et al. 2006). For instance, parents might have to change their pre-existing beliefs regarding a specific child-rearing practice when it doesn't lead to expected and desirable outcomes. Parents also might adapt their beliefs and behaviors according to specific circumstances. Some researchers make a distinction between parenting styles and beliefs to express the unstable nature of parental beliefs. According to Coplan et al. (2002), parenting styles represent typical tendencies of the parents, and they are considered stable, while parental beliefs tend to vary depending on the situation or change over time. Whether flexible or stable, parental ethnotheories provide intentions behind parenting strategies and behaviors. Parents act in specific ways because their beliefs make them think it will produce a specific outcome (Ziehm et al. 2013). For instance, parents from interdependent cultures believe that the sociocultural environment, especially the mother's parenting practices, plays a key role in children's behaviors, and thus mothers from these cultures take more responsibility for the child's outcomes (Buldukoğlu and Kukulu 2007). Similar beliefs might direct the mothers to be more hands-on in childcare and attempt to shape the child's behavior to achieve desired outcomes. In conclusion, it is crucial to study the factors that guide when, how, and why a parent behaves in certain ways to understand and explain development.

There is an abundance of studies examining parent and child behavior. However, most of these studies assume a universalistic approach to parent-child interactions or focus on general child-rearing beliefs and values (Özdemir and Cheah 2013). Hark-

ness and Super (2006) proposed a hierarchical structure for parental belief. In this model, the most general beliefs regarding the child, family, and parenting stand at the top of the hierarchy. Then comes the parental beliefs about specific outcomes and parental practices, and these are the beliefs that transform into parental behaviors. Thus, while general parental beliefs are necessary to understand cultural and universal approaches to parenting, studies show that cultural parenting beliefs associated with specific child behaviors and outcomes provide critical information that would help better understand parents' behavior patterns (Smetana 1994). It should be noted that similar behaviors of the parent or the child can have different meanings across cultures, therefore, invoke different beliefs and responses (Smetana 2017).

Consequently, what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate parent behavior in a cultural context is guided by these ethnotheories. For example, using corporal punishment on children would be deemed inappropriate in certain cultures, but some parents do not think of spanking their children as an inappropriate parent practice because they believe it helps positive behavior socialization (Smetana 2017). Furthermore, past studies show that while aggression from the child is perceived as a maladaptive behavior by both Chinese and Canadian parents, how they evaluate and emotionally respond to this undesirable behavior differs. Canadian mothers are shown to express disappointment and concern, while Chinese parents express anger in the face of child aggression (Cheah and Rubin 2004; Özdemir and Cheah 2013).

The variability of parenting beliefs and behaviors exists not only between cultures categorized as individualistic or collectivistic, but also among different cultures within the same generalized category, and even within a singular culture depending on the critical demographic characteristics, especially education level and socioeconomic status (Durgel 2011). For instance, Suizzo (2002) found that parents in France differ from other European cultures and have unique parental beliefs regarding child outcomes and goals which changes the parent's behavior patterns accordingly. Another study shows that parental beliefs and socialization goals vary depending on the parent's education level (Dost et al. 2006). Cross-culture comparisons reflect differences between cultures and this approach have been adopted in cultural studies extensively. Within-culture differences, however, have not been investigated as often. It is an especially important approach to consider for studies on parenting and development, as within-culture variability can explain and shape different courses of development in culture. Thus, this study will focus on diverse patterns of parenting within Turkish culture.

2.3 Parental Attribution

Parental attributions refer to the parent's interpretation of the child's behavior's reason, intention, and stability (Bugental and Johnston 2000). These attributions are the critical factors influencing how the parent would react to a particular behavior (Coplan et al. 2002). Research shows that parents often utilize attributions to make sense of their child's behavior and develop a strategic plan to deal with it (Miller 1995). The parent's response to the child depends on their understanding of these factors; why the child acted that way, whether the behavior was situation-specific or not, and how possible it is for the parent to alter the behavior or the source behind it.

The most common parental attributions are made regarding the externality versus internality of the motivation (locus of control) behind the behavior. Externality attributions give credit to situational and environmental factors like accidents and agitation, therefore absolving the child from any intentional responsibility. External attributions are also associated with believing the behavior was temporary due to circumstances. On the other hand, internal attributions direct the responsibility to stable factors such as the dispositional characteristics of the child and reflect the intentionality behind the behavior (Özdemir and Cheah 2013). Parents can show tendencies towards different attribution styles depending on the situation. Fundamental attribution error theory suggests that people are more likely to make external attributions for negative and internal attributions for positive outcomes and behaviors of people from the same social groups (Ross 1977). In line with this, one can expect a parent to prefer blaming the temporary factors outside sources for their child's negative behaviors and credit their child's characteristics for appropriate behaviors. However, past research shows that parental attributions are more complicated than that. According to Özdemir and Cheah (2013), both aggression and social withdrawal are undesirable outcomes for parents and evidence shows that parents tend to make external attributions about child aggression but internal attributions for social withdrawal. Another study found that Chinese mothers differed from American mothers in making more external attributions for social withdrawal (Cheah and Rubin 2004). This might be due to the general tendency of Chinese and other collectivistic cultures to make more contextual and less stable attributions (Choi et al. 1999). Academic success was another subject of disagreement as Chinese parents perceive academic success as the result of effort, while those from Western cultures attributed academic success to the ability of the child, which is more stable (Bornstein et al. 2011). It would not be absurd to expect Chinese moth-

ers to take more action and socialize their child out of the social withdrawal behavior or toward studying compared to American mothers who believe social withdrawal behaviors and academic performance are stable due to the child's disposition. This pattern shows another example of how parental beliefs, in this case, attributions, guide parental behavior.

Another commonly studied parental attribution is the responsibility attribution for the parent or the child considering the outcome of the behavior. Attributions directed to children are similar to internal attributions and imply that the parent believes the origin of the outcome is the child's disposition and inner state. On the other hand, attributions directed to parents put the blame or responsibility on the shoulders of the parent themselves. Those who make parent-directed attributions are more likely to think that the child outcome is a result of their parenting behaviors and reflects their parenting skills (Kil et al. 2021). Bornstein and his colleagues (2011) compared parents from multiple cultures on their parental attributions and found that each culture showed a unique pattern. Specifically, these researchers found that Chinese parents were more likely to make parent-directed attributions and take credit for their child's failures. In contrast, Colombian parents felt much less responsible for any failure regardless of the child or parent-directed attribution. Italian parents, however, showed higher child-directed attributions for failures which are in line with the child-driven developmental beliefs of Italians. Parents from Jordan reported low levels of responsibility for both parenting success and failures. Lastly, Thai parents reported the highest responsibility for both child-attributed and parent-attributed failures, while reporting low responsibility for success regardless of the attribution direction. These findings provide evidence for parental attributions and associated beliefs regarding responsibility for the child outcomes being highly influenced by cultural context. This study aims to investigate common parental attributions and how they influence parent behavior. In addition to cultural tendencies based on commonly studied attributions, there can be unique, culture-specific parental attributions that are not captured in these studies. For instance, research (Mednick et al. 2013 as cited in Kil et al. 2021) shows that parents in India and Egypt attribute physical health problems of their children to curses and gods. Similarly, with qualitative approaches or appropriate items, it would not be surprising to see Turkish parents make attributions to "Nazar" (evil eye). This emphasizes the importance of using a culturally relevant perspective to investigate parents' child-rearing beliefs.

2.4 Socialization Goals

Socialization goals are one of the most studied aspects of parental ethnotheories. Socialization goals refer to the most desirable and important child characteristics and outcomes (Harwood et al. 1996). They can be short-term, reflecting the desired outcomes for the child in the present and near future, or long-term, reflecting what parents want their child to be like as a competent adult (Çıtlak et al. 2008; Harwood et al. 1996). While they are considerably consistent overall, short-term socialization goals can differ from long-term ones, as what constitutes an ideal child can be different from what constitutes an ideal adult. For example, a parent may want their child to be compliant to make their job easier but wish for them to be an independent adult who goes after what they want (Luebbe et al. 2017).

Socialization goals communicate parents' preference and endorsement of some characteristics over others. These preferences reflect the cultural values and guide parenting practices (Çıtlak et al. 2008, Durgel et al. 2009). Parents utilize different child-rearing strategies to achieve desirable and prioritized outcomes (Le et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2002). However, the priorities of parents from different cultures, as well as those from different groups within the same culture, vary due to the needs of their social ecosystem (Mone and Benga 2020). Different characteristics of the social ecosystem, such as education and income, are intertwined with the needs and desires of the parents. Thus, to understand the relationship between socialization goals and parent behaviors, studies should consider their interaction with different aspects of the social ecosystem of the child and the parent, in addition to cultural differences (Çıtlak et al. 2008; Durgel et al. 2009). Accordingly, this study will investigate the relationship between socialization goals and factors of the social ecosystem, such as education and income.

2.4.1 The Family Change Model

Cultural differences have often been investigated based on the individualism and collectivism dichotomy. However, when it comes to cultural differences in parenting and family environment, Kağıtçıbaşı's (2005) Family Change Model can be considered a better reference point that captures the grey area that could be lost between the dichotomy of individualism and collectivism. Kağıtçıbaşı's model defines family structures that reflect the differences in social characteristics such as economy and education (Yağmurlu et al. 2009). Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) suggested three types of fam-

ily structures that interact in different ways with autonomy and relatedness. The first family type is called independent families that value the child for the emotional benefit and prioritize the financial independence and autonomy of the child. These types of families are associated with individualistic and wealthy communities. The second family type is interdependent families that are associated with collectivistic and rural communities where the value of the child is both emotional and economic, and there is an expectation of obedience over child autonomy (Kağıtçıbaşı 2005; Mayer 2013). Whereas these first two family types have considerable overlap with individualism and collectivism, the third family structure introduces a new type of family structure with its unique pattern. The third family type is called psychological interdependence or autonomously related, and it reflects the characteristics of interdependent families that went through rapid social changes.

Kağıtçıbaşı proposed that when interdependent communities experience modernization and economic development, all their values do not automatically shift to those of independent families but settle on a middle ground between autonomy and relatedness. With the economic, and consequently, educational growth, these families no longer need their children for their economic contributions, thus, they support the economic independence and autonomy of the child. However, independence is not a total separation, as autonomously related families still value relatedness with the child and expect the child to be dependent on the family for emotional closeness. Consequently, the socialization goals of the parents reflect the values of these family structures. Studies show that interdependent families displayed socialization goals such as being obedient, grateful to parents, staying close to the family, following social rules, and contributing financially to the family (Fung 1999). Autonomous-related families wanted their children to be self-reliant, autonomous, respectful, and emotionally close to their parents (Çıtlak et al. 2008; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). In the independent family type, however, the child's autonomy, achievement, and self-confidence are primarily valued (Dost et al. 2006).

The variance within communities characterized by these family types should not be overlooked considering that within the same family type, socialization goals may change depending on the parents' education level, income, and gender. For example, parents with low income promoted child acceptance goals more often, and mothers were more likely than fathers to promote socialization goals related to love and security (Le et al. 2018). Moreover, parents with high education value autonomy and self-enhancement goals such as academic achievement, self-expression, and self-confidence, whereas parents with low education are more likely to promote obedience and relatedness (Dost et al. 2006; Dost et al. 2009; Durgel et al. 2009; Mone et al. 2016). Therefore, critical demographic characteristics should be considered in

investigating how socialization goals and parenting beliefs of parents with distinct family types.

2.5 Psychological Control

2.5.1 Basic Conceptualization

Schaefer (1965) was the first scholar who systematically conceptualized and investigated parental psychological control using children's reports. Schaefer classified parenting behaviors into dichotomic dimensions. One of these dimensions was Psychological Autonomy versus Psychological Control, which included parenting behaviors such as intrusiveness, protectiveness, rejection, and the use of guilt for control. These types of parental controlling behavior were assumed to prevent the child's autonomy and thus, harm their optimal development.

Later, Barber and colleagues (1994) expanded this early conceptualization of psychological control and described it as intrusive and autonomy-inhibiting behaviors of parents who are non-receptive to their child's needs. They described psychological control as internally controlling strategies where the primary target is the child's inner world. Inducing guilt, invalidating the perspective and feelings of the child, threats of rejection, and withdrawal of love were strategies used to manipulate the child's inner world for control. Typically, parents interrupt the child whenever they talk, blame them for misfortunes that happen to the family, or ignore them when they do something the parent does not like to manipulate the child's feelings and thoughts (Barber 1996). Barber and his colleagues (2012) later added the "disrespect for adolescent's individuality" component to the definition of psychological control. While previously mentioned dimensions of psychological control behaviors directly invalidate the child's autonomy, this new component includes behaviors involving personal attack as well as invalidating feelings, such as embarrassing the child in public, making unfair comparisons, and violating the child's privacy.

2.5.2 Autonomy vs Psychological Control

According to the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Deci and Ryan 2017) well-being requires three basic psychological needs: competence, relatedness, and autonomy. When these needs are not met, optimal development and integration of the self are

hindered. Autonomy is characterized as the universal need for volitional functioning. Volitional functioning is individuals acting based on their internal desires, however, SDT suggests that external motivations can also satisfy the need for autonomy if they are fully internalized (Soenens and Vansteenkiste 2010). Partially internalized or not internalized motivations on the other hand will violate the autonomy need.

Parents can control their child externally, through rules and punishment, or internally, through manipulation of their feelings and thoughts. A child controlled through guilt induction can experience partial internalization, as the child will feel the internalized need to comply to avoid guild and the need to avoid the behavior at the same time. Ryan (1993) suggests that this conflicting experience of autonomy can lead to developmental vulnerabilities (as cited in Soenens and Vansteenkiste 2010). Thus, autonomy support is a crucial aspect of parenting to ensure optimal development.

Early conceptualizations define autonomy support and psychological control as dichotomous concepts (Schaefer 1965). However, recent approaches suggest a distinction between two types of autonomy support, namely: promotion of independence and promotion of volitional functioning (Soenens, Vansteenkiste, and Sierens 2009). Parents who promote volitional functioning want their child to make their own decisions according to the child's own values and desires, whereas parents who support independence want their children to be able to make decisions by themselves but not necessarily decisions that reflect the child's desires. Parents can use psychological control strategies such as guilt induction to manipulate the child's desires and values to match their own, consequently controlling the child's decisions without explicitly restricting them. This independence without volition restricts the child's individual, authentic self and is related to psychological control.

Soenens, Vansteenkiste and Sieren (2009) showed two types of autonomy support to be distinct in their relation to psychological control. Promotion of independence was orthogonal to psychological control, while promotion of volitional functioning was dichotomous to psychological control. Thus, it is important to distinguish the type of autonomy support when considering the autonomy restrictive aspects of psychological control. For instance, the interdependent family type might be characterized by the lack of autonomy support for both types. Autonomous-related families, however, allow support independence without support for volitional functioning. These families want their children to be close to them and share their goals and values, thus, they expect their children to make decisions the parents would approve of. In these families, support of autonomy and psychological control can co-exist.

2.5.3 Behavioral vs Psychological Control

Barber and colleagues (1994) made a distinction between parental psychological and behavioral control. Whereas psychological control primarily targets the child's "psychological and inner world", parental behavioral control primarily targets the "child's behavior". However, Soenens and Vansteenkiste (2010) claim that this distinction is not as straightforward. Different conceptualizations and perceptions of parental behaviors can blur the lines between psychological and behavioral control.

Internal control is the primary aspect that separates psychological control from behavioral control, however, not all psychological control behaviors are exclusively internal. Some parents can utilize behavioral means to manipulate the thoughts and feelings of their child, whereas others can use psychological control to change their child's behavior (Soenens and Vansteenkiste 2010; Wang et al. 2007). For instance, parents use guilt induction to increase their child's academic success (Wang et al. 2012) and to prevent them from being friends with people the parents do not approve of (Soenens, Vansteenkiste, and Niemiec 2009). In these examples, parents use internal manipulation strategies to achieve behavioral outcomes, which makes it hard to draw clear lines between psychological and behavioral control.

Parental behavioral control consists of aspects such as parental knowledge, parental expectations and rules, parental discipline (punishment and reward behaviors), and parental monitoring (Shek 2006). Parents set limits and rules to monitor and provide structure for their children to learn appropriate behaviors and develop self-regulation abilities (Barber and Harmon 2002; Kakihara et al. 2010; Soenens and Vansteenkiste 2010). These control behaviors, especially parental monitoring, have been linked to child outcomes such as decreased aggression, smoking, delinquent behaviors (Stattin and Kerr 2000), and increased self-regulation (Kakihara et al. 2010). However, children perceive high levels of behavioral control as over-controlling, intrusive, and stifling their autonomy in some cases (Kakihara et al. 2010; Smetana and Asquith 1994;). Considering intrusion and restriction of autonomy are essential features of psychological control, some aspects of behavioral control seem to be overlapping with psychological control. This overlap seems to happen when the child thinks the parent is unjustified in their controlling behavior. According to Smetana and Asquith (1994), children acknowledge parental control over moral and conventional issues but perceive attempts to control personal issues like clothing or friendship as intrusive. This perception of behavioral control as psychological control depends on the age, gender, temperament of the child, and the norms of the culture (Scharf and Goldner 2017; Soenens and Vansteenkiste 2010).

The outcomes of psychological and behavioral control are not similar, however, both concepts consist of multiple dimensions, and some dimensions can be perceived as the other, making strict distinctions between the two concepts tricky (Barber et al. 2012; Scharf and Goldner 2017). Accordingly, to capture a wide array of psychological control behaviors, this study will not draw a strict line between behavioral and psychological control, instead, incorporate overprotective and intrusive behaviors of the parents that are perceived as intrusive as well.

2.5.4 The Effects of Psychological Control

Past studies in Western cultures show that psychological control violates the child's autonomy and hinders optimal development. Compared to other controlling parenting behaviors, psychological control is uniquely associated with internalizing problems as it interrupts the development of a positive and stable sense of personhood and leads to the child being vulnerable to low self-esteem and depression (Barber and Harmon 2002). As parents pressure and manipulate the child through guilt induction, love withdrawal, and dismissal of their perspective, they suppress the child's need for autonomy (Barber et al. 2005). Psychological control is especially detrimental for adolescents, as it is a developmental period characterized by the need for increased autonomy (Steinberg 1990 as cited in Pettit et al. 2001). To give a few examples, psychological control has been found to be related to symptoms of anxiety and depression (Barber et al. 2005; Pettit et al. 2001; Soenens et al. 2012), internalizing problems (Barber et al. 1994), damaged emotion regulation and eating disorders (McEwen and Flouri 2009), behavior problems and delinquency (Pettit et al. 2001), feelings of incompetence (Scharf and Goldner 2017), low self-esteem (Barber and Harmon 2002; Soenens et al. 2005) and dependency on the parents (Pettit et al. 2001) among adolescence age children. Parents can also hurt their child's feelings and induce shame through guilt induction and rejection (Nelson et al. 2013).

These adverse effects of psychological control, however, are not universally identical and are influenced by cultural differences and child characteristics. The fit between ethnotheories and psychological control can determine how adverse effects of psychological control will manifest. For instance, research shows that psychological control is associated with negative child outcomes in both individualistic and collectivistic cultures, however, the adverse effects are stronger in children from individualistic cultures (Pomerantz and Wang 2009). This protection comes from collectivistic culture's norms of parental investment and acceptance being compat-

ible with psychological control. For instance, parents from collectivistic cultures commonly use psychological control to teach cultural values, and these practices are not perceived as harmful (Sharf and Goldner (2018) cited in Kara and Sümer 2022). However, this normativity does not eliminate the adverse effects. Additionally, in autonomous related societies, psychological control is perceived as rejection instead of parental acceptance, thus leading to internalizing problems (Ayçiçeği-Dinn and Sunar 2017), however, mild intrusion behaviors were accepted as normative (Sümer and Kağıtçıbaşı 2010).

Gender was another factor to moderate the harmful effects of psychological control. Kurt and colleagues (2013) showed that the relationship between loneliness and psychological control was stronger for girls than boys. Another study shows that perceived psychological control was associated with extrinsically prosocial behaviors, but only for fathers' psychological control.

2.5.5 Motivations behind Psychological Control

Considering the extensive adverse effects of psychological control, why parents use psychological control is an important question to answer, as well as why certain parents are more likely to use psychological control than others. Parents use psychological control strategies for different reasons depending on their socialization goals. Parents are indeed pressured to use psychological control (Grolnic 2003; Scharf and Goldner 2017). Grolnic defined three different ways a parent can be pressured to use psychological control.

The pressure that comes from "above" refers to social and contextual factors outside of the relationship with the child, such as the relationship with the spouse and issues at the workplace. For instance, studies show that parents who are experiencing conflict with their partner and are not satisfied with their marriage are more likely to resort to psychological control (Krishnakumar et al. 2003). Pressure from "below" refers to the child's behavior and characteristics. Some parents use psychological control to change their child's behavior. For instance, evidence suggests that parents of children who have externalizing problems and other behavior dysregulation problems were more likely to use psychological control in the following years (Pettit et al. 2001; Scharf and Goldner 2017).

Lastly, pressure from "within" refers to the parent's dispositional characteristics. Barber and colleagues (2002) claim this type of pressure to be the strongest predictor of psychological control. Perfectionism and feelings of parental incompetence have

been linked to increased psychological control (Costa et al. 2018). These parents use psychological control to obtain achievement outcomes and the child's compliance (Soenens and Vansteenkiste 2010). However, not all psychological control has child-related goals. Sometimes parents use psychological control just to take their own frustrations on someone, their kids in these cases (Soenens and Vansteenkiste 2010).

Psychological control motivation can arise from a combination of different pressures. Soenens, Vansteenkiste, and Luyten (2010) suggest that parents have achievement-directed and dependency-directed motivations for using psychological control. Achievement-motivated parents use psychological control to make the child comply with them and reach their expectations, whereas dependency-motivated parents use psychological control to make their child stay within close emotional boundaries. These motivations interact with the child's characteristics to predict psychological control. For instance, insecurely attached parents are more likely to use psychological control for dependency when their child attempts to gain independence (Barber and Harmon 2002). Similarly, achievement-oriented parents are more likely to use psychological control when their child does not meet the expected standards. Wang and colleagues (2012) show that parents' academic achievement expectations predicted psychological control only for children with poor academic records.

Finally, psychological control can function as a socialization tool for parents in the absence of dysfunctional tendencies (Scharf and Goldner 2017). Studies show that parents use psychological control to teach their children social norms (Fung 1999; Baumrind et al. 2010). Some parents use comparisons with others to evoke guilt, provide appropriate behavior models, and increase the child's awareness of how others think and feel (Fung and Lau 2012).

2.5.6 Measuring Psychological Control

Barber's (1996) Psychological Control Scale–Youth Self-Report (PCS–YSR) has been used and proved to be a reliable and valid psychological control scale. The initial scale consisted of 16 items measuring six different psychological control dimensions. These six dimensions were: invalidation of the child's feelings, personal attacks on the child, love withdrawal, guilt induction, erratic emotional behavior, and constraining verbal expressions of the child. The final version of the scale only included half of the items under a single dimension which consisted of relatively less controlling behaviors such as constraining verbal expressions, love withdrawal, and invalidating feelings. Despite not including half of the initial dimensions, Barber and

colleagues (2012) suggest a unified psychological control measure based on children interpreting the various psychological control behaviors in a common and shared direction. Due to this, most studies justified using a selective combination of items instead of assessing the whole scope of psychological control (Nelson et al. 2013). Others, however, emphasized the importance of utilizing the multidimensional nature of psychological control to capture different manifestations of psychological control across cultures (Barber et al. 2012; Chen-Bouck et al. 2019; Luebbe et al. 2018; Metin-Orta and Metin-Camgöz 2021; Nelson et al. 2003).

Research suggests that some psychological control strategies are more common in certain cultures than in others. Different socialization goals influence which psychological control strategies are used. For instance, internalizing behaviors are related to rejection and overprotection strategies, whereas externalizing behaviors are associated with only rejection (Nelson et al. 2013). Considering some cultures find one behavior more disruptive than the other, the psychological control strategies used will change accordingly (Scharf and Goldner 2017). Studies show that parents from collectivistic cultures use shaming and guilt induction more often than those from individualistic cultures (Chen-Bouck et al. 2019; Olsen et al. 2002; Wu et al. 2002). Additionally, Sümer and Kağıtçıbaşı (2010) found that love withdrawal, guilt induction, and overprotection were the common psychological control strategies used in Turkey. Considering that Barber's (1996) final version does not include guilt induction and overprotection dimensions, this scale is inadequate to capture the psychological control behaviors of parents from collectivistic cultures. Consequently, researchers have found ways to improve their measurement tools to reflect the culturally relevant dimensions of psychological control.

In their study with Chinese parents, Wang and colleagues (2007) used all items of Barber's (1996) scale, however, included additional items to measure guilt induction, which is shown to be a common psychological control dimension in China. Another study conducted interviews in different countries to develop culturally relevant items and used them in combination with universal items derived from theory (Barber et al. 2008). Results revealed that culturally relevant and universal items assessed distinct aspects of psychological control. Sayıl and Kındap (2010) showed that culturally relevant items were more reliable for non-western cultures such as Turkey and explained unique predictive power of psychological control on child outcomes. These findings indicate that psychological control might not be a construct with complete dimensional unity as Barber and colleagues suggested (2012). This makes incorporating culture-relevant concepts and dimensions of psychological control essential to study psychological control across cultures, which the current study aims to do so.

2.6 Relationship between Psychological Control and Parental Ethnotheories

As the reviewed literature suggests, parental ethnotheories such as beliefs, attributions, and socialization goals play an important role in shaping parenting behaviors. Especially, parental psychological and behavioral control behaviors are directly or indirectly via cultural values influenced by parental ethnotheories (Pettit and Laird 2002). There is considerable evidence in the current literature that supports the relationship between socialization goals and psychological control. It is shown that parents utilize psychological control to reach their achievement and closeness-related socialization goals (Soenens, Vansteenkiste, and Luyten 2010). Parents who desire their children to be dependent and close to them are more likely to use psychological control to create dependency (Barber and Harmon 2002), and those who value academic success are more likely to use psychological control to push the child toward that goal (Wang et al. 2012).

The relationship between socialization goals and psychological control is not a direct linear one. Socialization goals motivate parents to choose parenting strategies that would help them reach desired outcomes, however, other parenting beliefs, child, and environmental characteristics determine the final behavior outcome. Whether a parent, who prioritizes academic success, will utilize psychological control will be determined by the child's characteristics and parental attributions. Despite the proven adverse effects (Barber and Harmon 2002; Barber et al. 2005; McEwen and Flouri 2009; Pettit et al. 2001; Soenens et al. 2012), parents can justify psychological control use if they believe it to be a valuable tool toward better outcomes (Fung 1999; Scharf and Goldner 2017). However, parents will be less likely to use psychological control if their child is already academically successful (Wang et al. 2012), or they believe academic success comes from the child's disposition, thus not changeable. Because in these scenarios, psychological control will not bring any benefit.

Although cultural approaches to psychological control have been elaborated in past studies, there is a scarcity of research exploring the relationship between culture common psychological control behaviors and culture-specific socialization goals and beliefs. Smetana (1994) argues that parental beliefs are more predictive of parental behavior when they are about specific child behaviors and outcomes instead of general parenting tendencies. Thus, knowledge of cultural parental beliefs and attributions regarding specific child outcomes or consequences of specific parenting behaviors, particularly control behaviors, would allow a more comprehensive understanding of the parental motivation behind psychological control. This study aims

to provide evidence to fill this crucial gap in the literature, present a picture of parenting ethnotheories of contemporary Turkey and understand how specific parental ethnotheories of Turkish parents interact and affect psychological control behaviors.

2.7 Current Study

The current study aims to paint a comprehensive picture of parenting in Turkey by exploring parental ethnotheories and psychological control behaviors. There exist studies comparing Turkish immigrants' parenting beliefs in Europe with the parents in the host cultures or other cultures (e.g. Dost et al. 2006; Yağmurlu and Sanson 2004). These studies do not accurately represent the cultural beliefs of Turkish parents living in Turkey, as parenting beliefs of those who live in other countries will change and adapt to the host country's culture, via acculturation (Özdemir and Cheah 2013). For this reason, instead of adopting an etic approach and comparing Turkish parents with parents from other cultures based on commonly studied universal concepts of ethnotheories and psychological control, this study will adopt an emic approach and delve into the Turkish parent's characteristics to understand the dynamics of parenting within the Turkish culture. To achieve this, another goal of the study is to develop culturally relevant measurement tools that reflect Turkish parents' unique cultural characteristics. Thus, in the current study, parenting goals, beliefs, and psychological control behaviors of Turkish parents were examined by employing both qualitative and quantitative research methods in two stages.

This study is part of a nationwide research project investigating parental attitudes and ethnotheories in Turkey (118K050) and data collection for both the first and second stages, as well as the item development for the new measures, was completed as a part of this project.

The first part of the study will utilize qualitative research methods and will make use of semi-structured in-depth interviews with parents, grandparents, and babysitters to investigate parental ethnotheories and behaviors relevant to Turkish culture. The choice of interviewing not only parents but grandparents and babysitters was made to capture parental ethnotheories and attitudes of everyone involved in child care (Harkness and Super 1996). Considering the extended family structure of Turkey, especially grandmother's active involvement in childcare in some cases makes them another parental figure in the child's life (Kızmaz and Altuğ 2019). Thus, the ethnotheories of grandparents provide additional information regarding the development of the child. This approach also allows observations of intergenerational

transformation of parenting. As argued by Kağıtçıbaşı (2005), Turkish society is characterized by constant change and development. Therefore, it is expected that this change might be reflected in parenting beliefs and behaviors as well.

In this study certain segments of the interviews will be presented to show how culturally relevant parental ethnotheories (parenting goals and beliefs) and psychological control behaviors among Turkish parents were derived, using both a bottom-up approach and thematic analyses. Critical demographic characteristics, gender, education, income, and generation, will be considered to explore within-culture variance and generate items to reflect this variance. The development of scales to measure ethnotheories and psychological control behaviors of Turkish parents was completed as a part of the project, however, the factor structure of the parental belief and psychological control scales were explored as a part of this study.

In the second part of the study, the aforementioned culturally relevant scales will be used to quantitatively measure the parenting beliefs, socialization goals, and psychological control behaviors of Turkish parents. The data will be analyzed to discover trends in ethnotheory and psychological control behavior, and how they interact with parent and child characteristics such as age, gender, education, and income. Finally, the relationship between ethnotheories and psychological control will be examined.

3. STAGE ONE: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

3.1 Participants and Procedure

In the qualitative part of the project data collection, 329 semi-structured interviews were conducted with Turkish parents, grandparents, and babysitters. Of the interviews, 123 were with mothers, 81 with fathers, 58 with grandmothers, and 39 of them were with grandfathers. The remaining 28 interviews were conducted with babysitters.

Of the target children, 180 were boys and 149 were girls, while 129 were between the ages of 3-6, 94 were between 7-17, 31 were between 13-15, and 71 were younger than 3. In terms of employment, 97% of the fathers, 65% of the mothers, 25% of the grandfathers, and 18% of the grandmothers were working at the time of data collection. Among mothers, 29% were high school graduates while 51 % had completed university and above education. For fathers, 62% had university and above education while 30% had middle school and lower education. 70% of the babysitters had middle school and lower education compared to 50% of the grandmothers and 33% of the grandfathers. 42% of the grandfathers had university and above education, compared to the 23% of grandmothers. Considering the education and income levels, 30% of the participants were low SES.

Participants were selected through convenience and snowball sampling. All the interviews were planned to be conducted in person, however, due to covid-19 related circumstances, of the interviews, 73 were conducted online. Participants were first contacted and informed about the aim of the study, which was to learn more about parenting experiences in Turkey. They were told that questions about their experiences as a parent and their relationship with their child/grandchild would be asked during the interview. After they accepted to participate and be interviewed, a convenient time and place were decided for the interview to take place. Most of the interviews were conducted at the participants' houses, but in some cases, community

centers and meeting rooms were used, after ensuring privacy. The interviews were audio-recorded with the consent of the participants. Then, interviewers used previously prepared open-ended questions to initiate conversations on topics related to parenting and probed for further detail when necessary. Afterward, these interviews were transcribed, and their content was coded by trained assistants.

3.2 Coding Process

All qualitative analysis and coding processes were completed using MAXQDA software. Both bottom-up and top-down approaches were employed for thematic analyses. For the top-down approach, a codebook was prepared based on the patterns found in initial interviews and literature. A codebook and a systematic coding guide were prepared, and all coders were trained to recognize and code relevant information according to this guide. For the bottom-up approach, coders created their codes for information that did not fit into predetermined codes in the codebook. These initial simple codes were then combined based on concepts and patterns. To ensure inter-rater reliability, coders were given a sample interview to code according to the instructions and were given feedback until they reached a minimum of .70 agreement with the sample coding. The inter-rater agreement was calculated using the intercoder agreement analysis feature on MAXQDA.

3.2.1 Socialization Goals

Participants were asked questions such as "which characteristics of your child do you like?", "Are there any characteristics you would want to see in your child?" and "what are the characteristics or behaviors of your child that would make you feel elated and proud?" to explore socialization goals. In addition to the responses to these questions, statements related to socialization goals in any part of the interview were coded and included in the analysis. Some examples of statements by participants were:

> "As long as my child becomes a person with moral values, I would be really proud of them."

> "I want my child to be a child who is capable of standing on their own feet and who knows what they want"

> "Think about it, your child helps their friends, is kind and compassionate... it would make me proud if my child is like that"

> "For example, they should be able to express themselves in society without getting shy, what they want or don't want. Actually, everyone can express what they want, (I want) them to clearly express what they don't want. To be open to communication, to not be afraid of doing things and thinking they are capable. This is self-confidence for me."

> "I don't want my child to be a rebel, they should continue being respectful to their elders."

> "My only wish is to see my child study and get a profession. I would be very disappointed if they do the opposite"

In-depth interviews were content coded and analyzed to develop a culture-specific measure of socialization goals. Both numerical and qualitative approaches were adopted in the analysis process. Content analysis refers to dividing the qualitative data into smaller categories based on the meanings of the content to examine the data easier (Neuendorf 2016). For instance, statements that include socialization goals such as "studious", "puts importance on school" and "gets good grades" were categorized and coded as "academically successful". Other statements were coded similarly to create manageable, but informative and meaningful socialization goal categories. Later, MAXQDA software was used to explore the number of instances these socialization goals were mentioned to find out the most mentioned socialization goals. It should be noted that while using frequencies is a useful method to infer possible trends among the participants, the frequencies mentioned in the context of qualitative data do not have the generalization implications quantitative data has (Maxwell 2010). Some socialization goals were mentioned and coded multiple times in a single interview, therefore only the number of interviews a socialization goal was mentioned was considered in the frequency analysis. This way, how many parents a socialization goal was mentioned can be inferred, which enables a more meaningful interpretation of prevalence.

The results showed that many parents mentioned "ethic/moral", "self-confident" and "compassionate" as desirable characteristics. In addition to the socialization goals mentioned by many of the participants, socialization goals that were not men-

tioned as often but represented unique cultural information were considered. The items for the new measure were selected by the project members to represent common, universal, and culturally relevant items (See Appendix A). The final 20 items included typically autonomy-related socialization goals such as "independent" and "self-confident", relationship-related ones such as "respectful to elders" and "cooperative/agreeable" as well as culturally significant ones like "compassionate (conscientious)", "humble" and "contended".

3.2.2 Parental Beliefs

Interview questions did not include direct probing questions for parental beliefs. Rather, interviewers were trained to look for potential openings and probe for further detail when necessary. For instance, if the participants mentioned a characteristic of the child they didn't like, interviewers asked questions such as "why?" or when a statement was made about changing the child's behavior, "how?" was asked to probe for information on parental beliefs regarding explanations for child and parent behavior. The coders were also trained to recognize mentions of parental beliefs. Some examples of statements that were coded for parental beliefs are:

> "At home he is calm. He changes when he comes here because his aunts are here. Of course, the child gets spoiled when he receives interest."

> "(if my child does something bad) I would think it is my fault, that I couldn't teach them well. I would take the blame. I can't blame anyone else for my child's behavior, not even their father."

> "(When my child misbehaves) I think... they are a child right now, they change a lot. Today they will act this way, tomorrow they will not. It's a child in the end. They will return to themselves eventually. What's important is to be a role model with your behaviors. A child won't do what you say but will behave as you behave. If there is no fight, commotion in the home, they won't be ill-tempered and aggressive."

Statements that included information about parents' explanations behind positive and negative child behaviors and outcomes were considered for coding. Whether the outcome was attributed to a child's characteristic and behaviors, the parent's characteristic and behaviors or sources outside the parent-child relationship was taken into account. Additionally, beliefs regarding which emotions are acceptable

to be expressed in which circumstances were also included. These codes were then examined for patterns of parental beliefs. As a result, the parental beliefs scale given in Appendix B was developed by the project team. More information on the parental beliefs items generated from these interviews will be given in the measures section of the second stage.

3.2.3 Psychological Control

Psychological control, like parental beliefs, was not probed by the specific directed questions. General parenting behavior statements were analyzed for mentions of direct and indirect attempts to control or manipulate the feelings and thoughts of the child. Additionally, statements about overprotective and restrictive parental control behaviors were investigated. These mentions of invasive and manipulative control behaviors of the parents were considered and coded as psychological control. Some examples of coded statements can be seen below:

> "I don't punish him but sometimes I would say 'I won't forgive you or I won't ever forget what you did to him."

> "(I would tell that) I am enduring this for you. I could've left you with your father and found another job. I am making so much effort so that you can go to a good school and live in a good house. If I am enduring this much burden for you, you should be able to show success in your grades in return. I don't want bread, food, or work from you, just be good at your classes."

> "She ripped her homework... without getting angry I told her '(in a sarcastic tone) leave it, it's not useful anyway, right? let's forget about it and play'. She started crying and fixed her homework eventually... She cried and I didn't talk with her again that day."

These statements were analyzed and combined under codes that represent certain patterns of psychological control behaviors such as guilt induction, withdrawal of love, intrusion, and overprotection. Then, common cultural psychological control items were developed from these codes. To conclude, these newly developed items and items from previously standardized scales were combined to create a culturally relevant psychological control scale (See Appendix C). The items developed from the interviews will be discussed in more detail later in the second stage.

4. STAGE TWO: QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

4.1 Participants and Procedure

Participants were parents with at least one child between the ages of 3 and 18. Parents were contacted through schools and intived to participate in the study through an online survey. Initially, 488 parents responded to the online survey. Seventy-four participants who did not complete the measures of psychological control and parental beliefs were excluded, leaving 414 participants for further analyses. Of the parents, 279 were mothers ($M_{age} = 42.1, SD = 5,17$) with 1.86 children on average (SD = .68) and 134 were fathers ($M_{age} = 45.9, SD = 7,11$) with 1,78 children on average (SD = .77). Of mothers, 151 had two children, 41 had three children and 85 had one child. On the other hand, 55 fathers had one child, 58 had two children and 19 had three children. Participants with more than one child between the ages of 3-18 were instructed to choose a target child and take them as a reference when answering the questions. Of target children, 204 were girls ($M_{childage} = 11.92, SD = 3.35$) and 210 were boys ($M_{childage} = 11.04, SD = 3.28$). Characteristics of the sample can be seen in Table 4.1.

Of fathers, 106 completed university or higher-level education, 17 graduated from high school and 12 had middle school or below-level education. Of mothers, 142 were university and higher education graduates, 88 were high school graduates and 49 graduated from middle school or below education. Those with university and above education were classified as "high education", high school graduates were "middle education", while those with middle school and below education were classified as "low education" in the analyses. Fathers' education level was significantly higher than mothers, $t(412)$ = -4,82, p = .000.

Of mothers, 129 (46%) were currently not working, whereas only 9 out of 135 fathers (6%) were unemployed. Based on their monthly household income, 42% of the participants were classified as high income, 30% of them as middle, and 18% of

them as low-income group. Fathers had significantly higher levels of income than mothers, $t(412)$ = -5,385, p = .000. Of fathers, 81 (60%) reported high income, 42 (31%) reported middle and 12 (9%) reported low income. In comparison, of mothers, 93 (33%) reported high income, 123 (44%) reported middle income and 63 (23%) reported low income. The quantitative data used was the pilot data collected to test the newly developed culturally relevant measures. The data was collected from a relatively educated and affluent convenient sample; thus it should be noted that the education and income distributions of the data might not be particularly representative of the general population of Turkey.

Table 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variables	Mothers (N=279)	Fathers (N=134)
Education		
University and Above	142 (51%)	106 (78%)
High School	88 (31%)	17 (13%)
Middle School and Below	49 (18%)	12 (9%)
Income		
High	93 (33%)	81 (60%)
Middle	123 (44%)	42 (31%)
Low	63 (23%)	12 (9%)
Number of Children		
1 Child	85 (30%)	55 (41%)
2 Children	151 (54%)	58 (43%)
3 Children	41 (15%)	19 (14%)
Employement Status		
Employed	150 (54%)	126 (94%)
Not Employed	129 (46%)	9 (6%)

4.2 Measures

4.2.1 Socialization Goals

The scale consisted of a list of 20 items that described different socialization goals. The items were developed from the qualitative data in stage one by project members. Some of the socialization goals in the list were “self-confident”, “contented”, “shares problems and joys with parents”, “academically successful” and “cooperative/agreeable”. The items were presented to the participants in random order. Participants were then asked to read the items on the list of characteristics they

might want their child to possess and select the five most important characteristics from the list. They were not allowed to select more than five items and those who chose less than five were not able to continue to the next stage.

Because the participant selected only the five most important socialization goals, the collected data provides information only on the most prioritized socialization goals. Considering that socialization goals by their nature are desirable, Likert-type scales were not chosen as there would be a ceiling effect and a lot of variability in the data would have been lost. The second alternative, the Q-sort method, would require participants to rank the socialization goals according to their importance. This approach promises a deeper understanding of parents' attitudes, but it is more useful for smaller item lists. Ranking 20 items would cost a lot of time and cognitive effort for the participants. The difference between item rankings would also become meaningless since accurately estimating the difference between less important items would be a tricky task. Therefore, considering the time costs, ease of application, and information it offers relative to the costs, the current method of selecting the five most important items was chosen. This method has also been successfully used to measure socialization goals in previous studies (e.g. Mone et al. 2016).

For every socialization goal, participants who selected it (within the top five), received a score of 1, while participants who didn't select it would get a score of 0. Following this scoring system, participants were classified into two groups for each socialization goal as those who promote or did not promote the given socialization goal for analysis purposes.

4.2.2 Parental Beliefs

The Parental Beliefs Scale consists of 23 items derived from qualitative data in the first stage. The items were constructed based on semantic differential measurement methods. Unlike Likert-type scales that provide information regarding how much a participant agrees or disagrees with a statement, semantic differential scales provide information regarding participants' attitudes on two contrasting statements. Participants are given two opposite parental beliefs located at the opposite ends of the scale and instructed to choose which one they feel the closest to on a six-point scale. For instance, one of the items on the scale was "Parents are not responsible for the child's behavior / Parents are responsible for the child's behavior". For this item, ratings of three and below would indicate that the parent believes that "Parents are not responsible for the child's behavior" while those who gave a four and above rating believe that "Parents are responsible for the child's behavior". This method

forces participants to choose one parental belief over the other, thus providing crucial information regarding parents' attitudes towards the presented parental beliefs.

The items were constructed to capture parental attributions for child outcomes and behaviors, parental beliefs about appropriate emotion socialization, and parental beliefs regarding the outcomes of specific parenting behaviors. For example, one of the items is "The child will not take a parent who punishes them often seriously / The child will not take a parent who does not punish them often seriously". Higher ratings indicate support for the belief that "The child will not take the parent who does not punish them often seriously" thus, supporting parental punishment behaviors. On the other hand, lower scores would indicate that the parent believes their child will not take them seriously if they punish them often. Another item on the scale is "The child can express their anger in non-family social environments / The child should withhold/hide their anger in non-family social environments" and the item aims to capture parental beliefs regarding appropriate anger socialization. Higher scores imply parental beliefs that encourage suppression of the child's emotion expressions while lower scores indicate parental support for emotion expression.

Initial factor analysis extracted seven factors over the eigenvalue of one and the scree plot indicated two prominent factors explaining 18% and 12% of the variance respectively. The remaining 13 items were scattered across five factors and a lot of the items were cross-loaded. Trying a three-factor solution resulted in many items cross-loading or not loading on any factor. Therefore, a two-factor solution was used. A Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation was used to extract two factors and results revealed a good fit for 19 of the items while four items had lower than .30 loading for both factors. Those four items were "A child who is warned when they make a mistake corrects her/his mistake / insists on making the same mistake", "A child learns what is right and what is wrong in school / at home", and "A child's personality is mainly shaped by themselves / the parents", and "Difficult experiences of a child will affect them in a positively / negatively in the future". Correlation analysis showed that these four items were not related to psychological control, thus, they were excluded. Final factor analysis for a two-factor solution was conducted with the remaining 19 items (see Table 4.2).

The first factor consisted of eight items and explained 21% of the variance with a Cronbach's alpha of .81. The items on this factor were dysfunctional parental beliefs (DPBs), where higher scores promote suppression of emotional expression and controlling parenting behaviors, such as "Children should be able to express their anger in family environment / Children should hide their anger in the family environment" and "Children will not take a parent who punishes them often seriously

/ Children will not take a parent who does not punish them seriously.". The second factor consisted of 11 items, explained 14% of the variance, and had a Cronbach's alpha of .63. Exclusion of any item would not improve Cronbach's alpha, so the 11-item solution was deemed acceptable. Items on this factor were benign parental beliefs (BPBs) such as "Children are the only meaning of the parents' lives / Children are not the only meaning of the parent's lives", and "One should scold the child, so they won't repeat their mistake / Scolding the child does not work". Higher scores implied that the parent believes child outcomes will be adequate even without intensive parental control and involvement.

4.2.3 Psychological Control

This measure contains items from three different sources to capture both cultural and universal aspects of psychological control. Items from well-established measures were combined with the culture-specific items derived from the qualitative data in the first of the current study. Eight items included in the Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self-Report (PCS-YSR; Barber 1996) were included to measure universal psychological control behaviors. This short version has been used in multiple studies across cultures and proved to be a valid and reliable measure of psychological control (Barber et al. 2012, see Sayıl and Kındap 2010 for the Turkish version). Additionally, two items from the overprotection subscale of the Turkish version of the EMBU parent survey were included (Perris et al. 1980; Sümer et. al. 2009). Finally, seven new psychological control items derived from qualitative data in stage one have been used. These items represent psychological control behaviors that are common among Turkish parents. Some examples of the culture relevant items are "I make my child feel guilty by telling them they upset and disappointed me", "I tell my child I won't forgive them when they make a mistake", and "I tell my child how much I work and struggle for their sake" and "I would sulk/give them silent treatment". The scale contained a total of 17 items and participants rated how often they practiced the behavior mentioned in the items from 1 "never" to 6 "always" on a Likert-type scale.

An Exploratory Factor Analysis (PCA) was run on these 17 items using varimax rotation. The results revealed four factors with eigenvalues over one. The first two factors explained 24% and 10% of the variance while the third and fourth factors each explained 7% of the variance. Further examination revealed that one of the factors consisted of items with many cross-loading and were difficult to interpret. Therefore,

Table 4.2 Factor Loadings for Varimax Rotated 2-Factor Solution for Parental Beliefs

	Factor Loadings	
	Dysfunctional Parental Beliefs	Benign Parental Beliefs
Children should be able to express their anger in the family environment / Children should hide their anger in the family environment.	.815	
Children should be able to express their sadness in the family environment / Children should hide their sadness in the family environment.	.809	
Children should be able to openly express their happiness / Children should keep their happiness to themselves.	.804	
Children should be able to express their sadness in a non-family environment / Children should hide their sadness in a non-family environment.	.652	
Parents should let the children make mistakes / Parents should prevent children from making mistakes.	.648	
Children should be able to express their anger in a non-family environment / Children should hide their anger in a non-family environment.	.567	
Children won't take a parent who punishes them often seriously / Children won't take a parent who doesn't punish them seriously.	.488	
Family should not intervene with who the child is friends with / The family should intervene with who the child is friends with.	.330	
Children are the only meaning of the parents' lives / Children are not the only meaning of the parents' lives.		.576
The character will not develop without spirituality and morals / Spirituality and morals are not the only requirement for the character.		.542
Mother working affects the child negatively / Mother working affects the child positively.		.536
Parents are responsible for the behavior of the child / Parents are not responsible for the behaviors of the child.		.498
Being a single child will affect the character of the child negatively / Being a single child will not affect the character of the child negatively.		.485
How a child behaves outside is more important / How a child behaves at home is more important.		.440
One should scold the child so they won't repeat their mistake / Scolding the child does not work.		.401
Children get spoiled from love / Children won't get spoiled from love.		.383
Children do whatever they see their parents do / Children do whatever they want to do.		.376
Parents should not be like friends with the child / Parents should be like friends with the child.		.336
In some circumstances, physical punishment can be used for discipline / Physical punishment can't be used.		.301
Percentage of Explained Varience	215	14%
Cronbach's Alpha	.81	.63

a three-factor solution was preferred. Principal Component Analysis using varimax rotation was run to force a three-factor solution. Results showed a better fit and the item distribution among factors was concordant with the previous work (Barber 1996; Barber et al. 2012). Three factors explained 41% of the total variance and reliability analysis indicated acceptable internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha values varying from .60 to .71 (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Factor loadings for Varimax Rotated Three-Factor Solution for Psychological Control

	Factor Loadings		
	Guilt Induction and Shaming	Overprotection and Intrusion	Limiting Self Expression
I tell my child I won't forgive them when they make a mistake.	.654		
I make my child feel guilty by telling them they upset and disappointed me.	.652		
I tell my child how much I work and struggle for their sake.	.562		
I tell my child they should be ashamed when they make a mistake.	.551		
I blame my child for the struggles and hardship of the family members.	.544		
I remind my child their past mistakes when I criticize them.	.519		
I tell my child what to think and how to feel about most subjects.	.415		
I sulk/give them the silent treatment.	.388		
I won't let my child make friends outside of school for fear of something (bad) happening to them.		.712	
I won't let my child spend time with their friends away from the house.		.666	
I won't let my child do certain things their friends do in fear of something (bad) happening to them.		.582	
I check my child's bag, room, or telephone to see what they are doing.		.530	
I don't ask what my child feels or thinks, I already know.		.409	
I change the subject when my child is talking.			.770
I cut my child off when they are speaking			.749
I complete the sentences of my child without waiting for them to finish.			.579
I try to change the thoughts and feelings of my child regarding certain subjects.			.429
Percentage of Explained Varience	24%	10%	7%
Cronbach's Alpha	.71	.62	.59

The first factor was labeled Guilt Induction and Shaming (PC-GIS) which consisted of eight items. This factor explained 24% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .71. Of the eight items on this factor, five were culture-relevant items that were derived from qualitative data. Marker items with the highest loadings were "I tell my child I won't forgive them when they make a mistake" and "I make my child feel guilty by telling them they upset and disappointed me", with loadings of .65.

The second factor was labeled Overprotection, Intrusion, and Invalidation of Independent Identity (PC-OPI), which explained 10% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .62. Out of five items on this factor, three were culture-relevant items, and "I don't let my child make friends outside of school in fear of something (bad) happening to them" was the marker item with the highest loading of .71.

Third and the last factor was labeled Limitation of Self Expression and Invalidation of Child's Perspective (PC-LSE). All four items on this factor were taken from PCS-YSR (Barber 1996). The highest loading marker item was "I change the subject while my child is talking" with .77. This factor explained seven percent of the total variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .59. Further analysis with McDonald's

omega indicated the reliability of .60. Based on the literature, acceptable inter-item correlations, and the presumption that relatively low levels were due to the low number of items, the reliability analysis results were deemed acceptable.

Scores for each of the three factors were calculated by summing the mean score of each item loaded to the factor and higher scores indicated more frequent psychological control behavior.

4.3 Data Analysis Strategy

4.3.1 Preliminary Analysis

The first part of data analysis aims to summarize the data and discover patterns. Descriptive analysis will be run on the three target variables (psychological control, socialization goals, and parental beliefs) to explain the general tendencies of the parents in the sample. Then ANOVAs and independent-sample t-test analyses will be conducted to examine the relationship between target variables and demographic variables. These analyses will explain how psychological control, parental beliefs, and socialization goals change according to parents' and child's demographic characteristics such as education, income, age, and gender.

4.3.2 Inferential Analysis

Firstly, preliminary correlation analyses will be conducted to investigate any relationship between socialization goals and psychological control. Biserial correlations can be used when the categorical variable consists of two artificially dichotomous categories. Use of this method is justified for the current study, as parents who chose a socialization goal versus who did not are artificially created dischotomous categories due to measurement limitations, while socialization goal prioritization is assumed to be continuous in its nature. Then, multiple ANOVA analyses will be conducted for each psychological control dimension and the socialization goals that were found to be related to that dimension. For instance, to further investigate the relationship between PC-GIS and socialization goals, a separate ANOVA analysis will be conducted to examine the relationships between PC-GIS and each socialization goal that correlated with PC-GIS. The same process will be repeated for PC-OPI and PC-LSE. Education, income, child age, parent age, child gender,

and parent gender will be control variables for every analysis. These analyses aim to discover if parents who chose a certain socialization goal differ from those who didn't when demographic variables are controlled.

A correlation analysis will be conducted to investigate the association between parental beliefs and psychological control and the direction of these associations. Then, three separate hierarchical regression analyses will be conducted for three psychological control dimensions to further examine the predictive power of parental beliefs on psychological control dimensions. The first block will include demographic characteristics and the two parenting belief variables (DPBs and BPBs) will be added as the predictors in the second block. The aim is to see if parental beliefs predict psychological control above the effect of demographic characteristics.

The preliminary exploratory analyses will be conducted to describe the data. The main aim of these exploratory analyses is to discover the culture-specific pattern of the associations between parental ethnotheories (goals and beliefs) and psychological control. However, considering the past literature reviewed above, psychological control dimensions are expected to be associated with BPBs negatively and with DPBs positively.

5. RESULTS

5.1 Descriptive Findings

5.1.1 Psychological Control

Descriptive statistics on psychological control variables indicated that the mean scores of the psychological control dimensions were relatively low. On the 6-point scales, the average scores for PC-GIS (M = 2.07, SD = .68), PC-LSE (M = 2.15, SD = .70) and PC-OPI (M = 2.67, SD = .70) were lower than the midpoint of the scale suggesting that psychological control is not common practice in this sample. A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare the scores of different psychological control dimensions. Results revealed that PC-GIS scores were significantly lower than PC-LSE ($t(413)$ = -2.270, p = .024) and PC-OPI (t(413) = -14.603, p = .000). Scores of PC-LSE and PC-OPI were also significantly different, $t(413)$ = -10.558, p = .000. As expected, overprotection was the most common psychological control among Turkish parents, and it was statistically higher than guilt induction and intrusion.

A series of one-way between subjects ANOVAs were conducted to compare the SES groups (income) on the dimensions of psychological control. ANOVA on PC-GIS scores yielded a significant income effect, $F(2,411)$ = 11,960, p = .000. Post-hoc analysis using Tukey revealed that high income parents (M =1.90, SD = .53) reported lower PC-GIS than both middle income (M = 2.13, SD = .72) and low income (M = 2.33, SD = .78) parents. Parents with low income parents also significantly differed than the middle income parents, indicating a strong SES effect on PC-GIS. Similarly, ANOVA on PC-OPI scores showed a significant income effect, $F(2,411)$ = 20,517, p = .000. Tukey post-hoc analysis revealed that parents with low income (M = 3.11, SD = 1.04) had the highest PC-OPI scores, and parents with middle income (M = 2.75, SD = .81) showed significantly more PC-OPI than parents with

high income (M = 2.40, SD = .88). Income had no effect on PC-LSE scores.

A series of one-way between-subjects ANOVAs were conducted to compare the dimensions of psychological control across education levels. ANOVA on PC-OPI scores showed a significant education effect, $F(2,411)$ = 36,604, p = .000. Post-hoc analysis with Tukey revealed that parents with high education (M = 2.40, SD = .76) used significantly less PC-OPI than parents with middle (M = 2.96, SD = .88) and low education (M = 3.26, SD = .90). The difference between parents with low and middle education was also significant. Results for PC-GIS scores also showed an education effect, $F(2,411)$ = 32,156, p = .000. Parents with low education (M = 2.65, SD = .76) reported higher PC-GIS scores than both middle and high education parents. Parents with education (M = 1.93, SD = .59) significantly used less PC-GIS than parents with middle education (M = 2.07, SD = .65). No education effect was found for PC-LSE. Results indicate that low education was characterized by the highest use of guilt induction and overprotection.

Fathers and mothers were compared on their psychological control use. Results of ANOVA revealed a significant gender effect on both PC-GIS ($F(1,412)$ = 3.858, p = .05) and PC-OPI ($F(1,412)$ = 10.595, p = .001). Mothers (M = 2.11, SD = .70) used PC-GIS more than fathers (M = 1.98, SD = .61). Similarly, mothers reported higher PC-OPI scores (M = 2.77, SD = .87) than fathers (M = 2.47, SD = .86). Fathers and mothers did not differ on PC-LSE scores. There was no effect of child's gender and parents age was not associated with psychological control. However, the age of the child was negatively correlated with PC-GIS, r = -.121, n = 414, p = .014, indicating more guilt induction use for younger children.

5.1.2 Parental Beliefs

One-way between subjects ANOVAs were conducted to compare parental beliefs across education levels. There was a significant education effect for both benign ($F(2,411)$ = 13.314, p = .000), and dysfunctional parental beliefs ($F(2,411)$ = 30.256,p = .000). Post-hoc analysis with Tukey revealed that parents with high education (M = 3.95, SD = .62) had stronger benign parental beliefs than parents with low (M = 3.52, SD = .69) and middle (M = 3.66, SD = .73) education. However, parents with middle and low education did not differ. Likewise, parents with middle (M = 2.92, SD = .95) and low (M = 3.15, SD = .92) did not differ on dysfunctional parental beliefs. Parents with high education (M = 2.38, SD = .74) reported significantly less dysfunctional parental beliefs than other.

A series of one-way between subjects ANOVAs were conducted to compare the SES groups (income) on parental beliefs. Results showed an income effect both benign ($F(2,411) = 7.844$, $p = .000$), and dysfunctional parental beliefs ($F(2,411) = 19.180$, $p = .000$). Post-hoc with Tukey revealed that parents with high income ($M = 3.96$, $SD = .68$) held stronger benign parental beliefs than those with low ($M = 3.68$, $SD = .72$) and middle income ($M = 3.71$, $SD = .74$). Conversely, parents with high income ($M = 2.28$, $SD = .66$) reported less dysfunctional beliefs than those with low ($M = 3.01$, $SD = .10$) and middle ($M = 2.82$, $SD = .90$) income. Parents with low and middle income did not differ on both types of parental beliefs.

Results of a one-way between subjects ANOVA showed that parental beliefs fathers and mothers differed on their parental beliefs. Mothers'($M = 2{,}73$, $SD = .93$) dysfunctional parental beliefs were stronger than fathers' ($M = 2.42$, $SD = .74$), $F(1,412) = 11.435$, $p = .001$. Similarly mothers ($M = 3.88$, $SD = .68$) reported stronger benign parental beliefs than fathers ($M = 3.67$, $SD = .67$), $F(1,412) = 8.319$, $p = .004$. The gender of the child had no effect on dysfunctional parental beliefs, however, benign parental beliefs were higher for parents with girls ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .69$) compared to parents with boys ($M = 3.72$, $SD = .67$), $F(1,412) = 7.449$, $p = .007$.

5.1.3 Socialization Goals

A complete list of socialization goals in the order of most preferred to least preferred is shown in Table 5.1. The most prioritized socialization goals were *"self-confident"*, *"compassionate (conscientious)"*, *"expresses likes and dislikes"* and *"acts morally"*. These four were all included among the five most prioritized socialization goals of at least half the parents. In comparison, the four socialization goals that were least prioritized were all chosen by less than 10% of the parents. These goals were *"humble"*, *"gets along with friends"*, *"cooperative/agreeable"* and *"helps with household chores"*.

Potential differences in socialization goals preferences across income levels were examined using the Chi-Squared test of homogeneity. Results of the analysis showed that the frequency of preference was significantly different across income levels for half of the items. The frequency of selection and test statistics of these 10 socialization goals can be found in Table 5.2. For instance, socialization goals such as *"independent"*, *"self-confident"*, and *"can make own decisions"* were significantly preferred more often by parents with high income. On the contrary, socialization

Table 5.1 Prioritization Frequencies of Socialization Goals

	n	%
Self Confident	256	62%
Compassionate (Conscientious)	227	55%
Acts Morally	220	53%
Expresses likes and dislikes	213	51%
Can make own decisions	144	35%
Shares problems and joys with parents	131	31%
Communicates well with parents and siblings.	113	27%
Helpful / Sharing	107	26%
Academically Successful	102	25%
Is not aggressive/violent towards anyone	80	19%
Sociable / Takes initiative	73	17%
Contented	65	16%
Independent	64	15%
Respectful to elders	54	13%
Behaves in an age-appropriate/mature manner	51	12%
Uses social media/technology in a balanced way	48	12%
Humble	41	10%
Gets along with friends	37	9%
Cooperative/Agreeable	30	7%
Helps with household chores	14	3%

goals such as *"shares problems and joys with parents", "cooperative/agreeable", "respectful to elders"*, and *"contented"* were significantly more preferred by parents with low income, and preference for these socialization goals decreased as income increased.

A series of Chi-squared tests were conducted to explore the relationship between education and socialization goals. As seen in Table 5.3, results showed a similar trend as the relationship between income and socialization goals. Preference for socialization goals such as *"independent", "can make own decisions"*, and *"sociable/takes initiative"* were higher among parents with high education and lower among parents with low education. In particular, there was a strong preference for *"self-confident"* among parents with high education (72%) compared to low (31%) and middle education (56%). Contrarily, socialization goals such as *"communicates well with parents and siblings", "contented"*, and *"respectful to elders"* were chosen more frequently by participants with less education.

Unlike income and education, socialization goals did not differ between fathers and mothers. There was a significant difference in preference between mothers and fathers for the *"independent"* item, $X^2(1, N = 414) = 12,37, p = .000$. Fathers chose "independent" more frequently (24%) compared to mothers (11%). However, considering the education level differences between the mothers and fathers, this relationship was further examined to include the effect of education. Results showed that, after education levels were controlled, fathers and mothers did not differ, $F(1,412) = .886$, $p = .42$. Aside from this issue, socialization goals did not differ based on the parent's gender, the child's gender or the child's age.

Table 5.2 Results of Chi-Square Analysis and Frequencies for Socialization Goals Based on Income

	Low Income		Middle Income		High Income				
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	n	X^2	p
Uses social media/technology in a balanced way	12 (16%)	63 (84%)	24 (15%)	141 (85%)	12 (7%)	162 (93%)	414	6.57	.037
Independent	3 (4%)	72 (96%)	18 (11%)	146 (89%)	42 (24%)	13 (76%)	414	19.53	.000
Compassionate (Conscientious)	31 (41%)	44 (59%)	59 (56%)	78 (47%)	109 (63%)	65 (37%)	414	10.10	.006
Self-confident	34 (45%)	41 (55%)	87 (53%)	67 (41%)	124 (71%)	5 (29%)	414	15.63	.000
Can make own decisions	14 (19%)	61 (81%)	98 (59%)	114 (69%)	79 (45%)	9 (55%)	414	18..33	.000
Communicates well with parents and siblings.	22 (30%)	53 (70%)	51 (31%)	109 (66%)	35 (20%)	139 (80%)	414	8.35	.015
Shares problems and joys with parents	34 (45%)	41 (55%)	53 (32%)	112 (68%)	44 (25%)	130 (75%)	414	9.77	.008
Cooperative/Agreeable	10 (13%)	65 (87%)	15 (9%)	150 (81%)	5 (3%)	169 (97%)	414	9.92	.007
Respectful to elders	18 (24%)	57 (76%)	18 (11%)	147 (89%)	18 (10%)	156 (90%)	414	9.72	.008
Contented	22 (29%)	53 (71%)	28 (17%)	137 (83%)	15 (9%)	159 (81%)	414	17.32	.000

Table 5.3 Results of Chi-Square Analysis and Frequencies for Socialization Goals Based on Education

	Low Education		Middle Education		High Education				
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	Yes (%)	No (%)	n	X^2	p
Independent	2 (3%)	59 (97%)	7 (7%)	98 (93%)	55 (22%)	193 (78%)	414	21.70	.000
Compassionate (Conscientious)	21 (34%)	40 (66%)	55 (52%)	50 (48%)	151 (61%)	97 (39%)	414	14.18	.001
Self-confident	19 (31%)	42 (69%)	59 (56%)	46 (44%)	178 (72%)	70 (28%)	414	36.14	.000
Can make own decisions	10 (16%)	51 (84%)	26 (25%)	79 (75%)	108 (44%)	140 (56%)	414	22.14	.000
Communicates well with parents and siblings.	22 (36%)	39 (64%)	39 (37%)	66 (63%)	52 (21%)	196 (79%)	414	12.50	.002
Shares problems and joys with parents	25 (41%)	36 (59%)	43 (41%)	62 (59%)	63 (25%)	185 (75%)	414	11.13	.004
Sociable / Takes initiative	4 (7%)	57 (93%)	19 (19%)	86 (81%)	50 (20%)	198 (80%)	414	6.26	.044
Cooperative/Agreeable	9 (15%)	52 (85%)	8 (8%)	97 (92%)	13 (5%)	235 (95%)	414	6.62	.037
Respectful to elders	17 (28%)	44 (72%)	13 (12%)	92 (88%)	24 (10%)	224 (90%)	414	14.34	.001
Contented	19 (31%)	42 (69%)	20 (19%)	85 (81%)	26 (10%)	222 (90%)	414	16.99	.000

5.2 Socialization Goals and Psychological Control

A series of ANOVAs were conducted for each psychological control dimension and the socialization goals that were found to be related to it in the preliminary analysis; to examine if parents who preferred a specific socialization goal differed from those who didn't, in terms of psychological control scores. For every psychological control dimension, a series of separate ANOVAs were conducted with related socialization goals as fixed factors. Demographic variables such as gender, age, education, and income were controlled in all analyses.

5.2.1 Guilt Induction and Socialization Goals

Results showed that while none of the other demographic control variables had a significant effect on guilt induction and shaming, education had a significant effect on psychological control in all analyses conducted for PC-GIS. Therefore, to avoid repetition, statistics for the main effect of education for every analysis will not be given in the following section.

Results of ANOVA showed that parents who chose *"expresses likes and dislikes"* used less PC-GIS (M = 1.98, SD = .62) than those who did not (M = 2.17, SD = .72), $F(1,406)$ = 5.34, p = .021. Those with *"self-confident"* (M = 1.95, SD = .58) socialization goal reported less PC-GIS than others (M = 2.27, SD = .76), $F(1,406)$ = 8.455, p = .004. PC-GIS were higher for those who chose *"academically successful"* (M = 2.25, SD = .75) than others (M = 2.01, SD = .64), $F(1,406)$ = 5.55, p = .019. Parents who chose *"behaves in an age-appropriate/mature manner"* (M = 2.35, SD = .76) reported higher PC-GIS than others (M = 2.03, SD = .65), $F(1, 406)$ = 7.20, p = .008. Likewise, those who wanted *"cooperative/agreeable"* children (M =2.51, SD = .83) used more PC-GIS than others (M = 2.04, SD = .65), $F(1,406)$ = 9.24, p = .002. Lastly, parents who chose *"respectful to elders"* used more PC-GIS (M = 2.39, SD = .78) than those who did not (M = 2.02, SD = .64), $F(1,406)$ = 7.00, p = .008.

Results indicated that parents with individualistic and autonomous socialization goals such as *"expresses likes and dislikes"* and *"self-confident"* used less guilt induction and shaming, whereas, parents who wanted their child to be respectful, mature, and agreeable used more guilt induction.

5.2.2 Overprotection and Socialization Goals

Education had a significant effect on overprotection and intrusion behaviors in all analyses, while other control variables had no significant effect in any of them. Thus, further information about the main effect of education will be omitted in the following section as it would lead to a lot of repetition. The results reported below are the effects of socialization goals on PC-OPI, after the effect of education was accounted for.

Results revealed that PC-OPI scores were lower for parents who chose *"independent"* (M = 2.25, SD = .78) than those who did not (M = 2.75, SD = .87), F(1,406) = 5.62, p = .018, and parents who chose *"self-confident"* (M = 2.53, SD = .82) used less PC-OPI strategies than others (M = 2.89, SD =.93), F(1,406) = 3.85, p = .05. Parents who chose *"behave in an age-appropriate/mature manner"* (M = 2.99, SD = 1.01) used more PC-OPU than others(M = 2.62, SD = .85), F(1,406) = 4.88, p = .028. Parents who wanted a *"compassionate (conscientious)"* child (M = 2.54, SD = .82) reported higher PC-OPI than others (M = 2.83, SD = .92), F(1,406) = 5.12, p = .024. Lastly, parents who chose *"respectful to elders"* (M = 3.21, SD = .98) used PC-OPI more than those who did not choose (M = 2.59, SD = .83), F(1,406) = 14.57, p = .000.

Results show a similar trend with guilt induction, in that, overprotection and intrusion behaviors are lower for parents who want their child to be independent and self-confident. On the other hand, parents who promote socialization goals such as *"compassionate (conscientious)"* and *"respectful to elders"* use overprotection and intrusion more often.

5.2.3 Limiting Self Expression and Socialization Goals

A series of one-way between subject ANOVA were conducted to see the effect of socialization goals PC-LSE. The ANOVA for *"cooperative/agreeable"* showed a main effect of income (F(1,406) = 5.59, p = .019), and education (f(1.406) = 4.28, p = .039) on PC-LSE scores. After controlling for income and education, parents who chose *"cooperative/agreeable"* (M = 2.47, SD = .81) reported higher PC-LSE scores than others (M = 2.13, SD = .69), F(1,406) = 7.00, p = .008. The ANOVA for *"behaves in an age-appropriate/mature manner"* revealed income, (F(1,406) =4.89, p = .028), and education effect (F(1,406) = 4.41, p = .036) on PC-LSE. After controlling for these two factors, parents who wanted their child to *"behave in an age-appropriate/mature manner"* (M = 2.38, SD =.70) used more PC-LSE than

others (M = 2.12, SD = .70), F(1,406) = 6.48, p = .011. Finally, the ANOVA for *"self-confident"* indicated a significant effect of income, F(1,406) = 4.81, p = .37. After controlling for income, parents who chose *"self-confident"* used less PC-LSE (M = 2.07, SD = .66) than those who did not (M = 2.30, SD =.75), F(1,406) = 8.57, p = .004.

These results showed that, unlike guilt induction and shaming, and, overprotection and intrusion, limiting self-expression behaviors were related to fewer socialization goals and showed a different pattern of a relationship with income and education.

5.3 Parental Beliefs and Psychological Control

A correlation analysis was conducted to see whether parental belief variables had a relationship with psychological control dimensions. Results showed that BPBs were significantly negatively correlated with both PC-GIS, (r(412) = -.296, p = .000) and PC-OPI (r(412) = -.258, p = .000). Similarly, DPBs had a positive correlation with both PC-GIS (r(412) = .318, p = .000) and PC-OPI (r(412) = .305, p = .000). Lastly, while there was no relationship between the PC-LSE and DPBs, there was a marginally significant negative correlation between PC-LSE and BPBs, r(412) = -.096, p = .052.

To further investigate these relationships and see if parental beliefs had predictive power over psychological control, three separate hierarchical regression analyses were run for each psychological control dimension.

5.3.1 Guilt Induction and Parental Beliefs

Results showed that both the first and second models significantly predicted PC-GIS. The first model explained 11% of the variance in PC-GIS (F(6,407) = 9.660, p = .000), and adding parental beliefs to the model in the second block explained an additional 11% of the variance above and beyond the first model. The final model explained 22% of the total variance in PC-GIS, F(8,405) = 15.738, p = .000. Education, BPBs, and DPBs were significant predictors of guilt induction and shaming (see Table 5.4).

BPBs were the strongest predictor of PC-GIS and higher levels of BPBs predicted lower levels of PC-GIS ($\beta = -.29, p = .000$). Similarly, higher education predicted

lower scores of PC-GIS ($\beta - .19, p = .002$). Meanwhile, higher levels of DPBs predicted higher PC-GIS scores ($\beta = .25, p = .000$).

Table 5.4 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Guilt Induction

	B	SE	95% CI	Adjusted R2	β	p
Model 1						
Education	-.294	.056	[-.405, -.183]		-.321	.000
Income	-.010	.057	[-.122, .101]		-.011	.856
Parent Gender	-.002	.074	[-.147, .142]		-.003	.973
Parent Age	-.004	.008	[-.017, .007]		-.043	.434
Child Gender	.064	.064	[-.064, .186]		.045	.336
Child Age	-.016	.011	[-.037, .005]		-.080	.133
				.112		
Model 2						
BPBs	-.286	.046	[-.377, -.195]		-.288	.000
DPBs	.190	.037	[.118, .262]		.247	.000
Education	-.175	.055	[-.284, -.067]		-.191	.002
Income	.03	.053	[-.066, .144]		.043	.462
Parent Gender	-.080	.071	[-.219, .059]		-.056	.257
Parent Age	-.002	.006	[-.012, .010]		-.008	.884
Child Gender	-.023	.061	[-.142, .096]		-.017	.709
Child Age	-.008	.010	[-.028, .012]		-.039	-.766
				.222		

Note: BPBs = Benign Parenting Beliefs, DPBs = Dysfunctional Parental Beliefs

5.3.2 Overprotection and Parental Beliefs

Both models significantly predicted PC-OPI. The first model with demographic variables explained 15% of the variance ($F(6,407) = 12.777$, $p = .000$), and the addition of parental beliefs to the model in the second block resulted in an additional seven percent of the variance explained. The final model explained 22% of the total variance in PC-OPI, $F(8,405) = 15.229$, $p = .000$ (see Table 5.5).

BPBs ($\beta = -.23, p = .000$) and education ($\beta = -.22, p = .000$) significantly predicted PC-OPI scores. Higher education and higher BPBs predicted lower use of PC-OPI. On the other hand, higher DPBs predicted higher PC-OPI scores ($\beta = .20, p = .000$). Different from the guilt induction and shaming regression model, the parent's gender was also a significant predictor in the final model, and the parent being a mother instead of a father predicted increased use of PC-OPI ($\beta = .10, p = .045$).

Table 5.5 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Overprotection

	B	SE	95% CI	Adjusted R2	β	p
Model 1						
Education	-.382	.072	[-.523, -.241]		-.321	.000
Income	-.088	.072	[-.230, .053]		-.074	.221
Parent Gender	-.108	.094	[-.292, .077]		-.058	.251
Parent Age	-.004	.008	[-.019, .011]		-.026	.624
Child Gender	.058	.081	[-.101, .217]		.033	.475
Child Age	-.006	.014	[-.033, .021]		-.023	.662
				.146		
Model 2						
BPBs	-.295	.060	[-.414, -.176]		-.229	.000
DPBs	.202	.048	[.108, .296]		.202	.000
Education	-.258	.072	[-.399, -.117]		-.216	.000
Income	-.036	.070	[-.173, .101]		-.030	.607
Parent Gender	-.187	.092	[-.368, -.006]		-.100	.043
Parent Age	.000	.007	[-.014, .015]		.002	.968
Child Gender	-.029	.079	[-.185, .126]		-.017	.711
Child Age	.003	.013	[-.023, .029]		-.011	.830
				.216		

Note: BPBs = Benign Parenting Beliefs, DPBs = Dysfunctional Parental Beliefs

5.3.3 Limiting Self Expression and Parental Beliefs

Results showed that the first model with demographic factors did not predict PC-LSE scores ($F(6,407) = 1.645$, $p = .133$). However when parental beliefs were added, the final model predicted PC-LSE, $F(8,405) = 1.197$, $p = .051$. This final model explained four percent of the variance in PC-LSE scores (see table 5.6).

The two factors that significantly predicted PC-LSE were income and BPBs. Higher-income predicted higher levels of PC-LSE ($\beta = .16, p = .0205$) while higher BPBs scores predicted lower PC-LSE ($\beta = -.11, p = .033$). Unlike PC-GIS and PC-OPI, education and DPBs did not predict PC-LSE.

Table 5.6 Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Limiting Self Expression

	B	SE	95% CI	Adjusted R2	β	p
Model 1						
Education	-.134	.062	[-.256, -.012]		-.141	.031
Income	.131	.062	[.009, .253]		.137	.036
Parent Gender	.105	.081	[-.054, .265]		.070	.194
Parent Age	-.011	.007	[-.024, .002]		-.093	.111
Child Gender	-.057	.070	[-.194, .081]		-.40	.417
Child Age	-.013	.012	[-.036, .010]		-.062	.274
				.024		
Model 2						
BPBs	-.116	.054	[-.222, -.009]		-.112	.033
DPBs	.053	.043	[-.030, .137]		.067	.212
Education	-.092	.064	[-.218, .034]		-.097	.152
Income	.146	.062	[.024, .269]		.154	.020
Parent Gender	.071	.083	[-.091, .234]		.048	.387
Parent Age	-.009	.007	[-.022, .004]		-.080	.167
Child Gender	-.087	.071	[-.226, .052]		-.062	.217
Child Age	-.010	.012	[-.034, .013]		-.048	.392
				.037		

Note: BPBs = Benign Parenting Beliefs, DPBs = Dysfunctional Parental Beliefs

6. DISCUSSION

This research aimed to describe psychological control behaviors of Turkish parents in connection with parental ethnotheories and other parent characteristics. The goal was to expand the current literature on parental ethnotheories in Turkey and explore how these ethnotheories factor into parental psychological control. In the following sections, the findings of the study and their implications will be discussed.

6.1 Describing the Parents in the Study

6.1.1 Psychological Control

This study investigated parental psychological control behaviors of Turkish parents through three psychological control dimensions: guilt induction, overprotection, and limiting self-expression. Results suggest that the use of psychological control is relatively low among Turkish parents. Average responses implied the use of psychological control to be "rarely" or "sometimes". This is still a significant amount considering the possible adverse effects of psychological control, however, the results signal relative infrequency, nevertheless. Parent characteristics such as education, income, and gender were factors that influenced psychological control. Both guilt induction and overprotection were negatively associated with income and education. Higher-income and education were related to lower psychological control use, and as education and income levels decreased, psychological control use increased. These findings support past studies that suggested education and income to be negatively related to psychological control (Smetana and Daddis 2002). Interestingly, limiting self-expression strategies were not related to education or income. Similarly, whereas mothers reported more guilt induction and overprotection, there was no difference between fathers and mothers in their limiting self-expression behaviors. This provides important evidence supporting the psychological control conceptual-

ization with distinct dimensions that was proposed in past studies (Nelson et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2007). Results show that not all psychological control dimensions interact with other parent characteristics in the same way, thus, assuming they are interchangeable or unitary might lead to misrepresentations of psychological control and its relationship with other factors of parenting.

6.1.2 Parental Beliefs

Two different parental belief patterns of Turkish parents were examined, and results revealed both benign and dysfunctional parental beliefs to be related to demographic parent characteristics. Similar to psychological control, dysfunctional parental beliefs were negatively associated with education and income. Considering dysfunctional parental beliefs include beliefs regarding restricting the child's emotion expression and controlling the child's behavior; it is not surprising that a similar pattern emerged between psychological control and dysfunctional parental beliefs. Benign parental beliefs, in comparison, consisted of more tolerant beliefs and child-directed attributions. Therefore, unsurprisingly, benign parental beliefs showed a different relationship pattern and were positively related to education and income. An interesting point to highlight is that the difference in parental beliefs between education and income levels was only significant for high education and high-income groups. This implies that parents with university and above education hold different parental beliefs than those with high school and lower education, whereas, high school graduates did not hold different parental beliefs from parents with lower education. This pattern was the same for income levels, with only high-income parents diverging from others in their parental beliefs. This implies that parents with high education and income present a unique and distinct profile of parental beliefs in Turkey.

Another important result was that mothers overall held stronger parental beliefs than fathers, regardless of the belief type. This could be due to the role mothers take as the primary caretaker of the child. Even though fathers are more involved in child-rearing today compared to the past, mothers are still the primary caregiver in most cases (Le et al. 2018). As a consequence, mothers might be more invested in the development of the child, and thus hold stronger beliefs about certain behaviors and outcomes.

Another curious finding was that parental beliefs were the only parenting factor that was affected by the child's gender. Parents with girls reported stronger benign parental beliefs compared to parents with boys, however, this difference was limited

to benign parental beliefs as the same pattern did not emerge for dysfunctional parental beliefs. This suggests that Turkish parents hold more tolerant beliefs about raising girls than boys. This could be a reflection of a common belief in Turkish culture regarding girls being easier to raise and manage compared to boys. In Turkey, girls are seen as more cooperative and tamer compared to boys (Büyükşahin 2009; Kaya and Akgün 2016) which would explain why parents think girls need less intensive control to achieve adequate child outcomes. This shows how cultural norms regarding factors such as gender differences shape parental beliefs.

6.1.3 Socialization Goals

The results of this study presented socialization goal patterns that are unique and relevant to Turkish culture. Perhaps the most essential evidence collected in this study was with regards to the most desired and prioritized socialization goals of Turkish parents. Findings suggest that the most desired socialization goals were "self-confident", "compassionate", "acts morally" and "expresses likes and dislikes". These socialization goals were both the most mentioned ones in the interviews in the first stage and the most prioritized goals in the second stage; which means both qualitative and quantitative methods supported these specific socialization goals to be important for Turkish parents.

Another essential evidence was regarding the properties of these socialization goals, as two of them (self-confident and expresses likes and dislikes) reflect individualistic and autonomous values while the other two (compassionate and acts moral) reflect culturally relevant relational values. This pattern of prioritizing both autonomous and relational goals supports Kağıtçıbaşı's model for Turkish families. This model is further supported by the fact that parents with higher income and education prioritized these socialization goals more than others. According to Kağıtçıbaşı, values of interdependence lose relevance with increased education and economic growth, and autonomous and relational values become more relevant. For instance, interdependent socialization goals such as "contented", "respectful to elders" and "cooperative" were the least prioritized socialization goals overall, however, they were more common among parents with low education and low income. Additionally, the socialization goals that differed the most between income and education levels were "independence" and "self-confidence". Particularly, compared to others, high-income parents showed a strong preference for independence and self-confidence. These findings are in line with Kağıtçıbaşı's model, where economic growth and increased education shape parental socialization goals. Parents who have gone through more educational

and economic change fit into the proposed model of the autonomous related family structure better than others, in terms of their socialization goals. Past studies also demonstrated that Turkish parents with low education prefer cooperativeness (Yağmurlu and Sanson 2004), while those with high education preferred autonomy and self-confidence (Dost et al. 2006). Therefore, the findings of the study replicate these results and present additional evidence to the literature.

6.2 Relationship between Parental Ethnotheories and Psychological Control

Another aim of this study was to understand how socialization goals and parental beliefs of Turkish parents affected their psychological control behavior. Results indicated that both socialization goals and parental beliefs were associated with psychological control. An important aspect of these associations was that parental beliefs and socialization goals showed distinct relationship patterns with different psychological control dimensions. The results and implications will be discussed below.

6.2.1 Socialization Goals and Psychological Control

When the relationship between socialization goals and psychological control was first examined, around half of the socialization goals in the list of 20 were found to be associated with guilt induction and overprotection while only three of the socialization goals were associated with limiting self-expression strategies. These three socialization goals were *"cooperative", "behaves in an age-appropriate manner"*, and *"self-confident"*. Then demographic variables like income, education, and gender were controlled to see the unique effect of socialization goals. Results showed that education had a main effect on overprotection and guilt induction, and higher education levels were associated with lower guilt induction and overprotection. After the effect of education was accounted for, socialization goals such as *"age-appropriate behaviors"* and *"respect for elders"* were related to both higher overprotection and guilt induction whereas, *"self-confidence"* was related to lower guilt induction and overprotection. Socialization goals of *"independence"* and *"compassion"* were only associated with overprotection, in which independence was associated with lower, and compassion was associated with higher overprotection. Similarly, *"academic success"* and *"cooperation"* were only related to guilt induction, and parents with

these goals used more guilt induction.

An important pattern to consider was that approximately half of the socialization goals that were found to be associated with guilt induction and overprotection in exploratory ANOVAs were revealed to be unrelated to psychological control when demographic variables, especially education levels were controlled. The main effect of education eclipsed the effect of these socialization goals. This implies that the association between socialization goals and psychological control was mediated by education in some circumstances. Particularly, this was the case for guilt induction and overprotection dimensions. Limiting self-expression, on the other hand, displayed a distinct and more complex relationship with socialization goals. All three socialization goals that were found to be related to limiting self-expression still had the main effect when demographic factors were controlled. Additionally, unlike the other two psychological control dimensions, income had a main effect on limiting self-expression in all analyses, and higher income was related to lower limiting self-expression behaviors. Interestingly, while education had a main effect in all analyses for guilt induction and overprotection, the main effect of education was not significant in all analyses for limiting self-expression. In particular, while self-confidence and income had a main effect and were related to lower limiting self-expression behavior, education was not associated with limiting self-expression. The two socialization goals related to all dimensions of psychological control were *"behaves in age-appropriate manner"* and *"self-confident"*.

Before moving on to parental beliefs, an important pattern should be highlighted. Socialization goals that were positively related to psychological control were those that reflected relational and collectivistic values, while socialization goals that were negatively related to psychological control were those related to autonomous and individualistic values. Autonomy as a concept requires volitional functioning, and psychological control with its restriction of volitional functioning aspect is not compatible with autonomy, which can explain the negative relationship between autonomous socialization goals and psychological control. Additionally, relational socialization goals being positively related to psychological control could be due to parents' emotional dependency goals. Past studies suggest that creating dependency is one of the main motivations behind the use of psychological control (Barber and Harmon 2002; Soenens et al. 2010), therefore, it makes sense for parents who desire their child to be emotionally close to them to use more psychological control.

6.2.2 Parental Beliefs and Psychological Control

The parental beliefs examined in this study were parental attributions regarding certain child behaviors and outcomes, as well as beliefs about the appropriate child emotion expressions. These beliefs were categorized as either benign or dysfunctional beliefs. When the relationship between two types of parental beliefs and psychological control was investigated, benign beliefs were negatively, and dysfunctional beliefs were positively related to psychological control in general. Further investigation showed that these beliefs had unique predictive power over psychological control when the effect of demographic factors was accounted for. An increase in benign parental beliefs would predict a decrease in psychological control use, regardless of the dimensions. Dysfunctional parental beliefs, however, predicted higher guilt induction and overprotection but did not predict limiting self-expression.

The parenting beliefs measure created for this study should be highlighted, as it represents parental beliefs and attributions about certain behaviors and outcomes. It was common in past studies to take parenting beliefs about general parenting styles and tendencies as predictors for parenting behaviors. But as Smetana (1994) suggests, parental beliefs provide more information about parenting behaviors when they are about specific behaviors and outcomes. The parental beliefs in this study had high predictive power on psychological control because they represented parents' attributions and beliefs regarding specific child outcomes and behaviors. For instance, benign parental beliefs included attributions that were directed to the child and other factors that are out of the parent's control. Consequently, parents with stronger benign parental beliefs would claim less responsibility for child outcomes, as they will not expect their behavior to alter child outcomes. This might explain why they use less psychological control, as using psychological control strategies would not be beneficial nor bring them closer to their goals. Literature suggests that most parents use psychological control to attain a goal or outcome (Fung 1999; Fung and Lau 2012; Scharf and Goldner 2017). And if the parents don't aspire to change the child's thoughts and behavior, or believe that they don't have the power to, they would be less likely to use psychological control.

Among demographic factors, education predicted both lower guilt induction and lower overprotection. Gender was also a predictor for overprotection and the parent being a mother instead of a father predicted higher overprotection. One interesting finding was that income was a positive predictor for limiting self-expression, which means that as family income increased, parents were more likely to use limiting self-expression strategies. This was an unexpected result because although literature suggests that education is the stronger predictor of parent behavior compared to

income (Smetana and Doddis 2002; Bornstein et al. 2003), the positive correlation between the education and income levels in the sample would suggest the relationship between income and psychological control to be in the same direction as the relationship between education and psychological control. Analyses for other psychological control dimensions confirm a non-significant same-direction association, however, the results for limiting self-expression suggest that income has a unique relationship pattern with psychological control behaviors that limit self-expression. One explanation for this relationship could be the unique circumstances due to the pandemic. Many people started working from home during the pandemic, in particular, those with higher income jobs. Thus, it could be the case that parents with high income that participated in the study were in a new and unique family environment where they have to balance work and child care at the same time. They spend more time with their children at home and have to tend to their work and parental responsibilities. It could be that, compared to parents who stay at home and take care of their children, high income parents are still adopting to these circumstances, are overwhelmed and lack patience, therefore resort to using limiting self expression behaviors more often. This relationship should be further examined in future studies for replication. Perhaps, future studies should control the effect of family environment change due to covid or look into other factors that could explain this relationship.

6.3 Contributions to the Literature and Implications

The results of this study provided evidence for existing models and claims regarding parental ethnotheories and psychological control, while also providing novel information about parenting patterns of Turkish parents. Perhaps the main contribution of this study is its focus on the antecedents of psychological control instead of outcomes like most studies on psychological control focuses on. And even among many parent and child characteristics as possible antecedents, this study investigates ethnotheories as one of the precursors of psychological control.

One of the most important features of the study is its emic approach to investigating the parenting culture in Turkey. The genuine goal of understanding the intricacies of Turkish parenting, instead of comparing it to other cultures like most cross-cultural studies do. For instance, this study does not compare the socialization goals of Turkish parents with others, instead, it dives deeper to understand the within-culture variability of these parenting factors based. As a result, in addition to capturing

ethnotheories concerning Turkish parents, a lot of within-culture differences based on education, income, and gender were also captured. These results emphasize the importance of not assuming uniformity within a culture when it comes to parenting. Turkey is a country that is going through rapid social changes, thus ignoring within-culture variability prevents accurate representation of parenting in Turkey. This is also the case for other cultures, as social change is evident in most cultures, and patterns of parenting change accordingly between and within cultures (Greenfield 2009). However, capturing these differences and changes might be harder without the proper tools. That is why future studies should consider using culturally relevant measurements and focus on within-cultural differences in parenting more often like the present study.

Another noteworthy asset of this study is its use of mixed research methods and culturally relevant measurement tools. There have been studies using additional culture-relevant items to measure psychological control (Wang et al. 2007), and a few studies even used qualitative data to develop culture-relevant items for psychological control (Barber et al. 2008). However, the development of culturally relevant items based on qualitative data is rare for socialization goals and parental beliefs. Although there are studies that qualitatively explore unique cultural ethnotheories, using that information to test a larger population qualitatively has not been a common practice. The extensive qualitative data utilized in this study, including non-parent participants who are involved in child-rearing, allowed the development of culturally relevant measures that reflect the ethnotheories and psychological control behaviors of Turkish parents. As a result, this study provides new measurement tools developed to capture the intricacies of authentic Turkish parental ethnotheories and psychological control.

In addition to the methodology and aim of the study, the findings contribute critical new information as well as supporting information to the existing parenting literature. Education is suggested to affect socialization goals and psychological control (Mone et al. 2016; Mone and Benga 2020). Results of this study provide support for these claims and show that education is an important factor in parenting, evident by the way it affected all parental factors covered in this study, including parental ethnotheories. In addition to the main effect on all parental factors, it even mediated the relationship between some socialization goals and psychological control, providing support to education being one of the most important variables that determine parenting factors (Smetana and Doddis 2002; Bornstein et al. 2003).

The effect of education on socialization goals and parental beliefs, however, was distinct in certain ways. For instance, education predicted psychological control,

but the predictive power of education was smaller than the predictive power of parental beliefs, especially benign parental beliefs. This might be a reflection of the different concepts of socialization goals and parental beliefs, as well as their different functions when parenting is concerned. Socialization goals describe the end goal of the parents, and the desired outcomes, whereas parental beliefs instruct how to achieve that goal (Ziehm et al. 2013). Literature shows examples of parents with the same socialization goals using different strategies to achieve them (Le et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2002). If these different functions are considered, an implication could be that parenting beliefs are more influential on parenting behaviors compared to socialization goals. And the results of this study support this implication, as parental beliefs predicted psychological control in almost all cases while the effect of socialization goals was unreliable in most. This emphasizes the importance of using different aspects of ethnotheories when studying parenting as they provide information on different aspects of parenting. Socialization goals inform about the motivation behind parenting behaviors, and parental beliefs and attributions inform about the reason why a certain behavior was utilized among others.

Another key implication is regarding the multidimensional conceptualization of psychological control. Consider the three psychological control dimensions measured and analyzed in this study. Most of the items included in guilt induction and overprotection dimensions were culture-relevant items, while all items in the limiting self-expression dimension were adopted from Barber's scale which is considered to be universal (Barber et al. 2012). The results of the study show that these dimensions interacted with demographic and parental factors differently. While guilt induction and overprotection showed similar patterns of interactions and associations, limiting self-expression diverged from the other two.

The most important and relevant difference between psychological control dimensions was regarding their relationship with ethnotheories. Results indicated that the psychological control dimensions that consisted of mainly culture-relevant items and represented common cultural psychological control behaviors, were more influenced by parental beliefs and socialization goals. On the other hand, the dimension that consisted of assumed universal items was the least influenced by ethnotheories. These results imply that the effects of parental ethnotheories on parent behavior can be captured better if culture-relevant parental behaviors are considered (Sayıl and Kındap 2010), which emphasizes the importance of using culturally relevant tools to understand cultural patterns. This also provides evidence for the multidimensional structure of psychological control and challenges the assumption that psychological control can be used as a singular unitary factor across all cultures (Barber et al. 2012). Different psychological control strategies play different roles; therefore, they

interact with other parental factors in their way. Thus, this study emphasizes the importance of utilizing all aspects of psychological control to capture the diverse interactions between psychological control and other parenting aspects.

6.4 Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Studies

Some aspects of this study limit the interpretation of the results. For instance, the sample of participants in this study was not representative of the general Turkish population, especially regarding education levels. While the distribution of education in Turkey indicates more male university graduates than women, these numbers were 24% and 20% respectively in 2020 (TUİK 2022). In comparison, 78% of the fathers and 51% of the mothers in this study were university graduates. Although education levels were controlled in the analyses, there might be factors not controlled in this study that are affected by this unrepresentative sample. For instance, one study shows that among Turkish parents, those who live in cities use more psychological control than those who live in rural areas (Aydın 2020). As the sample of this study was selected based on convenience, not enough rural populations have been represented. Future studies with a more representative sample would be beneficial to understand and capture these within-culture differences in parenting in Turkey.

An important point to note is that, the quantitative part of the current study was conducted during the pandemic. For the psychological control scale, participants were instructed to consider their general attitudes instead of their recent attitudes in the pandemic period. But, considering that all aspects of life and family environment are affected by the changes due to the pandemic, the results should be interpreted with this in mind. While ethnotheories like socialization goals were stable across the pre-pandemic qualitative and post-pandemic quantitative data, parental behaviors such as psychological control are more likely to change due to the circumstances. But, while this limits the generalizability of the results, it also provides and opportunity for future studies to compare and understand the effects of the pandemic on parenting.

Another limitation is the method of selection used for the socialization goals scale. While the justifications for the choice of making participants choose only five items among 20 have been discussed in the methods section, this does not erase the fact that this method limits what could be done with the data. For instance, if the Q-sort method was used for rating all the socialization goals, the ranking of the items could be used for predictive analysis to see the relationship between socialization goals and

psychological control better. Future studies planning on studying socialization goals should consider these aspects of the methodology.

Results indicated relatively low levels of psychological control among Turkish parents. However, psychological control scores in this study were based on parent reports. Evidence shows that there are discrepancies between parent and child reports of psychological control (Conger 2009; Yaban et al. 2014). Therefore, further studies using child reports for these culturally relevant psychological control measures inform further about Turkish parents' psychological control tendencies. Better yet, using parent-child dyads to investigate the difference between parent and child perspectives using a culture-relevant measure would afford important insight, especially for studies that aim to examine the outcomes of psychological control.

To build on the findings of the current study, further research on the unique relationship between income and limiting self-expression behaviors found in this study would be insightful. Similarly, the fact that parents with at least a university education hold different parental beliefs than others should also be investigated closer. Is this related to university education itself or associated factors that come with higher education? If it is the main effect of education level, how and why do parents start to differ from others? What aspect of university education is critical for this process? These are possible questions to which the answers would give deeper insight into the influence of education on parental factors.

Literature suggests that psychological control behaviors increase during adolescence and parents of older children in Turkey are shown to use more psychological control (Aydın 2020). However, the results of the current study did not find a similar effect. The age of the child was only related to guilt induction behaviors and this relation was in the opposite direction of what past studies suggested. Parents in this study used more guilt induction for younger children. These findings could also benefit from further investigation. Perhaps if child reports were available, there could be an increase in the perceived psychological control in adolescence, due to parents possibly using distinct psychological control strategies for older children that are not perceived as psychological control by the parent but perceived as psychological control by the child.

Lastly, literature could benefit from further studies that expand the contents of ethnotheories. In particular, future studies should include more aspects of parental beliefs, and if possible, incorporate specific beliefs separately to get a more comprehensive picture. This study compared benign and dysfunctional parenting beliefs about their relationship with psychological control. However, as specific parental beliefs are more predictive of the parent's behavior, using single items as predictors

could provide additional insight. For instance, some benign beliefs included in this study might have predicted psychological control more than others. This kind of information could afford a deeper understanding of how parental beliefs influence psychological control.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aydın, A. 2020. Ergenlerin anne-babalarından algıladıkları psikolojik kontrol ile öznel iyi oluşları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Technical Report Unpublished Bachelors Thesis.

Ayçiçeği-Dinn, A, and D Sunar. 2017. "Çocuk Yetiştirme Tutumları ve Bağıntılarının Kültür içi ve Kültürlerarası Karşılaştırılması." *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi* 32(79): 95–110.

Barber, B. K., J. A. Olsen, M. Xia, C. McNeely, and K. Bose. 2008. Examining the essence of parental psychological control: Exploring parental disrespect.

Barber, Brian K. 1996. "Parental Psychological Control: Revisiting a Neglected Construct." *Child Development* 67(6): 3296.

Barber, Brian K., and Elizabeth Lovelady Harmon. 2002. "Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescents." *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents.* pp. 15–52.

Barber, Brian K., Joseph E. Olsen, and Shobha C. Shagle. 1994. "Associations between Parental Psychological and Behavioral Control and Youth Internalized and Externalized Behaviors." *Child Development* 65(4): 1120.

Barber, Brian K., Suzanne L. Maughan, and Joseph A. Olsen. 2005. "Patterns of parenting across adolescence." *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 2005(108): 5–16.

Baumrind, Diana, Robert E. Larzelere, and Elizabeth B. Owens. 2010. "Effects of Preschool Parents' Power Assertive Patterns and Practices on Adolescent Development." *Parenting* 10(3): 157–201.

Bayram Özdemir, Sevgi, and Charissa S. L. Cheah. 2013. "Turkish Mothers' Parenting Beliefs in Response to Preschoolers' Aggressive and Socially Withdrawn Behaviors." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 24(3): 687–702.

Belsky, Jay. 1984. "The Determinants of Parenting: A Process Model." *Child Development* 55(1): 83.

Bornstein, Marc H., Diane L. Putnick, and Jennifer E. Lansford. 2011. "Parenting Attributions and Attitudes in Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Parenting* 11(2-3): 214–237.

Boyd, Robert, and Peter Richerson. 2005. *The Origin and Evolution of Cultures (Evolution and Cognition).* Illustrated ed. Oxford University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1986. "Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives." *Developmental Psychology* 22(6): 723–742.

Bugental, Daphne Blunt, and Charlotte Johnston. 2000. "Parental and Child Cognitions in the Context of the Family." *Annual Review of Psychology* 51(1): 315–344.

Buldukoglu, Kadriye, and Kamile Kukulu. 2007. "Maternal punishment practices in a rural area of Turkey." *Child: Care, Health and Development* 34(2): 180–184.

Büyükşahin, G. 2009. Relatonship between the perceptions of parent attitudes of 11-13 year-old children of divorced and undivorced (intact) families and their social adjustment level. Technical Report Unpublished Bachelors Thesis.

Cheah, Charissa S.L., and Kenneth H. Rubin. 2004. "European American and Mainland Chinese mothers' responses to aggression and social withdrawal in preschoolers." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 28(1): 83–94.

Chen-Bouck, Li, Meagan M. Patterson, and Jie Chen. 2019. "Relations of Collectivism Socialization Goals and Training Beliefs to Chinese Parenting." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 50(3): 396–418.

Choi, Incheol, Richard E. Nisbett, and Ara Norenzayan. 1999. "Causal attribution across cultures: Variation and universality." *Psychological Bulletin* 125(1): 47–63.

Citlak, Banu, Birgit Leyendecker, Axel Schölmerich, Ricarda Driessen, and Robin L. Harwood. 2008. "Socialization goals among first- and second-generation migrant Turkish and German mothers." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 32(1): 56–65.

Cole, P.M., and P.Z. Tan. 2007. *Emotion Socialization from a Cultural Perspective.* Guilford Publications pp. 516–542.

Coplan, Robert J., Paul D. Hastings, Daniel G. Lagacé-Séguin, and Caryn E. Moulton. 2002. "Authoritative and Authoritarian Mothers' Parenting Goals, Attributions, and Emotions Across Different Childrearing Contexts." *Parenting* 2(1): 1–26.

Costa, Sebastiano, Maria C. Gugliandolo, Nadia Barberis, Francesca Cuzzocrea, and Francesca Liga. 2018. "Antecedents and consequences of parental psychological control and autonomy support: The role of psychological basic needs." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 36(4): 1168–1189.

Dost, A, B Çıtlak, B Yağmurlu, and B Leyendecker. 2009. "Türk Annelerin Çocuk Sosyalleştirme Hedefl erinde Eğitime Bağlı Olarak Gözlemlenen Farklılıklar." *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi* 24(63): 1–15.

Durgel, E. S. 2011. Parenting beliefs and practices of Turkish immigrant mothers in Western Europe. Technical Report s.n.

Durgel, Elif S., Birgit Leyendecker, Bilge Yagmurlu, and Robin Harwood. 2009. "Sociocultural Influences on German and Turkish Immigrant Mothers' Long-Term Socialization Goals." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 40(5): 834–852.

Friedlmeier, Wolfgang, Feyza Corapci, and Pamela M. Cole. 2011. "Emotion Socialization in Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 5(7): 410–427.

Fung, Heidi. 1999. "Becoming a Moral Child: The Socialization of Shame among Young Chinese Children." *Ethos* 27(2): 180–209.

Fung, Joey, and Anna S. Lau. 2012. "Tough love or hostile domination? Psychological control and relational induction in cultural context." *Journal of Family Psychology* 26(6): 966–975.

Greenfield, Patricia M. 2009. "Linking social change and developmental change: Shifting pathways of human development." *Developmental Psychology* 45(2): 401–418.

Grolnick, Wendy. 2003. *The Psychology of Parental Control: How Well-meant Parenting Backfires*. 1 ed. Psychology Press.

Harkness, Kenneth, and Ock Boon Super. 2006. *Themes and variations: parental ethnotheories in Western culture*. 1 ed. Psychology Press pp. 61–79.

Harkness, S., and C.M. Super. 1992. *Parental ethnotheories in action*. Psychology Press pp. 373–391.

Harkness, Sara, and Charles M. Super. 2020. "Why understanding culture is essential for supporting children and families." *Applied Developmental Science* 25(1): 14–25.

Harkness, Sara, Charles M. Super, and Nathalie Van Tijen. 2000. "Individualism and the "Western Mind" reconsidered: American and dutch parents' ethnotheories of the child." *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 2000(87): 23–39.

Harwood, Robin L., Axel Schoelmerich, Elizabeth Ventura-Cook, Pamela A. Schulze, and Stephanie P. Wilson. 1996*a*. "Culture and Class Influences on Anglo and Puerto Rican Mothers' Beliefs regarding Long-Term Socialization Goals and Child Behavior." *Child Development* 67(5): 2446.

Harwood, Robin L., Axel Schoelmerich, Elizabeth Ventura-Cook, Pamela A. Schulze, and Stephanie P. Wilson. 1996*b*. "Culture and Class Influences on Anglo and Puerto Rican Mothers' Beliefs regarding Long-Term Socialization Goals and Child Behavior." *Child Development* 67(5): 2446.

Kagitcibasi, Cigdem. 2005. "Autonomy and Relatedness in Cultural Context." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 36(4): 403–422.

Kakihara, Fumiko, Lauree Tilton-Weaver, Margaret Kerr, and Håkan Stattin. 2010. "The Relationship of Parental Control to Youth Adjustment: Do Youths' Feelings About Their Parents Play a Role?" *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 39(12): 1442–1456.

Kara, Demet, and Nebi Sümer. 2022. "The Role of Paternal Parenting and Coparenting Quality in Children's Academic Self-Efficacy." *Frontiers in Psychology* 13.

Kaya, Özlem Sevgi, and Ege Akgün. 2016. "Okul Öncesi Dönemdeki Çocukların Okula Uyum Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi." *İlköğretim Online* 15(4).

Kil, Hali, Anneesa D. Singh, Anmol Bains, Terri Rodak, and Brendan F. Andrade. 2021. "Parental Attributions in Ethnocultural Minority, Immigrant, and Country of Origin Parents: A Scoping Review and Call for Research." *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 24(4): 707–724.

Krishnakumar, Ambika, Cheryl Buehler, and Brian K. Barber. 2003. "Youth Perceptions of Interparental Conflict, Ineffective Parenting, and Youth Problem Behaviors in European-American and African-American Families." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 20(2): 239–260.

Kurt, D, M Sayıl, and Y Kındap. 2013. "Ana Babanın Psikolojik Kontrolü ile Gencin Yalnızlığı Arasındaki İlişkide Kişilerarası Güven İnancı ve Bağlanmanın Rolü." *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi* 28(71): 105–116.

Kızmaz, Z., and S. Altuğ. 2019. "Aile Sorunlarının Ortaya Çıkmasında Ebeveyn Müdahalelerinin Etkisi." *Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 8(2): 538–557.

Le, Bonnie M., John K. Sakaluk, Lisa C. Day, and Emily A. Impett. 2018. "How gender, age, and socioeconomic status predict parenting goal pursuit." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 36(10): 3313–3338.

Luebbe, Aaron M., Chunyue Tu, and Joseph W. Fredrick. 2017. "Socialization Goals, Parental Psychological Control, and Youth Anxiety in Chinese Students: Moderated Indirect Effects based on School Type." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 47(2): 413–429.

Maxwell, Joseph A. 2010. "Using Numbers in Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 16(6): 475–482.

Mayer, B. 2013. *Family change theory: A preliminary evaluation on the basis of recent cross-cultural studies.* Policy Press pp. 167–187.

McEwen, Ciara, and Eirini Flouri. 2008. "Fathers' parenting, adverse life events, and adolescents' emotional and eating disorder symptoms: the role of emotion regulation." *European Child &; Adolescent Psychiatry* 18(4): 206–216.

Metin-Orta, Irem, and Selin Metin-Camgöz. 2021. "Development of a maternal psychological control scale: A study with Turkish university students." *Current Psychology* .

Miller, Scott A. 1995. "Parents' Attributions for Their Children's Behavior." *Child Development* 66(6): 1557–1584.

Mone, IONUT SERGIU, OANA Benga, and ADRIAN Opre. 2016. "Cross-cultural differences in socialization goals as a function of power distance, individualism-collectivism and education." *Psiworld 2015 Proceedings* .

Mone, Ionuț-Sergiu, and Oana Benga. 2020. "The relationship between education, agency, and socialization goals in a sample of mothers of preschoolers." *Journal of Family Studies* pp. 1–21.

Nelson, David A., Chongming Yang, Sarah M. Coyne, Joseph A. Olsen, and Craig H. Hart. 2013*a*. "Parental psychological control dimensions: Connections with Russian preschoolers' physical and relational aggression." *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 34(1): 1–8.

Nelson, David A., Chongming Yang, Sarah M. Coyne, Joseph A. Olsen, and Craig H. Hart. 2013*b*. "Parental psychological control dimensions: Connections with Russian preschoolers' physical and relational aggression." *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 34(1): 1–8.

Neuendorf, Neuendorf Kimberly. 2016. *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. 2 ed. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Olsen, Susanne Frost, Chongming Yang, Craig H. Hart, Clyde C. Robinson, Peixia Wu, David A. Nelson, Larry J. Nelson, Shenghua Jin, and Jianzhong Wo. 2002. "Maternal psychological control and preschool children's behavioral outcomes in China, Russia, and the United States." *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents.* pp. 235–262.

Perris, C., L. Jacobsson, H. Linndström, L. Knorring, and H. Perris. 1980. "Development of a new inventory for assessing memories of parental rearing behaviour." *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 61(4): 265–274.

Pettit, Gregory S., and Robert D. Laird. 2002. "Psychological control and monitoring in early adolescence: The role of parental involvement and earlier child adjustment." *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents.* pp. 97–123.

Pettit, Gregory S., Robert D. Laird, Kenneth A. Dodge, John E. Bates, and Michael M. Criss. 2001. "Antecedents and Behavior-Problem Outcomes of Parental Monitoring and Psychological Control in Early Adolescence." *Child Development* 72(2): 583–598.

Pomerantz, Eva M., and Qian Wang. 2009*a*. "The Role of Parental Control in Children's Development in Western and East Asian Countries." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 18(5): 285–289.

Pomerantz, Eva M., and Qian Wang. 2009*b*. "The Role of Parental Control in Children's Development in Western and East Asian Countries." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 18(5): 285–289.

Ross, Lee. 1977. "The Intuitive Psychologist And His Shortcomings: Distortions in the Attribution Process." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* pp. 173–220.

Rubin, Kenneth, and Ock Boon Chung. 2006. *Parenting Beliefs, Behaviors, and Parent-Child Relations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. 1 ed. Psychology Press.

Ryan, Richard M., and Edward L. Deci. 2000. "Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being." *American Psychologist* 55(1): 68–78.

Sayıl, M., and Y. Kındap. 2010. "Turkish adaptation of the parental psychological control scale (s): A study of validity and reliability." *Turkish Psychological Reports* 13: 62–71.

Schaefer, Earl S. 1965. "A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior." *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 29(6): 552–557.

Scharf, Miri, and Limor Goldner. 2017. ""If you really love me, you will do/be. . . ": Parental psychological control and its implications for children's adjustment." *Developmental Review* 49: 16–30.

Shek, Daniel T. L. 2006. "Perceived Parental Behavioral Control and Psychological Control in Chinese Adolescents in Hong Kong." *The American Journal of Family Therapy* 34(2): 163–176.

Smetana, Judith G. 1994. "Parenting styles and beliefs about parental authority." *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 1994(66): 21–36.

Smetana, Judith G. 2017. "Current research on parenting styles, dimensions, and beliefs." *Current Opinion in Psychology* 15: 19–25.

Smetana, Judith G., and Christopher Daddis. 2002. "Domain-Specific Antecedents of Parental Psychological Control and Monitoring: The Role of Parenting Beliefs and Practices." *Child Development* 73(2): 563–580.

Smetana, Judith G., and Pamela Asquith. 1994. "Adolescents' and Parents' Conceptions of Parental Authority and Personal Autonomy." *Child Development* 65(4): 1147–1162.

Soenens, Bart, and Maarten Vansteenkiste. 2010. "A theoretical upgrade of the concept of parental psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory." *Developmental Review* 30(1): 74–99.

Soenens, Bart, Andrew J. Elliot, Luc Goossens, Maarten Vansteenkiste, Patrick Luyten, and Bart Duriez. 2005. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Perfectionism: Parents' Psychological Control as an Intervening Variable." *Journal of Family Psychology* 19(3): 358–366.

Soenens, BART, MAARTEN Vansteenkiste, and CHRISTOPHER P. Niemiec. 2009. "Should parental prohibition of adolescents' peer relationships be prohibited?" *Personal Relationships* 16(4): 507–530.

Soenens, Bart, Maarten Vansteenkiste, and Eline Sierens. 2009. "How Are Parental Psychological Control and Autonomy-Support Related? A Cluster-Analytic Approach." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71(1): 187–202.

Soenens, Bart, Maarten Vansteenkiste, and Patrick Luyten. 2010. "Toward a Domain-Specific Approach to the Study of Parental Psychological Control: Distinguishing Between Dependency-Oriented and Achievement-Oriented Psychological Control." *Journal of Personality* 78(1): 217–256.

Soenens, Bart, Seong-Yeon Park, Maarten Vansteenkiste, and Athanasios Mouratidis. 2012. "Perceived parental psychological control and adolescent depressive experiences: A cross-cultural study with Belgian and South-Korean adolescents." *Journal of Adolescence* 35(2): 261–272.

Stattin, Hakan, and Margaret Kerr. 2000. "Parental Monitoring: A Reinterpretation." *Child Development* 71(4): 1072–1085.

Suizzo, Marie-Anne. 2002. "French parents' cultural models and childrearing beliefs." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 26(4): 297–307.

Sümer, N, and Ç Kağıtçıbaşı. 2010. *Culturally Relevant Parenting Predictors of Attachment Security: Perspectives from Turkey.* 1 ed. Routledge pp. 157–179.

Sümer, N, M Sayıl, S Kazak-Berument, B Doğruyol, G Günaydın, M Harma, A Öztürk, S Salman, and E Selçuk. 2009. Çocuğun gelişiminde bağlanma, ilgi-bakım ve aile dinamiklerinin etkisi. Technical report.

TUİK. 2022. İstatistiklerle Kadın, 2021. Technical report.

Wang, Qian, Eva M. Pomerantz, and Huichang Chen. 2007. "The Role of Parents? Control in Early Adolescents? Psychological Functioning: A Longitudinal Investigation in the United States and China." *Child Development* 78(5): 1592–1610.

Wang, Qian, Hoi-Wing Chan, and Li Lin. 2012. "Antecedents of Chinese Parents' Autonomy Support and Psychological Control: The Interplay Between Parents' Self-Development Socialization Goals and Adolescents' School Performance." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 41(11): 1442–1454.

Wu, Peixia, Clyde C. Robinson, Chongming Yang, Craig H. Hart, Susanne F. Olsen, Christin L. Porter, Shenghua Jin, Jianzhong Wo, and Xinzi Wu. 2002. "Similarities and differences in mothers' parenting of preschoolers in China and the United States." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 26(6): 481–491.

Yaban, E. Helin, Melike Sayıl, and Yeliz Kındap Tepe. 2014. "Are discrepancies in perceptions of psychological control related to maladjustment? A study of adolescents and their parents in Turkey." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 38(6): 550–562.

Yağmurlu, B, and A Sanson. 2004. "The relations between parenting stress, goals and practices, and child temperament: Evidence from Australia.".

Ziehm, Jeanette, Gisela Trommsdorff, Tobias Heikamp, and Seong-Yeon Park. 2013. "German and Korean mothers' sensitivity and related parenting beliefs." *Frontiers in Psychology* 4.

APPENDIX A

Socialization Goals Scale and Instructions

Aşağıda anne babaların çocuklarında görmek istedikleri bazı özellikler rastgele verilmiştir. Sizden önce bu listenin tümünü dikkatlice okumanızı ve size göre en önemli olduğunu düşündüğünüz **sadece 5 (beş)** özelliği işaretlemenizi istiyoruz.

__ 1. Ne istediğini/istemediğini ifade eden
__ 2. Arkadaşlarıyla iyi geçinen
__ 1. Sosyal medyayı/teknolojiyi dengeli kullanan
__ 4. Alçakgönüllü
__ 5. Bağımsız
__ 6. Yaşına uygun/olgun davranan
__ 7. Ev işlerine yardım eden
__ 8. Girişken
__ 9. Merhametli (vicdan sahibi)
__ 10. Kimseye şiddet göstermeyen
__ 11. Kendi kararlarını alabilen
__ 12. Ana, baba ve kardeşleri ile iletişimi iyi
__ 13. Ahlaklı
__ 14. Özgüvenli
__ 15.Sahip olduklarıyla yetinen
__ 16. Sıkıntılarını ve sevinçlerini anne ve baba ile paylaşan
__ 17. Okulunda başarılı
__ 18. Söz dinleyen/uyumlu
__ 19. Büyüklerine saygılı
__ 20. Yardımsever/paylaşımcı

APPENDIX B

Parental Beliefs Scale and Instructions

EBEVEYNLİK İNANIŞLARI Aşağıda ülkemizde çocuk yetiştirme konusunda kişiden kişiye değişen yaygın inanışlar bulunmaktadır. Bu ankette sizin ne düşündüğünüzü öğrenmek istiyoruz.

Önce, aşağıda çocuk yetiştirme konusunda verilen inanışların her iki yönünü de okuyunuz. Sonra, hangi yöndeki inanışa daha yakın olduğunuzu 1 ve 6 arasındaki çizgiyi kaydırarak belirtiniz.

Örneğin, çocuğun sevgiden kesinlikle şımardığını düşünüyorsanız "1"i, kesinlikle şımarmayacağını düşünüyorsanız "6"yı işaretleyiniz. Görüşünüz bu kadar kesin değilse, sol tarafa yakınsanız "2" veya "3"ü, sağ tarafa yakınsanız "4" veya "5"i işaretleyiniz.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Çocuk sevgiden şımarır.							Çocuk sevgiden şımarmaz.
Yanlışı görüldüğünde uyarılan çocuk yanlışını düzeltir.							Çok uyarılan çocuk yanlışta ısrar eder.
Annenin çalışması çocuğu olumsuz etkiler.							Annenin çalışması çocuğu olumlu etkiler.
Anne baba çocuğa arkadaş gibi olmalıdır.							Anne baba çocuğa arkadaş gibi olmamalıdır.
Çocuk anne babada gördüğünü yapar.							Çocuk kendi bildiğini yapar.
Çocuğun karakteri daha çok kendisinden gelir.							Çocuğun karakterini daha çok aile şekillendirir.
Çocuk doğru yanlışı en çok okulda öğrenir.							Çocuk doğruyu yanlışı en çok evde öğrenir.
Çocuğun davranışından anne baba sorumludur.							Çocuğundan davranışından anne baba sorumlu değildir.
Aile çocuğun kimlerle arkadaşlık edeceğine karışmamalıdır.							Aile çocuğun kimlerle arkadaşlık edeceğine karışmalıdır.
Çocuk çok ceza veren ebeveyni ciddiye almaz.							Çocuk kendine ceza vermeyen ebeveyni ciddiye almaz.
Çocuk yanlışını tekrarlamasın diye kızmak gerekir.							Çocuk yanlışını tekrarlamasın diye kızmak fayda etmez.
Anne babanın hayatlarının tek anlamı çocuklarıdır.							Anne babanın hayatlarının tek anlamı çocukları değildir.
Bazı durumlarda çocuğu terbiye etmek için fiziksel ceza verilebilir.							Çocuğu terbiye etmek için fiziksel ceza verilemez.
Tek çocuk olmak çocuğun karakterini olumsuz etkiler.							Tek çocuk olmak çocuğun karakterini olumsuz etkilemez
Maneviyat olmadan karakter gelişmez.							Karakter gelişmesinin tek şartı maneviyat değildir.
Çocuğun yaşadığı zorluklar ileride onu olumlu etkiler.							Çocuğun yaşadığı zorluklar ileride onu olumsuz etkiler.
Ebeveyn çocuğun hata yapmasına izin vermelidir.							Ebeveyn çocuğun hata yapmasını engellemelidir.
Çocuk kızgınlığını aile ortamında gösterebilir.							Çocuk kızgınlığını içinde saklamalıdır.
Çocuk aile dışındaki sosyal ortamlarda kızgınlığını gösterebilir.							Çocuk sosyal ortamlarda kızgınlığını saklamalıdır.
Çocuk aile ortamında üzüntüsünü gösterebilir.							Çocuk üzüntüsünü içinde saklamalıdır.
Çocuk aile dışındaki sosyal ortamlarda üzüntüsünü gösterebilir.							Çocuk sosyal ortamlarda üzüntüsünü saklamalıdır.
Çocuk sevincini açıkça gösterebilmelidir.							Çocuk sevincini kendine saklamalıdır.

APPENDIX C

Psychological Control Scale and Instruction

ÖNEMLİ NOT: İçinde bulunduğumuz salgın dönemi ebeveynlerin çocukları ile olan ilişkisini doğal olarak etkilemiştir. **Bundan sonraki soruları salgın dönemine göre değil, sizin genel olarak tutum ve davranışlarınızı dikkate alarak cevaplayınız.** COVID-19'un etkisine ilişkin ek sorularımız anketin sonunda yer almaktadır.

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Çocuğum bir şey söylerken konuyu değiştiririm.						
2.	Çocuğum konuşurken bitirmesini beklemeden cümlesini tamamlarım.						
3.	Çocuğum konuşurken sözünü keserim.						
4.	Çocuğumun ne hissettiğini, ne düşündüğünü sormam, zaten bilirim.						
5.	Çocuğumun çoğu konuda ne düşüneceğini, nasıl hissetmesi gerektiğini söylerim.						
6.	Çocuğumun bazı konulardaki hislerini ve düşüncelerini değiştirmeye çalışırım.						
7.	Aile üyelerinin yaşadığı zorluklar/sorunlardan dolayı çocuğumu suçlarım.						
8.	Çocuğumu eleştirirken geçmişte yaptığı hataları hatırlatırım.						
9.	Beni üzdüğünü ve hayal kırıklığına uğrattığını söyleyerek suçlu hissettiririm.						
10.	Çocuğuma onun için ne kadar çok çalışıp emek harcadığımı söylerim.						
11.	Çocuğuma bir yanlış yaptığında onu affetmeyeceğimi söylerim.						
12.	Hata yaptığında utanması gerektiğini söylerim.						
13.	Başına bir şey gelecek korkusuyla arkadaşlarının yaptığı bazı şeyleri yapmasına izin vermem.						
14.	Başına bir şey gelecek korkusuyla okul dışında arkadaşlık kurmasına izin vermem.						
15.	Çocuğumun ne yaptığını anlamak için çantasını, odasını ya da telefonunu kontrol ederim.						
16.	Çocuğumun evden uzakta arkadaşları ile vakit geçirmesine izin vermem.						
17.	Çocuğum üşüyebilir korkusuyla kat kat giydiririm.						