The Role of Residential Area and Education in Developmental Expectations, Parenting Practices and Family Environment of Turkish Mothers

by

Melike Nacak

A Thesis Submitted to the

Graduate School of Social Sciences

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

Developmental Psychology

Koç University

July 2009

Koç University

Graduate School of Social Sciences

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a master's thesis by

Melike Nacak

and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,

and that any and all revisions required by the final

examining committee have been made.

Committee Members:

_____

Bilge Yağmurlu, Asst. Prof. (Advisor)

_____

Fons van de Vijver, Prof.

_____

Asiye Kumru, Assoc. Prof.

_____

Nazan Aksan, Assoc. Prof.

Date: _____

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for any rewards or other degree or diploma in any university or other institution. It is affirmed by the candidate that, to the best of her knowledge, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Signed Melike Nacak

ABSTRACT

The major aim of this study was to investigate differences and similarities in developmental expectations, parenting practices, and quality of home environment in Turkish mothers of preschoolers who live in a megacity and a rural-city. Another aim was to examine the role of maternal education in these parenting variables. The participants were 161 mothers of preschoolers living in Istanbul and 73 mothers living in Konya, Kayseri, and Nevsehir. Differences between groups were examined using MANOVAs and MANCOVAs, and results revealed that mothers who lived in rural-cities reported higher levels of obedience-demanding behaviors and punishment; had earlier developmental expectations about traditional/moral rules; and provided healthier physical environment than megacity mothers. It was also found that compared to low-educated mothers, high-educated mothers reported less obedience-demanding behaviors and more permissiveness and cognitive stimulation; expected earlier development in the physical, cognitive, social, self-control, autonomy, obedience, family orientation, and agency domains; and provided more learning materials and healthier physical environment. The results partially supported the hypotheses. Taken together, the findings implied that the mothers who live in a megacity and a rural-city have some similarities and differences in terms of developmental expectations, child-rearing practices, and home context. In addition to the differences related to social environment, results showed that parenting variables differ according to mothers' education level, which is consistent with child development literature.

Keywords: Developmental Timetables, Child-rearing Practices, Maternal Education, Social Environment, Residential area

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, okul öncesi yaş grubunda çocuğu olan Türk annelerin yaşadıkları şehrin (kırsal-şehir ya da megaşehir) ve eğitim seviyelerinin gelişimsel beklentilerine, çocuk yetiştirme davranışlarına ve ev ortamlarının niteliğine olan etkisini değerlendirmektir. Örneklem grubu megaşehirde (İstanbul) yaşayan 161 anne ile kırsal-şehirde yaşayan 73 anneden oluşmaktadır. Kırsal şehir grubundaki anneler İç Anadolu bölgesinde geleneksel Türk aile özellikleri taşıdığı düşünülen Konya, Kayseri ve Nevşehir'de yaşamaktadır. Gruplar arası farklar MANOVA ve MANCOVA ile analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, kırsal-şehirde yaşayan annelerin megaşehirde yaşayan annelere göre daha fazla itaat bekleme ve cezalandırma davranışı sergilediklerini ve geleneksel/ahlaki kurallara uyum becerilerinin daha erken yaşlarda kazanılması gerektiğini düşündüklerini göstermiştir. Ev ortamı gözlemlerinde kırsal-şehir grubunda çocuğun yaşadığı evin fiziksel çevresinin daha sağlıklı olduğu bulunmuştur. Bulgular ayrıca, yüksek eğitimli annelerin düşük eğitimlilere kıyasla daha az itaat bekleme davranışı sergilediklerini ve fiziksel, bilişsel, öz-denetim, sosyal gelişim, özerklik, itaatkarlık, aileye yönelim ve kendi kendine yeterlilik özelliklerinin daha erken yaşlarda kazanılması gerektiğini düşündüklerini göstermiştir. Ayrıca, yüksek eğitimli annelerin düşük eğitimli annelere kıyasla çocuğa daha fazla öğrenme gereçleri sağladığı ve evlerinin fiziksel çevresinin daha sağlıklı olduğu bulunmuştur. Araştırmanın bulguları hipotezleri kısmen desteklemiştir. Tüm bu bulgular, kırsal-şehir ve megeşehirde

yaşayan annelerin gelişimsel beklentilerinde, ebeveynlik davranışlarında ve ev ortamlarında farklılıklar kadar benzerlikler de olduğunu göstermektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Gelişimsel Beklentiler, Ebeveynlik Davranışları, Annenin Eğitimi, Sosyal Çevre, Yaşanılan Yer

DEDICATION

"To my dearest family, Ayşe Nur, Nusret, and Melih, who believed and supported me in every step I have taken in my life"

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

After a seven-year instruction period in Koç University, a new life is starting for me outside Koç campus with this thesis. I am a little anxious (as usual), but also curious about my new life. During this thesis-writing period, I found myself in many different situations; while sometimes I felt love, joy, and peace, sometimes I felt stressed, tired, and upset. When I'm looking backwards, I see that all these experiences were steps for me to grow up. Now, I would like to give my gratitude to everyone who shared my feelings, dreams, and life with me.

I also need to express my special thanks for special people in my life.

First of all, I should deeply thank to my advisor and mentor Asst. Prof. Bilge Yağmurlu, who had always been with me, encouraged and challenged me for 6 years. She was not only a teacher for me, but also a friend and a sister. Without her sincere guidance, this thesis would not have been accomplished. I thank her very much for her valuable support in this thesis and many other things.

I would also like to thank to Prof. Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı, Prof. Sami Gülgöz, Prof. Zeynep Aycan, Assoc. Prof. Aylin Küntay, Assoc. Prof. Nazlı Baydar, Assoc. Prof Nazan Aksan, and Asst. Prof. Tarcan Kumkale for everything I learned from them. Witnessing their enthusiasm to work motivated me to go on with the thesis.

The data used in this thesis comes from a broader research project done by University of Tilburg. I would like to thank Prof. Fons van de Vijver and Elif Durgel for sharing the data and their hospitality in Tilburg.

I should also thank to TUBİTAK for its financial support for two years.

Lastly but most importantly, I would like to thank to my family. I am grateful to my parents, Ayşe Nur and Nusret Nacak, who not only unconditionally loved me but also be with me and supported me. It is impossible to go over all the contributions of my dear friend Derya Kunduzcu, she is my ANGEL. I also don't know how to thank my beloved, Birkan Akbıyık, he was the hero of my last year. I also thank to my brother Melih Nacak, my huge family, my friend Ayşe Sarılar, and my uncle Ersan Güresen who encouraged me by their readiness to listen my progress in the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General

Developmental expectations/timetables, as parental beliefs, refer to the ages at which parents expect specific developmental skills to be achieved by children (Goodnow, Cashmore, Cotton, & Knight, 1984). It is recognized that there is a significant relation between these parental beliefs and parents' child-rearing behaviors (Abidin, 1992). Specific parenting practices have a great impact on children's social (Kumru, 2003; Schaffer, 2003), cognitive (Meadows, 1996), and language development (Abell, Clawson, Washington, Bost, & Vaughn, 1996). Socio-demographic characteristics of parents are associated with both parents' parenting beliefs and practices (Dix, 1992; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1989; Miller, 1988), and also with the quality of home environment (Andrade et al., 2005). In this respect, examining the role of specific socio-demographic characteristics on parenting variable (beliefs, practices, and home context) is of special importance to understand parenting and child development.

1.2 Scope and Purpose of Research

Studies on parental socialization show the necessity of examining both parents' child-rearing practices and cognition in order to understand parenting (e.g., Goodnow, 1988). Parents' cognitions such as parental perceptions (Bornstein et al., 1998), beliefs (Abidin, 1992), expectations (Daggett, O'Brien, Zanolli, & Peyton, 2000), and goals (Leyendecker, Harwood, Lamb, & Schoelmerich, 2002) are influential on their child-rearing practices. In addition to parental beliefs and practices, quality of home context might be included in parenting variables because characteristics of the family environment are also important for young children. There is a strong relationship between family environment, parental variables, and child development, especially cognitive development (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 2005). Thus, in this thesis, maternal developmental expectations, child-rearing practices, and the quality of home context are examined to understand parenting.

It has been widely reported that social context is influential on parenting and developmental outcomes of children. Most of the research, investigating the relationship between social context and parenting variables, have addressed cultural differences by focusing on the context of broader cultural values (Bornstein et al., 1998; Goodnow, et al., 1984; Harwood, Schoelmerich, Schuize, & Gonzales, 1999; Hess, Kashiwagi, Azuma, Price, & Dickson, 1980; Rao, McHale, & Pearson, 2003).

Social environment also appears as a factor which is associated with parenting variables. Residential location, which is one of the indicators of social environment, might be associated with parenting through social networks and interaction patterns (e.g. Williams, Soetjiningsih, & Williams, 2000). In accordance, the major aims of this study were to examine similarities and differences between mothers of preschoolers in Turkey who live in a megacity or rural-cities in terms of their developmental timetables, parenting practices, and home context.

Variations in parents' developmental expectations and practices have also been examined in relation to their socio-demographic characteristics. Previous studies showed that the effect of culture on parenting weakens or disappears when socio-demographic characteristics (such as education) of parents are taken into account (Harwood, Schoelmerich, Ventura-Cook, Schulze, & Wilson, 1996; Laosa, 1980; Solis-Camara & Fox, 1995; Willemsen & van de Vijver, 1997). In this sense, examining within-culture parenting differences as related to the background characteristics (e.g., residential location and education) appears to be necessary. This would expand our knowledge about the role of socio-demographic characteristics on parenting variables. In the literature, there are few studies (e.g., Kumru, Yağmurlu, & Sayıl, 2008) that have examined parenting variables of Turkish mothers, the role of the city they live in and education in these parenting variables.

In the present thesis, Chapter 2 summarizes the previous studies on parenting, culture, and socio-demographic variables. The aims and hypotheses of the present

study are presented in Chapter 3, and Chapter 4 gives details about the participants and measures. The results of the statistical analyses are presented in Chapter 5 while findings of the present study are discussed in Chapter 6. Limitations and directions for future research are also given in this chapter. Secondary information regarding measures and findings are presented in the Appendices.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Parenting

There has been growing recognition that family is the first and most important social context for socialization of the child. Parents and children are both members of a biosocial system in which parents protect, nurture, and express affection and warmth to child and they live in close proximity (Grusec & Davidov, 2007). Parenting is defined as "purposive activities aimed at ensuring the survival and development of children" (Hoghughi, 2004, p.5). The extensive literature on parenting shows the significant effect of parenting practices on child development such as cognitive (e.g., Wade, 2004) and social development (e.g., Schaffer, 2003). Parents' child-rearing practices vary according to their ideas and knowledge about parenting and child development (McGuillicuddy-De Lisi, 1980). The quality of family environment is also associated with parenting beliefs and practices (Yeung, Linver, & Brooks-Gunn, 2002). Thus, in order to understand parenting and child development, it is necessary to examine parents'

cognitions, child-rearing practices, and also the quality of home environment provided by parents.

2.1.1 Parents' Social Cognitions

Okagaki and Bingham (2005) defined beliefs, goals, and expectations as interrelated but distinct aspects of parents' cognition. Parental beliefs are ideas or knowledge about the actual role and responsibilities of parents. Parents' ideas about different aspects of parenting such as child development, child-rearing practices, and parent-child relationships have been widely examined in the parenting literature (e.g., Çıtlak, Leyendecker, Schölmerich, Driessen, & Harwood, 2008; Tudge, Hogan, Snezhkova, Kulakova, & Etz, 2000). Socialization goals form one aspect of parental beliefs and specify what parents want their children to have when they grow up. Researchers (e.g., Kuczynski, 1984) examined the association between long-term versus short term socialization goals of mothers and their child-rearing behaviors. Parental developmental expectations are defined as the time/age that parents believe particular developmental skills should be reached by the child. Parental developmental expectations are also called as developmental timetables. Miller (1988) examined general questions that have guided previous studies on parental beliefs. Miller (1988) found that some studies focused on general belief systems about the nature of child development. The main question in these studies was about a comparison between

child inborn abilities and abilities they get through experience. The other category of studies focused on parents' beliefs about specific abilities in children. These studies addressed the timing of development by examining developmental expectations of parents, mostly mothers.

In the parenting literature, considerable attention has been paid to the variations in parental expectations that are associated with differences in socio-cultural context such as culture and socioeconomic status (The association between parenting and socio-cultural context is described in Section 2.2.). Parents' cognitions, including developmental expectations, are related with parenting practices which are, in turn, influential on child development (Abell et al., 1996). What parents believe about child development and the capabilities of their own child influence their child-rearing practices (McGuillicuddy-De Lisi, 1980; Miller, 1988). Thus, in order to understand child development and parenting process, it is also necessary to examine parenting practices.

2.1.2 Parenting Practices

There are many studies that examine the relationship between parenting and child developmental outcomes such as social and cognitive development (Dekovic & Janssen, 1992; Lee, Daniels, & Kissinger, 2006; Tamis-LeMonda, Shamon, Cabrera, & Lamb, 2004). Baumrind (1966) proposed three parenting styles which are authoritative,

authoritarian, and permissive parenting. In their typology, warmth and control were the two dimensions that were used to characterize parenting styles. Maccoby and Martin (1983) proposed a fourfold scheme in which there were combinations of high and low warmth and high and low control. Their typology described neglecting parenting as a fourth parenting style. These parenting styles can be summarized as follows:

Authoritarian parenting involves parental attempts to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior of children depending on their permanent standards with low levels of parental warmth. Authoritarian parents value obedience, restrict child's autonomy, and do not encourage verbal give and take. *Authoritative parenting* involves both warmth and control. Authoritative parents use firm control without restrictions in order to attain their objectives, they use reasoning and explanation; and encourage verbal communication. *Permissive parenting* involves warmth and unlimited acceptance toward the children's desires and actions. Permissive parents allow their children to regulate their own activities, but they do not exercise control and warn their children to obey the rules (Baumrind, 1966). *Neglecting (uninvolved) parenting* includes low warmth and low control. Uninvolved parents use minimum time and effort to have an interaction with the child (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Although Baumrind's parenting model has received substantial support, some researchers think that it is more useful to focus on specific parenting practices rather than understanding parents' influence on children's developmental outcomes, (Amato & Fowler, 2002; Dekovic & Janssen, 1992). Responsiveness (e.g., responding to child's

signals appropriately), warmth (e.g., providing emotional support), induction (e.g., giving reasons and explanations), power assertion (e.g., showing power to obtain compliance), cognitive stimulation (e.g., having activities to expand child's knowledge), demandingness (e.g., having demands from the child to act maturely and independently) and intrusiveness (e.g., over-controlling behaviors) are the most common parenting behaviors that are examined (Dekovic & Janssen, 1992; Paulussen-Hoogeboom, Stams, Hermanns, Peetsma, & van den Wittenboer, 2008; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2004; Yağmurlu & Sanson, 2009a). It has been shown that positive parenting behaviors (such as induction, warmth, responsiveness) predict positive developmental outcomes such as improved mental development (Lee et al., 2006), vocabulary development (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2004), prosocial skills (Dekovic & Janssen, 1992), and emotional development (Paulussen-Hoogeboom et al., 2008).

According to Stevenson-Hinde (1998) parenting should be examined by paying attention to the content and frequency of child-rearing behaviors, instead of parenting style, which is about the quality of parenting. Parenting style is described as a "constellation of attitudes toward the children that are communicated to the child and create an emotional climate in which the parents' behaviors are expressed" and parenting practices refer to "specific, goal-directed behaviors through which parents perform their parental duties" (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, p.488). Parenting practices can be "observed behavior that can be distinctively defined, reliably measured, and directly related to a child's behaviors' (Lee et al., 2006, p.256).

In sum, it might be argued that parenting practices are the mechanisms through which parents directly affect children's socialization (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). In this regard, while examining the relation between parenting and social context, it seems to be more informative to investigate parenting practices.

2.1.3 Home Environment

The physical and social settings in which families live are part of developmental niche (Harkness & Super, 1995). The idea of home environment might be defined as acts, objects, and places that are related to parental caregiving (Bradley, 1995). Characteristics of the home environment are important for young children. There are growing number of studies that measure family environment and its relation with parental variables and child development (Andrade et al., 2005; Bradley & Caldwell, 1984; Caughy, Randolph, & O'Campo, 2002; Gershoff, Aber, Raver, & Lennon, 2007; Vernon-Feagans et al., 2008). A strong relationship between family environment and child development, especially child's cognitive development, has been widely indicated in the results of these studies (Bradley, Caldwell, & Elardo, 1977; Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 2005).

Language stimulation available to the child, the responsivity of parent, the emotional support given by parents, availability of play materials, varied sensory input, arrangement of the physical environment, parental concern with achievement, and positive emotional climate are significant elements in the environment that promote

early development of children (Caughy et al., 2002). In addition to parental cognitions and child-rearing practices, in order to have a broader knowledge about parenting it is important to examine different aspects of the quality of home context. In the present study examining learning materials provided by parents and the physical arrangement of the home is of special importance to understand home context.

2.1.4 Child Characteristics

Child-related factors such as sex and age are related to parenting. In terms of the child sex, Leaper, Anderson, and Sanders (1998) found that mothers tended to talk more and used more supportive speech with their daughters than with their sons. Block's (1983) study also revealed greater warmth and physical closeness in the parent-daughter relationship compared to the parent-son relationship.

Age is another child characteristic that is associated with parental cognition and child-rearing practices. It has been found that authoritarian parenting behaviors decrease with increasing age of the child (Ross, 1984). McNally, Eisenberg, and Harris (1991) examined changes in mothers' reported practices about independence, control, expression of positive and negative affect, and discipline over an 8-year time period from 7-8 years to 15-16 years of age and found that maternal control increased with age in mid-adolescence and expression of affect (especially positive affect) decreased with the age of the child. Results of this study also showed that the use of denial of

privilege, as punishment technique, increased and the use of isolation decreased with age.

2.2 Parenting and Socio-Cultural Context

It is widely agreed that in order to understand parental cognitions and behaviors, it is necessary to examine the wider context in which child is being socialized. According to the contextualist view, behavior cannot be understood without knowing characteristics of the context in which it occurs (Super & Harkness, 1986). There is an interaction between the individual and its environment; thus, there is a need to understand the individual in his/her environment (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993). The relation between culture and parenting variables (parental cognition, behaviors, and home context) is discussed in Section 2.2.1.

2.2.1 Parenting and Culture

Parents are the primary socialization agents through which cultural values and rules are transmitted to children. Culture shapes the skills and behaviors that are valued in that particular context. Those skills and behaviors that are valued in the culture are emphasized highly by parents, parents' behaviors encourage them, and children are expected to achieve them at an earlier age.

One of the models that explain contextual influence on parental beliefs is related to the concepts of 'individualism' and 'collectivism'. Hofstede (2001) suggested four dimensions to organize cultures: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity/femininity, and individualism-collectivism. Among all these dimensions, individualism-collectivism dimension is the most widely examined one in cultural studies. Schaffer (2006, p.91) defines individualism-collectivism as a 'bipolar dimension along which societies can be arranged according to the extent to which people give priority to personal goals as opposed to those of their social group'. In individualistic cultures people value uniqueness, equity, competition, and their own needs and rights. In those contexts, nuclear family is the common family type, where individuals are encouraged to be independent and autonomous. Self-assertion, self-expression, and self-actualization are some of the characteristics highly stressed by the culture. On the other hand, in collectivistic cultures connectedness to other members of the in-group is stressed; individuals show social interdependence and cooperation. Group unity, harmony, and equality are highly valued and the common family type is extended family (Schwarz, Schafermeier, & Trommsdorff, 2005; Triandis, 1994; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990).

There are many studies that examine variations in parental cognitions and behaviors that are observed in individualistic and collectivistic cultures (Bornstein & Cote, 2001; Hess, et al., 1980; Harwood et al., 1999). One of these studies (Hess et al., 1980) examined Japanese and American mothers' views on the age at which their

children master a number of specific developmental skills. Results showed that Japanese mothers, who were assumed to serve as an example of parents from a collectivistic culture, wanted to see early development in areas that relate the child to adults, such as self-control, compliance with adult authority, and social courtesy in interaction with adults. American mothers, who belong to a more individualistic culture, wanted to see early development in areas that relate the child to his/her peers, such as displaying individual action, standing up for rights, and other forms of verbal assertion (Hess et al., 1980). Goodnow et al. (1984) also found that Anglo mothers reported significantly earlier expectations about social skills and verbal assertiveness than Lebanese mothers. Anglo mothers wanted their children to acquire social skills related to peers and to be verbally informative earlier. Lebanese mothers reported significantly later ages for the items related to the independence (Goodnow et al., 1984).

Harwood et al. (1996) studied socialization goals of mothers living in the USA and Puerto Rico. Results indicated that culture and socioeconomic status both contribute independently to the group differences but the hierarchical log-linear analyses showed that culture has a stronger influence on socialization goals of mothers. Self maximization (which is about self-confidence and independence) was more valued mostly by Anglo-American mothers and proper demeanor, which is linked to respectfulness, obedience, having good family relations, was more highly valued by Puerto Rican mothers. Middle-class Anglo mothers reported self-maximization while lower-class Anglo mothers reported self-maximization, proper demeanor, and decency.

Middle-class Puerto Rican mothers reported self-maximization more, but the proper demeanor was reported frequently among all Puerto Rican mothers. Harwood et al. (1996) suggested that these findings provide evidence for the general usefulness of the individualism-collectivism conceptualization.

Shortly, the reviewed studies show that parents coming from a culture with more individualistic orientation emphasize individual-oriented child-rearing goals such as being independent, self-reliant, and self-realization, while parents coming from more collectivistic orientation emphasize group-oriented child-rearing goals such as encouraging cooperation, proper demeanor, and family ties in the child.

In addition to the individualistic-collectivistic conceptualization, Kağıtçıbaşı's (2007) Family Change Model also proposes to explain self, family, and socialization in socio-cultural context. It is a theoretical model in which self is situated within the family and the family is situated within the context. Culture and living conditions of the family are two components of the context. Urban-rural residence, socioeconomic level, subsistence/affluence levels of living conditions are some of the main indicators of context. In this model, there is a dynamic interaction between context and family system through time. Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) proposed three family models which are related to different family systems and different contexts: family model of interdependence, family model of independence, and family model of emotional interdependence.

Family model of interdependence exists in collectivistic cultures (or culture of relatedness) with rural/agrarian traditional structure and close human/family relations. According to the Model, in this family system, interdependence is stressed because of the agricultural lifestyle, shared work and low affluence levels. Authoritarian parenting and obedience demanding behaviors are adaptive in this context for family survival through time. Thus, both material interdependence and emotional interdependence are valued; consequently, the relational self develops in this type of family system (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

Family model of independence exists in individualistic cultures (or culture of separateness) and in the Western, urban/suburban, industrial, technological, middle class societies. In this family system, independence and psychological values of the child are stressed because there are industrial/technological lifestyles and high levels of affluence that provide old age security. In such a context, women have higher intrafamily status, and fertility rate is low. According to the Model, permissive parenting and low control in child-rearing practices are adaptive in this context. This type of socialization leads to both intergenerational and interpersonal independence; and consequently, the independent-separated self develops (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

Family model of emotional interdependence is observed in traditional societies where there is rapid social change. With urbanization and economic development, material dependencies decrease and there are different sources for parents' old-age security. In such a context, relatedness is still valued as the culture is collectivistic in

origin. However autonomy is also endorsed as it becomes a need in the urban lifestyle. Parents want to have a child for psychological satisfaction, not for its economic value. Authoritative parenting and both relatedness- and autonomy-oriented child-rearing practices are adaptive in this context. Thus, this type of socialization leads to both intergenerational and interpersonal interdependence. The autonomous-relational self is adaptive for this family model (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

Taking Kağıtçıbaşı's Family Change Model as a reference point, Lamm, Keller, Yovsi, and Chaudhary (2008) examined parenting ethnotheories of mothers from different cultural groups. First group of mothers were from Germany who were highly educated, relatively older, and had fewer children than the other samples. Mothers in the second group were living in rural regions of Cameroon-Nso In this group, mothers lived in the villages, made their living from farming, had only primary education, and the number of children per mother was higher than all the other samples. The third group of mothers were living in Delhi and urban regions of Nso. They had an interdependent cultural heritage but were living in larger cities of societies with increasing industrialization. Results of Lamm et al. (2008) study showed that German mothers expressed more autonomy and less relatedness than all the other mothers. The rural Nso mothers expressed the least autonomy but the highest level of relatedness. The mothers from Delhi and urban Nso expressed relatedness as much as rural Nso mothers and expressed levels of autonomy in between the Berlin and rural Nso mothers, providing support for Kağıtçıbaşı's Family Change Model.

With respect to parenting practices, it is suggested that some parenting behaviors that are observed in the infancy period such as nurturing, physical stimulation, social exchange are similar all around the world and cultural differences in child-rearing behaviors are observed to a large extent in subsequent years (Bornstein, 1995). This recognition has led researchers examine the role of culture on parents' child-rearing behaviors in preschool and elementary school years. In order to examine specific child-rearing strategies of mothers to accomplish their socialization goals, Harwood et al. (1999) asked middle class Anglo-American mothers and Puerto Rican mothers to describe what they do to encourage or discourage the development of specific qualities. Results indicated that, when socioeconomic differences were controlled, mothers coming from collectivistic and individualistic cultures displayed differences in their child-rearing strategies. It was found that Anglo-American mothers preferred to be a model by personally acting desirable behaviors, provide their children opportunities in which children learn by themselves, and Puerto Rican mothers preferred to teach their children through the direct exercise of parental authority. Similarly, Fogel, Stevenson, and Messinger (1992) explored child-rearing strategies of mothers coming from individualistic and collectivistic cultures. It was found that Japanese mothers satisfied their infants' desires for proximity by comforting the infant, accepting and responding directly to the infants' needs in order to encourage interdependence. They focused infant attention toward dyadic events and their speech

contained direct emotional interventions. American mothers encouraged autonomy by directing the infant to activities, leaving their infants with toys and encouraging them to do task on their own. They spoke with their child in a direct manner, the infant was perceived as a full conversational partner.

In another study, Keller, Borke, Yovsi, Lohaus, and Jensen (2005) evaluated parenting behaviors of mothers from three cultural environments: German middle class, Cameroonian Nso farmer, and the Costa Rican mothers. German middle class families represent individualistic cultural orientation where individual achievement is based on competition and self-esteem is based on comparison. Cameroonian Nso farmers represent interdependent socialization orientation where all households are extended families and obedience, respect for authority, and conformity to traditional norms are highly valued. The Costa Rican families represent an autonomous-relational orientation where there is transition from traditional independent Latin-American structures and values to those coming with economic modernization. Results of this study were also consistent with propositions of Family Change Model of Kağıtçıbaşı (2007); parenting behaviors of mothers from different cultural contexts significantly differed from each other: German mothers applied the assumed independent model by focusing on a distal parenting style such as more face-to-face contact and object play, and less body contact and body stimulation. Cameroonian Nso farmers showed a proximal parenting style such as more body contact and body stimulation, and less face-to-face context and object play which is related to more interdependent family model. The Costa Rican

mothers also showed a proximal parenting style but they had less body contact than Cameroonian Nso mothers which is interpreted as a change toward an autonomous-relational orientation.

2.2.2 Parenting and Socioeconomic Status of Parents

While there are many studies that examine the association between culture and parenting, it is acknowledged that socio-demographic factors are also important contextual variables that should be examined in order to explain parenting (Garcia Coll & Pachter, 2002; Hernandez, 1997). Socioeconomic status (SES) is a key socio-demographic marker and associated with variations in parenting and child development (Cowan, Powell, & Cowan, 1998; Hernandez, 1997). Kohn is one of the first researchers who investigated the link between socioeconomic status and parenting. He suggested that social class which is closely related to occupational status of a person shapes his/her life perspectives (Kohn, 1959, 1963). Findings of Kohn (1959) indicated that parents from different social classes differ in terms of what they value in their children: working class parents tended to value the qualities that assure respect and obedience to authority because their works require obeying the directives of the authority; and middle class parents valued internalized standards of conduct and independence as their works require self-direction, creativity and exploration (Kohn, 1959).

There are many studies that support Kohn's (1959, 1963) theories about the relation between social class and parenting. For example, Tudge et al. (2000) examined American and Russian parents' values and beliefs about appropriate child-rearing practices. Results of the study showed that there were significant social class differences rather than cross-societal differences in values for self-direction and conformity. In both societies, middle class parents valued self-direction by encouraging freedom both in and around home. Working class parents valued conformity; they thought that children should obey the rules and authority. Another study (Luster, Rhoades, & Haas, 1989) revealed that American mothers who had 9 to 23 months old infants, differed in their values and behaviors depending on their social class. Findings showed that lower class mothers (who had lower education, lower occupational status, and lower family income) valued conformity (e.g., to keep him/herself and his/her clothes clean) more highly; whereas higher social class mothers (who had higher education, more prestigious occupations, and higher income) valued self-direction more (e.g., to think for him/herself).

As the reviewed studies showed that socioeconomic status is one of the predictors of parental cognitions and behaviors. Socioeconomic status is defined as a social stratification in which individuals, families, or groups are in a rank depending on their access to control wealth, power, and social status (Mueller & Parcel, 1981). However, social scientists do not fully agree on what SES has to represent, and what the best way to measure SES is. It is also argued that (Duncan & Magnuson, 2003) parental

education, occupation, and family income are the most common components of SES; but they are distinct constructs and have distinct theoretical linkages to developmental outcomes. Therefore, some researchers prefer to examine components of SES separately, in order to identify the distinctive role of each component in parenting and human development (Bornstein, Hahn, Suwalsky, & Haynes, 2003).

Maternal education is one of the most frequently used indicators of SES in child development literature. In a review of articles published in three selected journals, maternal education was found to be the most commonly used indicator of SES. These articles were published over the past decade in order to examine the relation between SES and child development (Ensminger & Forhergill, 2003). Compared to education, occupational status and income are seen as problematic indicators of SES, as they may vary considerably even in short-term periods (Bornstein et al., 2003). In the present study, the link between parenting and mother education is examined rather than the composite SES variables. Previous studies have also shown that education is more closely associated with how parents organize their parental beliefs, child-rearing practices, and home environment compared to income and occupation (Bornstein et al., 2003; Davis-Kean, 2005; Laosa, 1980). Parents who have higher levels of education have been shown to know more about child development, communicate more effectively, and provide higher levels of appropriate cognitive stimulation and emotional support to their children (Davis-Kean, 2005).

In one of the early studies, Laosa (1980) found that Chicano mothers in the USA mostly used modeling, visual cue, directive and negative physical control, and the Anglo mothers mostly used inquiry and praise as teaching strategies. However, Laosa (1980) also reported that observed cultural group differences in maternal teaching strategies disappeared when differences in maternal education was controlled. Solis-Camara and Fox (1996) found that higher amount of schooling was related to more nurturance in Mexican mothers. These mothers were also reported to give more importance to psychological growth of their children, compared to mothers with lower amount of schooling. Williams, Soetjiningsih et al. (2000) conducted a similar study with Balinese mothers and revealed that compared to mothers with lower education, Balinese mothers with more education had earlier developmental expectations about physical and perceptual-motor behaviors of children. Correspondingly, high-educated mothers reported earlier ages to start talking to babies, telling stories, reading books, weaning from breast feeding, letting their babies feed themselves, and disciplining their children. The results might be related to the engagement of high-educated mothers in practices that facilitate child development.

Kağıtçıbaşı (1989) suggested that children who have mothers with low levels of education are not exposed to environmental stimulation much: they lack sufficient number of toys and books. Kağıtçıbaşı (1989) further argued that low educated parents believe that children are not educable until school age; thus, they do not engage in

practices that facilitate child development. Low-educated mothers' children also do not receive verbal reasoning and communication much, which is related with limited vocabulary and verbal competition of mothers.

Consistent with Kağıtçıbaşı's suggestion, environment structuring, parental expectations, child-rearing practices, cognitively stimulating materials, and diversity in daily stimulation are examples through which parental schooling affects child development (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). Andrade et al. (2005) examined the association between maternal education, quality of stimulation in the family environment and child's cognitive development. It was found that 'organization of physical and temporal environment' and 'appropriate play materials and games available' which are two components of home environment were positively associated with schooling. It was also found that child's cognitive performance was associated with these components of home environment; a child with higher score in home context also had better cognitive performance.

The studies reviewed in this section suggest that SES is significantly related to parenting beliefs, behaviors, and family environment. Maternal education appears to be the critical component of SES, which significantly predicts child-rearing. In addition to education, it is also important to examine other indicators of socio-cultural context (such as social environment) in which parents and children live in order to better understand the variations in parenting values and behaviors. The following section

(Section 2.2.3) reviews the role of social environment on parenting and child development.

2.2.3 Parenting and Social Environment

Within any society, the structure of the family, including number of and organization of their interrelationships, are influenced by the economy, modernity, and values held in the society (Clausen, 1996; Frankel, Roer-Bornstein, & Le Vine, 1982). The size and type of community are also important predictors of values in a society (Fischer, 1978).

Rural versus urban differences have been examined in order to understand the association between social environment and parenting (e.g., Frankel et al., 1982; Abels et al., 2005). According to Lampard, Voigt, and Bornstein (2000), rural and urban cultures can be defined by noticeable characteristics, beliefs, and behaviors. Rural is characterized as less populated communities where there are extended families and close interactions between people familiar with one another. Cohesiveness, homogeneity, and shared values can be the characteristics that protect traditions in rural contexts. On the other hand, urban contexts are characterized as more populated communities where there are large, segmented, and utilitarian communities with different ideas, experiences, backgrounds, and actions (Coleman, Ganong, Clark, & Madsen, 1989). Scanzoni and Arnett (1987) examined similarities and differences

between rural men and women with urban men and women in a country located in a Metropolitan Area in USA. Gender role specialization was the specific aspect examined in relation to modernity/traditionalism. It was found that compared to urban women and men, rural women and men adopt more traditional on gender role preferences such as the father and husband roles.

Empirical studies provide support to the claim that rural and urban families differ in terms of parental cognitions and behaviors. Williams, Williams, Lopez, and Tayko (2000) reported a significant main effect of residential location on mothers' developmental expectations in the Philippines. Results of this study showed that compared to rural mothers, urban mothers had earlier expectations for cognitive, psychosocial, and physical/perceptual-motor development. Maternal education also had a significant main effect for mothers' expectations for children's cognitive and psychosocial development while there was a significant interaction effect of residential location and maternal education only on maternal expectations for children's physical/perceptual-motor development. In other words, urban mother who had higher education reported earlier expectations for children's physical/perceptual-motor development than low-educated rural mothers. Urban mothers also used more stimulating child-rearing practices than rural mothers. In addition, Coleman et al. (1989) showed that both urban mothers and fathers emphasized the importance of social development more than rural parents in the US, and suggested that this might be due to the fact that urban population is mobile and has fewer close kin relations compared to

rural population where social interaction occurs naturally within the close kinship ties. According to Coleman et al. (1989), children in urban must learn social skills to have friends, to join social groups, and maintain social interactions. Therefore, urban parents view social competence skills as an important outcome which is necessary for child's psychological well-being.

In addition to the differences between rural (generally represents villages) and urban areas, differences in socioeconomic characteristics of cities (such as percentages of people who read-write, percentage of university graduates, and economic wealth) can be taken into consideration. However, the number of studies that examine the role of social environment, specifically the role of residential location that varies through socio-demographic characteristics, on parenting is inadequate (e.g., Volkan & Çevik, 1989). In most of the developmental studies about Turkey, participants were recruited from Istanbul, Ankara or Izmir, the three biggest cities in Turkey (e.g., Baydar, Kağıtçıbaşı, Küntay, & Gökşen, 2008; Göksun, Küntay, & Naigles, 2008; Hortaçsu, Ertem, Kurtoğlu, & Uzer, 2001; Kumru, Carlo, & Edwards, 2004; Kumru, et al., 2008; Sayıl, 2001; Yağmurlu, Çıtlak, Dost, & Leyendecker, 2009). This thesis will let us examine similarities and differences in parenting variables (parental cognitions, child-rearing behaviors, and home context) of Turkish mothers that are related to living in a megacity and a rural-city.

2.3 Parenting and Turkey

Social context of the Turkish family is based on networks of close bonds, loyalty, and interdependence (Aygün & İmamoğlu, 2002; Fişek, 1982; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). Traditionally obedience and dependence are the common socialization values in the Turkish family while external control and physical punishment are the common child-rearing practices of Turkish parents (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1989). However, with the social change, extended family structure of traditional Turkish family is becoming nuclear in its features (Duben, 1982; Fişek, 1982). Extended family, in which family members provide social, emotional, and material support to each other, is one of the characteristics of collectivistic Turkish culture (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; 1989). Even though there are constant features of the traditional Turkish family, some of the features are in a process of transformation. In order to describe 'Turkish family', it is necessary to talk about both the features of the traditional, rural Turkish family and emerging characteristics of modern urban Turkish family.

Traditional Turkish family is patriarchal; father is the authority in the family. High degree of material interdependence and emotional interdependence among family members are the other important features of traditional rural Turkish family. Attachment, respect, and loyalty towards parents are valued. In addition to warmth, control is the dominant child-rearing behavior in the traditional authoritarian family (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1970) which is external, and based on anxiety and shame, rather than

internal and based on guilt (Taylor & Oskay, 1995). Obedience-demanding behaviors and physical punishment are common among traditional authoritarian family (Sunar, 2002). Cultural values indicate a clear differentiation in attitudes toward girls and boys, favoring boys. Boys are tolerated more by parents compared to girls while girls are expected to do housework and help mother (Kıray, 1976; Kongar, 1976; Llyod & Fallers, 1976). In short, listed characteristics of Turkish parenting show that Turkish culture might be classified as "collectivistic" (Hofstede, 2001). Additionally, Kağıtçıbaşı's (2007) conceptualization of "family model of interdependence" also might represent characteristics of traditional Turkish family.

As Sunar (2002) mentioned, even though seventy percent of the Turkish population live in the urban areas, most of these people were born in villages or their parents live in village; thus, traditional values are endorsed by many people in the urban. On the other hand, Turkey is exposed to western culture through mass media, and the official policies support modernization, industrialization, and westernization. Large urban groups are different from traditional group in terms of education, occupation, lifestyles, and values (Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992). Göregenli (1997) stressed that urban population cannot be characterized as collectivistic or individualistic, even though rural can be characterized as collectivistic. In other words, urban culture is different than rural culture in terms of beliefs and practices. As Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) proposed, in the modern urban Turkish family both individual and group loyalties are valued, and parenting practices aim to produce an "autonomous-relational" self, rather

than independent or interdependent self. Ataca and Sunar (1999) found that in contrast to the traditional Turkish family's patriarchal structure, urban middle class women were more involved in decision-making in family. Increased share in decision-making for women, communication, and role sharing between spouses were found as examples of egalitarian intra-family relations that were observed among urban families. It was also found that there was a decrease in boy preference and an increase in girl preference (Ataca & Sunar, 1999). Urban parents use rewards and reasoning as a method of discipline and control more than authoritarian control and punishment (Sunar, 2002).

The study of the Value of Children (VOC) in Turkey is one of the most important studies that explain parenting among Turkish families (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). The original VOC study was done in 1975 with 2305 Turkish married respondents, 1762 females and 543 males. Thirteen percent of the women did not have children. This study was a part of a nine-country research project that aimed to examine values attributed to children, motivations for child-bearing, and the fertility outcomes. In this study, multi-stage stratified random sampling was used and stratification was done according to the level of development. The population which is less than 2000 was classified as rural population. Urban population was classified into three groups (developed, intermediate, and less developed) according to the composite socioeconomic indices of government statistics. The fifth group was from the three metropolitan areas of Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir which were used as a self-representative area (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982).

The responses of the participants reflected the social and economical structure of Turkey in 1970s. The results of the study showed that parents in the rural and less developed areas mostly emphasized economic value of children. Participants expected their children to economically support them in the future, child was perceived as an old age security, especially the son. In contrast, psychological value was found to be mostly emphasized by parents who live in the context of greater affluence and urban lifestyle. The reasons for having a child were child's friendship, love, and joy rather than an economic advantage (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). The Turkish VOC Study (1975) showed that with socioeconomic development, economic value of children would decrease and psychological value of children would increase. Various indicators of socioeconomic development were used. Developmental level of the residential location and education were found as the most important indicators for the differences in value of children (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982).

After 30-year time period, Kağıtçıbaşı and Ataca (2005) conducted a study in order to examine the influence of economic and social development on social lives of the three generations of females. These participants did not take part in the 1975 VOC study, because the 2005 study was not a full replication of the 1975 study; there were methodological differences. For example, the 2005 study had only female respondents and some of the questions were not asked in identical way in the two studies. Thus it was not possible to make a direct comparison. Urban participants were recruited from

lower and upper/middle socioeconomic neighborhoods of Istanbul. Rural participants were from villages in Southwestern and Southeastern Turkey. Firstly, because the younger mothers of the 2005 study matched the mother sample of the 1975 VOC study in terms of age, comparisons of VOC across three decades in Turkey was made between these two groups of mothers. The findings indicated that from 1975 to 2003 psychological value of children increased and their material value decreased significantly. Also, in terms of sex preference, there was an increase in girl preference and a decrease for boy preference in three decades. The effect of social environment on value of children, expectations from a grown-up children, and qualities desired in children by comparing the three groups (urban upper/middle SES, urban lower SES, and rural) was further examined. It was found that both groups valued psychological value of children highly. However, material value of children was valued the most by the rural group, followed by the urban low SES group; urban high SES group valued it the least important. Thus, the economic value of the child decreased with the socioeconomic development of the social environment. These findings provided support to Kağıtçıbaşı's (2007) family model of psychological interdependence. The distinction among social groups regarding the importance attached to the economic value of children showed the diversity of lifestyles and corresponding values among Turkish mothers.

The role of parental education on parenting in the Turkish family has also been examined. One of these studies (Yağmurlu et al., 2009) examined long-term

socialization goals of mothers living in Istanbul and whether educational level of mothers could be a source of within-culture variation. It was found that compared to low-educated mothers (who had an average of 4,9 years of education), high-educated mothers (who had an average of 15,5 years of education) emphasized goals related to autonomy and self-enhancement. High-educated Turkish mothers emphasized characteristics such as being self-confident, psychologically healthy, hard-working, and autonomous. They wanted their children to run for their ideals and do what they believe to be true. On the other hand, low-educated Turkish mothers valued proper demeanor, such as obedience, respectfulness, and well-manner. Close family ties, being kind, being adaptive to the situation, and respect for the older ones were the other desirable characteristics that low-educated mothers emphasized more strong than high-educated mothers. Mothers did not significantly differ in value placed on decency (such as being hardworking, responsible, and honest), lovingness (such as being friendly and maintaining affective relationships with others), and self-control (being able to control negative impulses) (Yağmurlu et al., 2009). Especially, two groups of mothers had common long-term socialization goals which were related to being successful at school and at work, and being able to cope with difficulties. Both groups of mothers stressed the importance of education, and they reported that they wanted their children to attend university and get a job with a fixed income. These similarities among the two groups of mothers regardless of their education level might be related to the inadequate social security system in Turkey. Both groups of mothers might be

aware of the importance of economic affluence and wish their children to develop skills which may be helpful for their future economic affluence in a country with social security problems.

2.4 Summary

Findings reviewed in this chapter indicate that characteristics of social and cultural background influence parenting. Therefore, investigating the role of socio-cultural context on parenting beliefs, practices, and family environment is important to understand parenting and its effects on child development. Explaining the interactions requires carefully designed studies which investigate distinct aspects of parenting, take a broader perspective to describe contextual forces, and employ an appropriate measurement method which is sensitive to characteristics of the participants.

Consistent with existing literature, the general pattern of expected relations is described in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

THE PRESENT STUDY

As previously described in Chapter 2, family is the first and the most important social context for the socialization of children (Grusec & Davidov, 2007; Schaffer, 2003). Specific parenting variables have a great impact on child development (Abell et al., 1996; Meadow, 1996; Schaffer, 2003). Hence, it is important to identify and understand the factors which might be related to differences in parenting variables. The broad aim of this study was to understand the factors that are related to parenting beliefs, practices, and home context of Turkish mothers, by examining a number of characteristics of the child, parent, and social context.

This chapter presents the general pattern of expected relations that are in light of the existing literature. First, hypothesized group differences depending on social environment are described. Then, the influence of maternal education on their child-rearing practices, parental beliefs, and home context are explained. The chapter continues with hypotheses about expected relations between variables (i.e., child's age, sex and mothers' child-rearing practices and developmental expectations).

3.1 Social Environment and Parenting

One of the major aims of the present study is to investigate the role of social environment on Turkish mothers' parenting practices, beliefs, and home context. There are some variations in parental variables depending on the development level of regions where parents live (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). The comparison of parental cognition and behaviors between rural and urban was reviewed in the previous chapter (Coleman et al., 1989; Williams, Williams et al., 2000), but it is not clear whether parents who live in a megacity and a rural-city display similar parenting beliefs and behaviors or not. This study aims to explore similarities and differences in parenting values, practices, and home environments of Turkish mothers who live in megacities and rural-cities in Turkey.

Megacity is a metropolitan area where there is rapid growth, high level of population density, formal and informal economics, as well as poverty, crime, and traffic. Megacities are important for their countries and regions. They are political and cultural centers and the economic drivers for their country (Wenzel, Bendimerad, & Sinha, 2007). On the other hand, a rural-city is a large and stable urban settlement with advanced systems for sanitation, utilities, land usage, housing, transportation, and more (Kuper & Kuper, 1996). As explanations showed, even though they are both urban settings megacities are different from rural-cities in term of their socioeconomic characteristics; megacities are socioeconomically more developed and complex than

rural-cities. In this respect, in the present study it was expected to find some differences and similarities in Turkish mothers' parenting variables in relation to their residential location. Mothers who live in a megacity were expected to report higher levels of inductive reasoning and cognitive stimulation and less obedience-demanding and punitive behaviors than mothers who live rural-cities which are socioeconomically less developed compared to megacities, even when differences in level of education is controlled.

Consistent with previous studies (e.g., Williams, Williams et al., 2000), it was predicted that, when the level of maternal education is controlled, mothers who live in megacity would report earlier developmental expectations that are related with autonomy values, specifically 'autonomy' and 'agency', which help the child become an independent person and develop his/her abilities as an individual. On the other hand, mothers who live in rural-cities were expected to report earlier expectations that are consistent with relatedness values, in particular 'obedience' and 'traditional/moral rules', which lead the child be respectful, compliant, and well-mannered. It was also expected that there would be no differences between mothers' expectations related to family orientation (child's ability to maintain effective relationships with family members) because it might be a characteristic that is highly valued in the Turkish family, even in urban families where emotional interdependence is the common form of relationship (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

There are also many studies that examine family environment and its relation with parental variables and child development (Andrade et al., 2005; Bradley & Caldwell, 1984; Yeung et al., 2002). Families with different socio-demographic characteristics differ widely in the kinds and amounts of stimulation they provide to their children (Bradley et al., 1977; Gershoff et al., 2007; Yeung et al., 2002). Thus, residential location of parents can be related with the family environment (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1989). Accordingly, in this study it was predicted that even when the level of maternal education is controlled mothers who live in megacity would provide more learning materials than mothers who live in rural-cities; while rural-city mothers would provide healthier physical environment to their children than megacity mothers.

3.2 Maternal Education and Parenting

Megacities have heterogeneous population and display significant variation in socioeconomic characteristics of its residents. Therefore, it appears that mothers' child-rearing beliefs and practices may display significant variation in megacities and an important part of this variance might be due to the gap in mothers' socioeconomic background. Previous studies show that maternal education is the best predictor of mother and child behavior compared to other components of socioeconomic status (Bornstein et al., 2003; Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997; Laosa, 1980). Hence, another

aim of the present study was to examine the role of maternal education, as a socioeconomic variable, on their parenting practices and beliefs. Depending on previous studies (Davis-Kean, 2005; Williams, Soetjiningsih et al., 2000), it was posited that low-educated mothers would report lower levels of inductive reasoning and cognitive stimulation and higher levels of punishment and obedience-demanding behaviors than high-educated mothers.

In addition, consistent with previous studies (Solis-Camara & Fox, 1996; Williams, Soetjiningsih et al., 2000), it was predicted that high-educated mothers would report earlier ages for expectations about autonomy and agency which lead the child to become more independent and self-confident. On the other hand, it was predicted that low-educated mothers would report earlier ages for expectations about obedience and traditional/moral rules which lead the child to become well-mannered, respectful, compliant, and dependent. It was also expected that there would be no differences in mothers' expectations related to family orientation as it is highly valued by Turkish people in different socioeconomic backgrounds.

There is an association between the level of parental education and parental expectations, child-rearing practices, and quality of the child's environment. In the present study, it was expected that compared to low-educated mothers, high-educated mothers in megacities would provide more learning materials and healthier physical environment.

3.3 Predicted Relationships of Child Characteristics and Parenting

Examining the role of child-related factors in parenting behaviors and beliefs of mothers was another goal of the study. In the literature, age and sex are examined as major child-related factors which might be associated with parenting practices and beliefs. It has been found that authoritarian parenting behaviors decrease with increasing age of the child (McNally et al., 1991; Ross, 1984). Thus, in the present study it was predicted that child age would be negatively associated with mothers' punitive and obedience-demanding behaviors.

In terms of the child's sex, studies showed an advantage in favor of girls such as supportive speech (Leaper et al., 1998) and greater warmth (Block, 1983). Also, it was found that mothers of boys emphasized the ability to meet basic social standards such as being hardworking, cooperative, and honest significantly more than mothers of girls in Turkey (Yağmurlu, 2009). Hence, it was expected that there would be significant differences between boys and girls in terms of parenting practices and the quality of home environment. Specifically, it was predicted that mothers of girls would report higher levels of warmth, inductive reasoning and more language stimulation; and mothers of boys would report more learning materials.

3.4 Predicted Relations between Parenting Variables

Previous studies showed that parental control is positively associated with group-oriented and achievement-oriented goals and negatively associated with individual-oriented goals (Schwarz et al., 2005). Hence, in the present study, it was expected that mothers who had earlier developmental expectations for obedience and traditional/moral rules would report using higher levels of obedience-demanding behavior and punishment. On the other hand, mothers who reported earlier developmental expectations for cognitive skills, autonomy, and agency were expected to use higher levels of inductive reasoning and cognitive stimulation.

3.5. Summary

This chapter summarized previous findings to establish the aims of the present study. Measures used to examine parenting and family variables, and techniques used to analyze the proposed hypotheses are described in the following chapter.

Chapter 4

METHOD

4.1 Overview of Chapter

This chapter presents information on the methodology of the study. First, it gives a description of characteristics of the participants. Next, the materials that are used to measure mothers' developmental expectations, child-rearing behaviors, and quality of family environment are described. The last section includes details of the procedure, such as preparation of the measures and the recruitment.

4.2 Participants

The sample comprised of two groups of Turkish mothers who had at least one child in the preschool period: megacity mothers and rural-city mothers.

1- *Megacity Mothers:* In this sample, there were 162 mothers who were living in different suburbs of Istanbul. Istanbul is a megacity; the cultural and financial centre of Turkey. It is the largest city in Turkey which has its settlements

uniquely at the crossroads between Europe and Asia with a population around 13 million. It is also the second largest metropolitan area in Europe. Its urban structure and socio-economic characteristics are constantly developing (Istanbul Province, 2008). According to the State Institute of Statistics (2000, 2001), most of the socioeconomic characteristics of Istanbul are above the Turkey average. Percentages for reading-writing, university graduates, the rural population, and economic wealth for Turkey and Istanbul are presented in Table 4.1 as indicators of socioeconomic characteristics. Istanbul is rapidly growing city with a population growth rate of 3.45%. This increase is mostly due to internal migration from other cities. The population density for Istanbul is 1885 people per square km while it is 87 people per square km for Turkey (SIS, 2000). These statistics reveal that Istanbul is a province which represents characteristics of megacities. It is also suggested that as a megacity there are different social groups in Istanbul (Mortan, 2000). Mothers in the megacity sample were divided into two according to their level of education. Eighty-eight mothers in the megacity sample had at least high school education while 74 had at most secondary school education.

2- Rural-city Mothers: In this study, Konya, Kayseri, and Nevsehir were chosen to represent rural-cities of Turkey. These are the three old cities in Central Anatolia that are thought to best represent characteristics of the traditional Turkish family. The population density is 54 for Konya, 57 for Nevsehir, and 62

for Kayseri which are lower than Turkey average (SIS, 2000). They also have low percentages for reading-writing, university graduate and economic wealth which are indicators of less developed socioeconomic characteristics of these cities compared to big cities such as Istanbul (In Table 4.1, some of the socioeconomic characteristics of these cities are presented). Therefore, in this study these three cities were grouped as rural-cities. In this sample, there were 81 mothers regardless of their level of education, specifically there were 38 mothers from Konya, 24 mothers from Kayseri, and 19 were from Nevsehir. The total number of mothers who lived in rural-cities declined to 73 because of the missing values. Thirty-two mothers had at least high school education while 40 had at most secondary school education. One of the mothers did not give any information about her education.

Table 4.1

SIS Statistics for Socioeconomic Characteristics of Turkey, Istanbul, Konya, Kayseri, and Nevsehir

	Purchase power ($) *	Urban% **	Rural% **	Literacy% **	University graduate% **	Illiterate men % **	Illiterate women % **	birth rate **
Türkiye	6132	64.90	35.10	87.30	5.30	16.30	5.20	2.53
İstanbul	8752	90.69	9.31	93.40	7.90	35.50	9.50	1.97
Konya	4440	59.07	40.93	90.10	3.90	21.50	6.60	3.00
Nevsehir	5160	44.05	55.95	88.40	3.90	21.00	5.50	2.55
Kayseri	6048	69.06	30.94	88.90	4.60	21.80	5.70	2.62

Note. * indicates year of 2001 statistics, ** indicates year of 2000 statistics.

Gross domestic product ($) per individual on purchase power was chosen to show economic wealth of cities in Turkey. Statistics showed that purchasing power of individuals in Istanbul is higher than both Turkey average and Konya, Kayseri, and Nevsehir. Percentages of individuals who are literate and graduated from university in Istanbul are higher than Turkey average, in addition to the higher percentages for illiteracy. Thus, these statistics for Istanbul also support the heterogeneous characteristics of megacities. Rural versus urban percentages of the cities also might be indicators of their socioeconomic development. Compared to Konya, Kayseri, and Nevsehir, which are around Turkey average, urban percentage in Istanbul is more than 90%.

4.2.1 Descriptive Characteristics of Participants

The data were obtained from 235 mothers. The mean age of these mothers was 30.62 years (*SD* = 4.92), the youngest being 20 years old and the oldest being 47 years old. In terms of family composition, 98.7% came from intact families (both mother and father), 0.9% of mothers were divorced, and 0.4% of mothers were widowed. Sixty percent of the mothers had only one child and 36.2% had more than one child. Preschoolers were the target children of this study. The mean age of target child was 45.13 months (*SD* = 19.24), the youngest being 5 months old and the oldest 80 months old.

Among the 235 mothers, 88 were living in Istanbul and had high education (megacity-high-educated mothers), 74 were living in Istanbul and had low education (megacity-low-educated mothers), and 73 (32 had high education, 40 had low education, and a missing variable) were living in Konya, Kayseri, and Nevsehir (rural-city mothers). Descriptive statistics for demographic data for the three groups of samples are presented in Table 4.2. In Appendix F, the percentages for mothers' education levels for each group are presented.

ANOVA results showed that there were significant differences in education level ($F(2,230) = 203.98$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .64$) and age ($F(2,231) = 10.05$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$) of the three groups of mothers. Post-hoc analysis was further conducted using a Tukey HSD test. The results of these tests indicated that the two groups which significantly differed in terms of education ($p < .001$) were megacity-high educated and rural-city mothers. Megacity-high educated mothers significantly differed from megacity-low educated ($p < .001$) and rural-city mothers ($p < .001$) in terms of age. Significant education difference ($F(1,231) = 7.01$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$) and maternal age differences $F(1,232) = 14.72$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$) were found between mothers who lived in a megacity and rural-cities.

The target children in the study, who were preschoolers, consisted of 116 girls ($M = 46.39$ months, $SD = 19.14$) and 115 boys ($M = 43.51$ months, $SD = 19.32$). There were 46 girls ($M = 49.09$ months, $SD = 16.93$) and 40 boys ($M = 45.28$ months, $SD = 18.64$) in the megacity-high-educated group; there were 39 girls ($M = 39.77$ months, SD

= 15.19) and 33 boys (M = 47.16 months, SD = 16.33) in the megacity-low-educated group; and there were 31 girls (M = 50.97 months, SD = 24.48) and 42 boys (M = 38.85 months, SD = 21.59) in the rural-city sample. The three groups did not significantly differ on their age ($F(2,224) = .99$, *ns.)* and sex ratio (X^2 (2, N = 231) = .00, *ns*.).

4.3 Materials

Three questionnaires were used to measure the variables examined in this study. These questionnaires, which were completed by the mothers, are described in the following sections. Information on factor structures of the scales is presented in the Appendices. Internal consistency values for each scale are presented in Appendix E.

4.3.1 Background Information Form

The background information form (see Appendix A) provided information about the child (date of birth, sex, and child order) and maternal background characteristics (age, education, and marital status). Education of mothers was rated according to the highest level achieved (1 represented 'Dropped out of primary school' and 5 represented 'University graduate'). In the present study, maternal education, which is the most frequently used indicator of socio-economic status in the child development literature (e.g., Küntay & Ahtam, 2004), was used to examine its role on parenting.

Table 4.2

Demographic Data for Megacity-high-educated, Megacity-low-educated, and Rural-city Samples

Variable	Megacity-high-educated (n = 88)			Megacity-low-educated (n = 74)			Rural-city (n = 73)		
	M	*SD*	Range	*M*	*SD*	Range	*M*	*SD*	Range
Age of child (in months)	47.41	17.63	65	43.39	16.33	69	44.12	23.51	74
Age of mothers[b]	32.19	4.72	26	30.50	5.00	25	28.82	4.49	23
*Education of mothers (1 = low, 5 = high)[a,b,c]	4.59	0.49	1	2.32	0.57	2	3.11	1.04	4

Note. [a] indicates a significant ($p < .001$) difference between megacity-high- and megacity-low-educated groups; [b] indicates a significant ($p < .001$) difference between megacity-high-educated and rural-city groups; [c] indicates a significant ($p < .001$) difference between megacity-low-educated and rural-city groups.
*Details of rating scale are presented in Section 4.3.1.

Consistent with the literature (e.g., Yağmurlu et al., 2009) in the present study, maternal education was used to represent SES; and its role in mothers' developmental expectations, child-rearing practices, and quality of HOME environment was investigated.

4.3.2 Child-rearing Behaviors

In order to measure parenting behaviors, mothers completed a modified version of the Child Rearing Questionnaire (see Appendix B) developed by Sanson (1994) and elaborated by Paterson and Sanson (1999). The Turkish version of the Child Rearing Questionnaire was formed by Yağmurlu and Sanson (2009b). The original Child Rearing Questionnaire has 30 items where parents indicate the frequency of each behavior with their children on a 5-point scale, where 1 describes 'Never' and 5 describes 'Always'.

The original Child Rearing Questionnaire consists of four domains: six items for Inductive Reasoning (e.g., "I try to explain to my child why certain things are necessary."), nine items for Punishment (e.g., "I use physical punishment, such as smacking, for very bad behavior."), six items for Obedience-demanding Behavior (e.g., "I expect my child to do what he/she is told to do, without stopping to argue about it."), and nine items for Warmth (e.g., "My child and I have warm, intimate times together.").

The modified version of the scale included two new domains that tap permissiveness and cognitive stimulation. Permissiveness subscale included ten items (e.g., "I believe that my child should have his/her way as often as I do") which attempt to understand mothers' disposition to allow freedom of choice and behavior. These items were taken from the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) which was developed by Buri (1991) in order to measure Baumrind's permissiveness, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles.

Cognitive stimulation subscale was included in the scale. Previous studies (e.g., Bradley and Corwyn, 2005, Keller, 2003, Keller et al., 2004) were taken as a reference point in order to compose new items. There were nine items in the cognitive stimulation subscale (e.g., "I read books to my child to enhance his/her cognitive development").

The modified version consisted of 49 items. Reliability analysis showed that item 30 decreased the internal consistency of obedience-demanding behaviors subscale and item 17 decreased the internal consistency score for punishment. Thus, these two items were excluded from the scale before the subscales were formed. Internal consistency scores for subscales were found as: .75 for Inductive Reasoning, .76 for Punishment, .74 for Warmth, .73 for Obedience-demanding Behavior, .70 for Permissiveness, and .82 for Cognitive Stimulation for the total sample. Internal consistency scores of subscales for the three groups of mothers were examined separately and found to be similar to those reported for the total sample (see Appendix

E for alpha coefficients for rural-city, megacity-high-educated, and megacity-low-educated mothers separately).

4.3.3 Developmental Expectations

In the present study, a developmental expectation scale developed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008) was utilized. This new measure (see Appendix C) combined 127 items from previous studies (e.g., Goodnow et al., 1984; Willemsen and van de Vijver, 1997) and consisted of nine subscales: Physical Skills, Cognitive Skills, Self-control, Social Skills, Autonomy, Obedience, Family Orientation, Traditional/Moral Rules, and Agency. The scale asks the mothers to indicate the age that they expect a child to achieve certain skills for the first time (0.5 represents before age of 1 and 7 represents after age 6). For each subscale, average scores of mothers' reported age expectations for the particular skill were calculated. Low scores indicated earlier expectations for a particular domain, while high scores indicated later expectations for a particular domain.

There were nineteen items that measure mothers' developmental expectations about Physical Skills. Eleven items (e.g., "Stand without support more than 1 minute") were taken from the Developmental Expectation Scale developed by Willemsen and van de Vijver (1997). The other eight items (e.g., "Look at person who is talking to

him/her") were new items developed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008) to examine physical expectations of mothers more extensively.

There were eighteen items in the Cognitive Skills subscale. Seven items (e.g., "Read some letters") were taken from the Developmental Expectation Scale developed by Willemsen and van de Vijver (1997); and eleven items (e.g., "Tell what is left and right") were the new items developed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008).

There were eleven items in the Self-control subscale. Three items (e.g., "Wait for own turn in games") were adapted from Goodnow et al. (1984); "Keep playing according to game rules even if she loses" was borrowed from the scale used by Hess et al., (1980); "No longer cries when doesn't get something" was taken from the Developmental Expectation Scale developed by Willemsen and van de Vijver (1997). The other six items (e.g., "Control the display of negative emotions during interaction with friends") were the new items composed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008).

There were thirteen items in the Social Skill subscale. Four items (e.g., "Share toys with other children") were adapted from Goodnow et al. (1984); items "Co-operate in a game" and "Have a best friend to play with" were taken from the Developmental Expectations Scale developed by Willemsen and van de Vijver (1997). The other seven items (e.g., "Help other children to clean a mess") were new items developed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008).

There were eighteen items in the Autonomy subscale. Five items (e.g., "Express what she/he wants to watch on TV") were adapted from the scale used by Savage and

Gauvain (1998); four items (e.g., "Decide what to wear") were adapted from Goodnow, et al. (1984); and item "Be toilet-trained" was taken from the Developmental Expectation Scale developed by Willemsen and van de Vijver (1997). There were eight new items (e.g., "Explain clearly what she/he does not like about someone's behavior") developed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008).

There were twelve items in the Obedience subscale. "Take care of younger siblings when asked to" was adapted from the scale used by Savage and Gauvain (1998); "Do not do things forbidden by parents" was borrowed from the scale used by Hess et al. (1980); items "Give up reading/TV when mother asks for help", "Stop misbehaving when told", and "Come or answer when told" were adapted from Goodnow et al. (1984). There were seven new items (e.g., "Stop playing with friends immediately when mother calls") developed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008).

There were twelve items in the Family Orientation subscale ("Like to visit grandparents", "Want to call cousins on their birthdays"), which was developed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008) according to the 'Like to Visit Family' and 'Strong Feeling for Family' subscales of the Developmental Expectation Scale developed by Willemsen and van de Vijver (1997). There were twelve items in the Traditional/Moral Rules subscale (e.g., "Have a preference on toys according to own gender (e.g., boys-cars, girls-dolls)") and nine items in the Agency subscale (e.g., "Try to be ahead of peers"). The items in the Traditional/Moral Rules and Agency subscales were new and developed by Durgel and van de Vijver (2008).

Reliability analysis showed that the alpha coefficient of internal consistency was .89 for Physical Skills, .92 for Cognitive Skills, .90 for Self-control, .93 for Social Skills, .93 for Autonomy, .91 for Obedience, .92 for Family Orientation, .91 for Traditional/Moral Rules, and .95 for Agency.

4.3.4 HOME Inventory

In the present study, two aspects of home context which are learning materials provided to children at home and the physical arrangement of the inside and outside of the home environment were examined as indicators of quality of home environment. The 'Learning Materials' and 'Physical Environment' subcategories of HOME Inventory (Bradley & Caldwell, 1984) were used to measure these variables.

HOME Inventory was developed by (Bradley & Caldwell, 1984) to "assess the quality and quantity of stimulation and support available to a child in the home environment" (Bradley & Corwyn, 2005, p. 468). Observation and unstructured interview methods are used to measure learning materials and physical environment which approximately takes fifteen minutes to complete. In the present study, the interviewer observed home environment (such as visible books and safety of play environment). Information that is not likely to be observed during the visit (such as buying and reading daily newspapers) was obtained via interview.

There are eleven items for Learning Materials (e.g., "Child has a record, tape, or CD player and at least 5 children's records, tapes, or CDs") and seven items for Physical Environment (e.g., "Interior of home or apartment is not dark or perceptually monotonous") (All items in the two subcategories are presented in Appendix D).

If the item was observed during the interview or positively responded by mother, it was scored as 1. If the item was not observed or negatively responded by mothers, then it was scored as 0. The higher total scores indicated more learning materials provided to children at home and healthier physical environment both inside and outside of the home. Cronbach alpha coefficient was .74 for Learning Materials and .70 for Physical Environment, indicating acceptable internal consistencies.

4.4 Procedure

4.4.1 Translation of Materials

The English version of Developmental Expectations Questionnaire was translated into Turkish language by a Turkish psychologist working in the Netherlands. Original versions and back-translations were carefully compared by researchers at Tilburg University. Notable semantic distinctions were corrected.

4.4.2 Procedure

All participants (from Istanbul, Konya, Kayseri, and Nevsehir) were recruited through snow-ball sampling method. Mothers were asked whether they would like to participate in the study by completing questionnaires and have a short home interview. However, sixteen mothers from megacity sample and eleven mothers from rural-city sample did not want to host the researchers in their homes. For this group, information about quality of home environment could not be obtained and it was coded as missing. Those mothers who agreed to participate were visited in their home. In the interview, the researcher first gave the instruction about how to fill in the questionnaires. If there were other individuals at home, they were also informed about not intervening the mothers' opinions and responses.

Mothers were told to answer child-rearing and home environment questions thinking about the target child. They were also explained that the measure for developmental expectations was about their general opinions about child development, not specifically related to the target child per se. It took maximum three hours to complete all questionnaires, depending on the level of maternal education.

Chapter 5

RESULTS

5.1 Overview of Chapter

This chapter presents the data and results of the statistical analyses that were performed to examine the hypothesized relations in the study. It starts with the findings from descriptive statistics for the megacity and rural-city samples. Then, between-group differences in child-rearing practices, developmental expectations, and home variables, which are related to residential location and mothers' education levels, are investigated. Next, relations between child's age, sex and parenting and family variables are presented. Finally, zero-order correlations between child-rearing behaviors and developmental expectations are given.

5.2 Descriptive Statistics

Before analysis, all data were screened using SPSS. Child-rearing practices, developmental expectations, and home variables were examined in terms of means,

standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values. Descriptive statistics for megacity and rural-city mothers for child-rearing practices is presented in Table 5.1, those for developmental expectations are given in Table 5.5, and those for home variables are given in Table 5.9. Descriptive statistics for megacity-high-educated, megacity-low-educated, and rural-city mothers for child-rearing practices are presented in Table 5.3, those for developmental expectations are given in Table 5.7, and those for home variables are given in Table 5.10.

5.3 Social Environment, Maternal Education, and Parenting

In this section, results of analyses comparing rural-city and megacity mothers on their child-rearing practices, developmental expectations, and home variables are reported. In order to compare the two groups, MANOVA analyses were performed. Then, a series of MANCOVAs were used to assess differences between the two groups on child-rearing behaviors, developmental expectations, and home context after the variance in maternal education was accounted for. Additionally, a series of analyses were done to compare metropolitan-high educated, metropolitan-low educated and rural mothers in terms of the parenting and home variables. This latter analysis was conducted to more clearly investigate similarities and differences between the three groups of mothers.

5.3.1 Child-Rearing Practices

MANOVA results (see Table 5.1) showed that mothers who lived in a rural-city and a megacity were significantly different in overall child-rearing practices (*Wilks' Λ* = .91, $F(6, 221) = 3.72$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$). Compared to mothers who live in a rural-city, megacity mothers reported significantly lower levels of obedience-demanding behaviors ($p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$) and punishment ($p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$). The two groups of mothers were not significantly different in levels of warmth, permissiveness, inductive reasoning, and cognitive stimulation practices.

Table 5.1

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, and Maximum Values for Child-rearing Practices for Megacity and Rural-city Samples

	Megacity-mothers (n = 162)				Rural-city mothers (n = 73)			
Variables	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max
Child-rearing Practices								
Obedience demanding*	3.05	0.83	1.00	4.60	3.38	0.81	1.40	5.00
Punishment*	1.86	0.51	1.11	3.44	2.14	0.62	1.22	4.11
Warmth	4.55	0.42	3.13	5.00	4.59	0.43	2.89	5.00
Inductive reasoning	4.38	0.52	2.67	5.00	4.41	0.55	3.00	5.00
Permissiveness	3.43	0.64	1.40	5.00	3.37	0.80	1.67	5.00
Cognitive stimulation	4.00	0.67	1.44	5.00	4.11	0.61	2.14	5.00

Note. * indicates significant difference between megacity and rural-city mother after maternal education is controlled.

Mothers in the megacity sample had significantly higher levels of education compared to mothers in the rural sample (see Section 4.2.1). Therefore, education level was taken as a covariate in the next step of the analyses. MANCOVA results showed that, having adjusted for differences in level of maternal education, differences between the two groups remained significant (*Wilks' Λ* = .92, F (6, 218) = 3.04, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$) for child-rearing practices. When MANCOVA results for each child-rearing variable was examined, it was found that significant group differences in obedience-demanding (F (1, 223) = 5.20, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$) and punitive (F (1, 223) = 8.55, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$) behaviors remained; but group differences for warmth, inductive reasoning, permissiveness, and cognitive stimulation were again nonsignificant (see Table 5.2).

Table 5.2

MANOVA and MANCOVA (Controlling for Maternal Education) Results for Child-rearing Behaviors for Rural-city (n = 70) and Megacity (n = 158) Samples

	MANOVA				MANCOVA			
Variables	*Df*	*F*	*p*	η^2	*df*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Child-rearing Behaviors	6	3.72	< .001	.90	6	3.04	< .05	.08
Obedience demanding	1	9.05	< .001	.04	1	5.20	< .05	.20
Punishment	1	11.50	< .05	.05	1	8.55	< .05	.04
Inductive reasoning	1	0.17	*ns*	.00	1	0.78	*ns*	.00
Warmth	1	0.02	*ns*	.00	1	0.29	*ns*	.00
Permissiveness	1	0.11	*ns*	.00	1	0.08	*ns*	.00
Cognitive stimulation	1	1.48	*ns*	.01	1	3.06	*ns*	.01

Additionally, the three groups of mothers (rural-city mothers, megacity-low- and megacity-high-educated mothers) were compared in terms of their child-rearing practices. MANOVA results (see Table 5.3) showed that the three groups of mothers were significantly different in terms of general child-rearing practices (*Wilks' Λ* = .78, $F(12, 440) = 4.95$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$). Compared to rural-city mothers ($p < .001$) and megacity-low-educated mothers ($p < .001$), megacity-high-educated mothers reported significantly lower levels of obedience-demanding behaviors; but megacity-low-educated mothers and rural-city mothers did not significantly differ. Rural-city mothers reported using significantly higher levels of punishment than megacity-high-educated mothers ($p < .05$). Megacity-high-educated mothers reported significantly higher level of permissiveness than megacity-low-educated group ($p < .05$), and rural-city mothers reported a level in between the latter 2 groups but did not significantly differ from the two groups. The three groups of mothers were significantly different in terms of reported cognitive stimulation they provided to their children. Megacity-high-educated mothers reported higher score for cognitive stimulation ($p < .05$) than megacity-low-educated mothers. The three groups of mothers were not significantly different in terms of reporting warmth and inductive reasoning behaviors (see Table 5.4).

Table 5.3

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, and Maximum Values for Child-rearing Practices for Rural-city, Megacity-low-educated, and Megacity-high-educated Sample

	Megacity-High-educated Mothers (n = 88)				Megacity-Low-educated Mothers (n = 74)				Rural-city Mothers (n = 73)			
Variables	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max
Child-rearing Practices												
Obedience demanding [a,b]	2.74	0.82	1.00	4.20	3.44	0.68	1.60	4.60	3.38	0.81	1.40	5.00
Punishment [b]	1.79	0.45	1.11	3.33	1.95	0.55	1.11	3.44	2.14	0.62	1.22	4.11
Warmth	4.46	0.35	3.13	5.00	4.46	0.47	3.22	5.00	4.59	0.43	2.89	5.00
Inductive reasoning	4.63	0.47	2.83	5.00	4.30	0.58	2.67	5.00	4.41	0.55	3.00	5.00
Permissiveness [a]	3.56	0.57	2.00	5.00	3.27	0.69	1.40	4.60	3.37	0.80	1.67	5.00
Cognitive stimulation	4.10	0.57	1.67	5.00	3.68	0.76	1.44	5.00	4.11	0.61	2.14	5.00

Note. [a] indicates a significant difference between megacity-high- and megacity-low-educated groups; [b] indicates a significant difference between megacity-high-educated and rural-city groups; [c] indicates a significant difference between megacity-low-educated and rural-city groups.

Table 5.4

MANOVA Results for Child-rearing Practices for Rural-city (n = 70), Megacity-low-educated (n = 70), and Megacity-high-educated (n = 88) Samples

	MANOVA			
Variables	*Df*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Child-Rearing Behaviors	12	4.95	< .001	.12
Obedience demanding	2	20.54	< .001	.15
Punishment	2	7.30	< .05	.06
Inductive reasoning	2	2.53	*ns*	.02
Warmth	2	1.17	*ns*	.01
Permissiveness	2	3.79	< .05	.03
Cognitive stimulation	2	3.46	< .05	.03

5.3.2 Developmental Expectations

MANOVA results (see Table 5.6) showed that rural-city and megacity mothers were significantly different in their developmental expectations (*Wilks' Λ* = .85, $F(9, 218) = 4.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .15$). An examination of descriptive statistics revealed that megacity mothers reported earlier ages for expectations about development of physical skills, cognitive skills, social skills, obedience, and agency; while rural-city mothers reported earlier ages for expectations about self-control, autonomy, family-orientation, and tradition/moral rules. However, the two groups of mothers were

significantly different only for expectations about cognitive development ($F(1, 226) = 5.47$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$).

Table 5.5

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, and Maximum Values for Developmental Expectations for Megacity and Rural-city Samples

	Megacity-mothers (n = 162)				Rural-city mothers (n = 73)			
Variables	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max
Developmental Expectations								
Physical	2.41	0.56	1.03	4.53	2.56	0.61	1.45	4.16
Cognitive	3.94	0.77	1.63	5.82	4.22	0.89	2.46	6.80
Self-control	5.42	1.04	1.60	7.00	5.38	1.09	2.75	6.91
Social skills	4.45	1.06	1.88	7.00	4.61	1.00	2.13	6.54
Autonomy	4.92	0.95	1.90	6.94	4.87	0.94	2.50	7.00
Obedience	5.18	1.06	1.10	7.00	5.33	1.04	3.10	7.00
Family orientation	5.22	1.10	1.50	7.00	5.13	1.02	2.90	7.00
Tradition/moral rules*	4.60	1.03	2.00	6.83	4.36	1.08	2.25	7.00
Agency	5.14	1.22	2.00	7.00	5.26	1.15	2.25	7.00

Note. * indicates significant difference between megacity and rural-city mother after maternal education is controlled.

When the level of maternal education was controlled, there was still significant overall difference between rural-city and megacity mothers (*Wilks' Λ* = .87, $F(9, 215) = 3.71$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .14$), but the two groups were no longer significantly

different in developmental expectation for cognitive development. Instead, MANCOVA results indicated that when the level of maternal education was controlled, rural-city and megacity samples differed significantly; the rural-city mothers reporting earlier expectations for learning traditional/moral rules ($F(1, 223) = 7.01$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .10$).

Table 5.6

MANOVA and MANCOVA (Controlling for Maternal Education) Results for Developmental Expectations for Rural-city (n = 71) and Megacity (n = 157) Samples

	MANOVA				MANCOVA			
Variables	*df*	*F*	*p*	η^2	*df*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Developmental Expectations	9	4.42	< .001	.15	9	3.71	< .001	.14
Physical	1	2.91	*ns*	.01	1	0.72	*ns*	.00
Cognitive	1	5.47	< .05	.02	1	1.44	*ns*	.01
Self-control	1	0.07	*ns*	.00	1	1.41	*ns*	.01
Social skills	1	0.70	*ns*	.00	1	0.00	*ns*	.00
Autonomy	1	0.06	*ns*	.00	1	1.17	*ns*	.01
Obedience	1	0.94	*ns*	.00	1	0.08	*ns*	.00
Family orientation	1	0.73	*ns*	.00	1	2.17	*ns*	.01
Tradition/moral rules	1	3.47	*ns*	.02	1	7.01	< .05	.03
Agency	1	0.35	*ns*	.00	1	0.14	*ns*	.00

Table 5.7

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, and Maximum Values for Developmental Expectations for Rural-city, Megacity-low-educated, and Megacity-high-educated Sample

	Megacity-High-educated Mothers (n = 88)				Megacity-Low-educated Mothers (n = 74)				Rural-city Mothers (n = 73)			
Variables	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max
Developmental Expectations												
Self-control [a]	5.15	1.07	1.60	7.00	5.74	0.90	3.18	7.00	5.38	1.09	2.75	6.91
Family orientation [a,c]	4.97	1.05	1.50	6.92	5.52	1.09	2.50	7.00	5.13	1.02	2.90	7.00
Obedience [a]	4.96	1.04	1.10	7.00	5.45	1.02	2.50	7.00	5.33	1.04	3.10	7.00
Agency [a,b]	4.79	1.12	2.00	7.00	5.57	1.20	2.09	7.00	5.26	1.15	2.25	7.00
Autonomy [a]	4.65	0.87	1.90	6.83	5.24	0.94	2.88	6.94	4.87	0.94	2.50	7.00
Tradition/moral rules [a,c]	4.34	0.99	2.00	6.83	4.91	0.99	2.50	6.75	4.36	1.08	2.25	7.00
Social skills [a,b]	4.19	0.96	1.88	6.92	4.77	1.10	2.46	7.00	4.61	1.00	2.13	6.54
Cognitive [a,b]	3.68	0.72	1.63	5.39	4.26	0.72	2.86	5.82	4.22	0.89	2.46	6.80
Physical [a,b]	2.30	0.46	1.03	3.26	2.55	0.64	1.08	4.53	2.56	0.61	1.45	4.16

Note. [a] indicates a significant difference between megacity-high- and megacity-low-educated groups; [b] indicates a significant difference between megacity-high-educated and rural-city groups; [c] indicates a significant difference between megacity-low-educated and rural-city groups.

MANOVA results (see Table 5.8) showed that the three groups were significantly different (*Wilks' Λ* = .74, $F(18, 434) = 3.84$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .14$).

Table 5.8

MANOVA Results for Developmental Expectations for Rural-city (n = 71), Megacity-low-educated (n = 71), and Megacity-high-educated (n = 86) Samples

	MANOVA			
Variables	*df*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Developmental Expectations	18	3.84	< .001	.14
Physical	2	5.27	< .01	.05
Cognitive	2	14.02	< .001	.11
Self-control	2	6.73	< .01	.06
Social skills	2	6.96	< .01	.06
Autonomy	2	8.33	< .001	.07
Obedience	2	4.93	< .01	.04
Family orientation	2	5.94	< .01	.05
Tradition/moral rules	2	7.64	< .01	.06
Agency	2	9.72	< .001	.08

Megacity-high-educated mothers reported significantly earlier ages for the development of physical skills ($p < .05$), cognitive skills ($p < .001$), and social skills ($p < .05$) compared to both megacity-low-educated and rural-city mothers. Megacity-high-educated mothers reported also significantly earlier ages for the development of agency compared to megacity-low-educated ($p < .001$) and rural-city mothers ($p < .05$). There were not significant differences between megacity-low-educated and rural-city mothers

in these subcategories of developmental expectations. Megacity-high-educated mothers reported earlier ages for the development of self-control ($p < .05$), autonomy ($p < .001$) and obedience ($p < .05$) skills compared to megacity-low-educated mothers. Megacity-low-educated mothers reported later expectations for the development of family orientations ($p < .05$) and traditional/moral rules ($p < .05$) compared to megacity-high-educated and rural-city mothers. Megacity-high-educated mothers reported earliest developmental expectations for family orientation while rural-city mothers reported earliest expectations for the development of traditional/moral rules.

5.3.3 Home Environment and Parenting

ANOVA results showed that megacity mothers provided significantly more learning materials compared to rural-city mothers ($F(1, 206) = 5.62$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$) while rural-city mothers provided better physical environment ($F(1, 205) = 14.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$). When the difference in the level of maternal education was controlled, the significant difference between rural-city and megacity mothers about learning materials disappeared ($F(1, 204) = 1.13$, *ns*, $\eta^2 = .01$). Rural-city mothers still reported healthier physical environment than megacity mothers when maternal education was controlled ($F(1, 203) = 26.43$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$).

Table 5.9

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, and Maximum Values for Home Variables for Megacity and Rural-city Samples

	Megacity-mothers (n = 146)				Rural-city mothers (n = 62)			
Variables	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max
HOME Inventory								
Learning materials	7.21	2.33	2.00	11.00	6.34	2.60	0.00	11.00
Physical environment*	5.58	1.46	1.00	7.00	6.41	1.34	2.00	7.00

Note. * indicates significant difference between megacity and rural-city mother after maternal education is controlled.

The differences related to the quality of home environment were also examined for rural-city, megacity-low-educated and megacity-high-educated samples. It was found that the three groups of mothers differed significantly in terms of providing learning materials at home ($F(2, 205) = 28.90$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .22$). Post-hoc analyses showed that megacity-high-educated mothers provided more learning materials at home compared to megacity-low-educated ($p < .001$) and rural-city ($p < .001$) mothers. It was also found that there were significant differences in physical environment variables between the three groups of mothers ($F(2, 204) = 20.26$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .17$). Megacity-low-educated mothers got lower score on physical environment compared to megacity-low-educated mothers ($p < .001$) and rural-city mothers ($p < .001$).

Table 5.10

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, and Maximum Values for Home Variables for Rural-city, Megacity-low-educated, and Megacity-high-educated Samples

	Megacity-High-educated Mothers (n = 78)				Megacity-Low-educated Mothers (n = 68)				Rural-city Mothers (n = 62)			
Variables	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max
HOME Inventory												
Learning materials[a,b]	8.40	1.99	3.00	11.00	5.84	1.91	2.00	10.00	6.34	2.60	0.00	11.00
Physical environment[a,c]	6.11	1.12	1.00	7.00	5.00	1.58	1.00	7.00	6.41	1.34	2.00	7.00

Note. [a] indicates a significant difference between megacity-high- and megacity-low-educated groups; [b] indicates a significant difference between megacity-high-educated and rural-city groups; [c] indicates a significant difference between megacity-low-educated and rural-city groups.

5.4 Child's Sex, Age, Maternal Education, Parenting, and Home Quality

Child-rearing practices and quality of home environment were investigated according to child's sex for the total sample and for the three samples (metropolitan-high-educated, metropolitan-low-educated, and rural-city mothers) separately. Physical environment was not related to child's sex. But because girls and boys might be provided with a different amounts of learning materials in different residential locations, this comparison was meaningful.

MANOVA results showed that there were no significant differences between boys and girls in terms of parenting practices of mothers and the provided learning materials at home for total sample (see Table 5.11 and Table 5.12).

When the same analysis was repeated for rural-city, megacity-low-educated and megacity-high-educated mothers separately, it was again found that reported child-rearing behaviors of mothers and provided learning materials at home did not significantly differ for boys and girls. The association between child's age and child-rearing practices was also examined via Pearson correlations (see Appendix G for the correlations between age and child-rearing practices for total, megacity-high-educated, megacity-low-educated, and rural-city samples). In the megacity-high-educated sample, maternal punishment increased with child's age ($r(86) = .26$, $p < .05$) while displaying warmth decreased ($r(88) = -.23$, $p < .05$). It was also found that there was a negative correlation between displaying warmth and child's age for mothers who lived in a rural-city ($r(67) = -.36$, $p < .001$).

Table 5.11

Sex Related Differences in Child-rearing Practices for Rural-city, Megacity-low-educated, and Megacity-high-educated Samples

	Megacity-high-educated (n = 86)				Megacity-low-educated (n = 68)				Rural-City (n = 70)			
	Boys (n = 40)		Girls (n = 46)		Boys (n = 31)		Girls (n = 37)		Boys (n = 40)		Girls (n = 30)	
Variables	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Child-rearing Behaviors												
Obedience demanding	2.83	0.81	2.63	0.82	3.45	0.73	3.40	0.67	3.46	0.83	3.33	0.81
Punishment	1.83	0.47	1.75	0.45	1.92	0.55	1.96	0.57	2.11	0.60	2.12	0.58
Inductive reasoning	4.44	0.50	4.47	0.45	4.33	0.57	4.30	0.51	4.43	0.55	4.39	0.56
Warmth	4.60	0.42	4.64	0.30	4.49	0.50	4.45	0.45	4.64	0.38	4.52	0.50
Permissiveness	3.48	0.70	3.62	0.43	3.25	0.66	3.22	0.68	3.40	0.74	3.40	0.83
Cognitive stimulation	4.02	0.65	4.18	0.49	3.90	0.70	3.80	0.82	4.15	0.57	4.10	0.68

Table 5.12

Sex Related Differences in Home Variables for Rural-city, Low-educated Megacity, and High-educated Megacity Samples

	Megacity-high-educated (n = 64)				Megacity-low-educated (n = 60)				Rural-City (n = 61)			
	Boys (n = 30)		Girls (n = 34)		Boys (n = 28)		Girls (n = 32)		Boys (n = 35)		Girls (n = 26)	
Variables	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
HOME Inventory												
Learning materials	8.37	1.94	8.35	2.20	6.14	1.86	5.63	1.96	6.06	2.86	6.65	2.24
Physical environment	6.00	0.98	6.21	1.30	5.00	1.83	4.81	1.40	6.43	1.40	6.39	1.33

Child's age did not significantly correlate with any of the child-rearing practices for megacity-low-educated sample.

Scale items measuring developmental expectations were about mothers' general ideas about child development; they were not about expected ages for development of certain qualities in boys and girls separately. Therefore, the scale was not completed by mothers with the target child in mind. Hence, the association between child sex, child's age, and mothers' developmental expectations were not examined.

Additionally, the relation between year of maternal education and mothers' child-rearing behaviors was examined via Pearson correlations. Among total sample, obedience demanding behaviors ($r(192) = -.43$, $p < .001$) and punishment ($r(192) = -.21$, $p < .001$) decreased with year of maternal education while warmth ($r(192) = .16$, $p < .05$), permissiveness ($r(191) = .22$, $p < .001$), and cognitive stimulation ($r(190) = .16$, $p < .05$) increased with year of maternal education. The association between year of maternal education and child-rearing practices were examined among rural-city, megacity-low-educated and megacity-high-educated groups separately, however there was not any significant relation (see Appendix G).

5.5 Predicted Relations between Parenting Variables

Associations between developmental expectations and child-rearing practices were examined through Pearson correlations (Appendix G presents all correlations

while Table 5.13 for megacity-high-educated, Table 5.14 for megacity-low-educated, and Table 5.15 for rural-city samples represent only significant correlations). For megacity-high-educated sample, maternal cognitive stimulation was significantly associated with earlier developmental expectations for cognitive skills ($r(88) = -.33$, $p < .001$) , social skills ($r(88) = -.24$, $p < .001$), autonomy ($r(88) = -.30$, $p < .001$), and obedience ($r(87) = -.25$, $p < .05$). There were no other significant relations between child-rearing practices and developmental expectations for megacity-high-educated sample (see Table 5.13).

Table 5.13

Significant Pearson Correlations between Developmental Expectations and Child-rearing Practices for Megacity-High-Educated Mothers (n = 88)

Variables	Obedience-demanding	Punishment	Warmth	Inductive reasoning	Permissiveness	Cognitive stimulation
Physical						
Cognitive						-.33**
Self-control						
Social skills						-.29**
Autonomy						-.30**
Obedience						-.25*
Family orientation						
Moral/traditional rules						
Agency						

Note. Non-significant results in the correlation matrix are not reported.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .001$.

For megacity-low-educated sample, maternal cognitive stimulation was significantly associated with earlier developmental expectations for cognitive skills

($r(70) = -.37$, $p < .001$), self-control ($r(68) = -.24$, $p < .05$), autonomy ($r(69) = -.25$, $p < .05$), obedience ($r(69) = -.26$, $p < .05$), moral/traditional rules ($r(69) = -.26$, $p < .05$), and agency ($r(69) = -.27$, $p < .05$). It was also found that expectations for cognitive skills were significantly and negatively associated with permissiveness ($r(71) = -.24$, $p < .05$) while expectations about agency were significantly and negatively associated with using punishment ($r(70) = -.26$, $p < .05$). In other words, if a low-educated megacity mother had earlier expectations for development of cognitive skills, she also tended to use permissiveness more. In addition, if a low-educated megacity mother had earlier expectations for the development of agency, also she tended to use higher levels of punitive behaviors (see Table 5.14).

Table 5.14

Significant Pearson Correlations between Developmental Expectations and Child-rearing Practices for Megacity-Low-Educated Mothers (n = 74)

Variables	Obedience-demanding	Punishment	Warmth	Inductive reasoning	Permissiveness	Cognitive stimulation
Physical						
Cognitive					-.24*	-.37**
Self-control						-.24*
Social skills						
Autonomy						-.25*
Obedience						-.26*
Family orientation						
Moral/traditional rules						-.26*
Agency		-.26*				-.27

Note. Non-significant results in the correlation matrix are not reported.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .001$.

The association between child-rearing practices and developmental expectations for the rural-city sample was also examined (see Table 5.15). It was found that maternal cognitive stimulation was significantly associated with earlier developmental expectations for social skills ($r(70) = -.31$, $p < .001$), obedience ($r(71) = -.30$, $p < .05$), family orientation ($r(71) = -.26$, $p < .05$), moral/traditional rules ($r(71) = -.29$, $p < .05$), and agency ($r(71) = -.26$, $p < .05$). Besides, it was found that if a mother who lived in a rural-city had earlier expectations for development of social skills, she tended to display higher levels of warmth ($r(71) = -.26$, $p < .05$). Pearson correlations also indicated that rural-city mothers who had earlier xpectations for autonomy tended to report higher levels of punishment ($r(71) = -.26$, $p < .05$).

Table 5.15

Significant Pearson Correlations between Developmental Expectations and Child-rearing Practices for Rural-City Mothers (n = 73)

Variables	Obedience-demanding	Punishment	Warmth	Inductive reasoning	Permissiveness	Cognitive stimulation
Physical						
Cognitive						
Self-control						
Social skills			-.31**			-.31**
Autonomy		-.26*				
Obedience						-.30*
Family orientation						-.26*
Moral/traditional rules						-.29*
Agency						-.26*

Note. Non-significant results in the correlation matrix are not reported.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .001$.

Chapter 6

DISCUSSION

6.1 Introduction

Parents are the primary agents in socialization of children in a society. Literature has shown that there is an association between parental cognitions and parenting practices and styles (Luster, et al., 1989; Schwarz et al., 2005); which, in turn, affect child development (Abell et al., 1996; Kumru, 2003; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2004). It has been widely reported that social context is influential on parenting variables. Hence, examining socio-demographic variables might be helpful to understand predictors of parental cognitions and behaviors. In this respect, the present study aimed to examine the role of social environment (i.e., living in a rural-city and a megacity) and maternal education in reported developmental expectations and child-rearing practices, and both observed and reported learning materials and physical arrangement of home environment, as indicators of parenting in Turkish mothers of preschoolers.

Mother-rated questionnaires and home observation inventory were used to assess parenting variables. Hypotheses of the study were formed on the basis of the extant literature, and the proposed relations were analyzed using multivariate statistics. Bivariate correlations were used to investigate the relations between parenting variables.

In the present chapter, the results obtained from the various analyses are evaluated with respect to the hypotheses of the study and findings in the literature. The chapter starts with discussion of findings on the association between social environment and parenting variables; whereas in subsequent sections, the role of maternal education is investigated with respect to parenting variables. The relations among parenting variables were also discussed in order to understand how different aspects of parenting are associated. Finally, limitations of the present study and implications of its findings are considered, and suggestions for future research are presented.

6.2 Social Environment and Parenting Variables

The social context in which child is being socialized is considered an important indicator of parenting and child development (Super & Harkness, 1986). Even though, the association between culture and parenting is emphasized widely (e.g., Bornstein et al, 1998; Harwood et al., 1999; Hess et al., 1980), it is acknowledged that the association between socio-demographic factors and parenting is also important (Garcia Coll & Pachter, 2002; Hernandez, 1997; Yeung et al., 2002). Social environment is one

of the key socio-demographic variables and associated with variations in parenting and children's developmental outcomes (Abels et al., 2005; Williams, Soetjiningsih et al., 2000).

Parental cognition and behaviors in rural and urban settings has been examined in previous studies (Coleman et al., 1989; Williams, Williams et al., 2000). However, cities themselves may vary in size and characteristics of social environment and how this difference might be linked to parenting is not clear. So, for example, it is not clear whether parents who live in a megacity and a rural-city display similar parenting beliefs and behaviors or not. In the present study, I did not examine *"rural"* in the sense of a residential location (e.g., village) with a population less than 2000, but examined rural by focusing on small-size cities located in less "modernized" parts of the country. Therefore, in this study rural-cities represent more traditional and collectivistic ways of life which is common in the central Anatolia and they are socio-economically less developed than megacities. As mentioned earlier, one of the primary goals of the study was to explore the differences and similarities between mothers who live in a megacity and rural-cities in terms of their parenting (i.e., developmental expectations, child-rearing practices, and quality of home environment).

Previous studies on the traditional Turkish family indicated that obedience, interdependence, and loyalty are common socialization values; external control and physical punishment are common child-rearing behaviors (Aygün & İmamoğlu, 2002; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1989, 2007). On the other hand, economic development has led to changes

in traditional family patterns. With rapid social change, there is now a population in large urban areas of Turkey with higher education, different lifestyles and values (Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992). There are also some variations in parental beliefs and behaviors of Turkish parents living in more developed regions of the country as VOC studies showed (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; Kağıtçıbaşı &Ataca, 2005). Depending on the findings of the previous studies, in the present study, rural-city mothers were expected to report obedience-demanding and punitive behaviors more highly than megacity mothers, while megacity mothers were expected to report inductive reasoning and cognitive stimulation more highly than rural-city mothers. In support of the predictions, after controlling for differences in mothers' education, rural-city mothers reported more obedience-demanding and punitive behaviors compared to megacity mothers; whereas, the two groups of mothers were not significantly different in terms of reported warmth, permissiveness, inductive reasoning, and cognitive stimulation.

Depending on the literature on developmental expectations (e.g., Williams, Williams et al., 2000), it was expected to find differences and similarities in terms of megacity and rural-city mothers' developmental expectations. Consistent with the expectations it was found that, after controlling for differences in mothers' education, rural-city mothers reported significantly earlier ages for developmental expectations about tradition/moral rules. This result is consistent with previous findings (e.g. Sunar, 2002) which showed the importance of traditional values in the rural parts of Turkey. However there were no other significant differences. For example, megacity and rural-

city mothers reported similar ages for developmental expectations related to autonomy values. This might be due to the mothers' knowledge about the importance of being an independent person and developing abilities as an individual to be socially competent in an urban setting. Additionally, as expected there were no significant differences in family orientation expectations of rural-city and megacity Turkish mothers, because this is highly valued in Turkish culture, even among high/middle class urban families (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

Previous studies also showed that the kinds and amounts of stimulation parents provide to their children change with socio-demographic characteristics of parents (Andrade et al., 2005; Gershoff et al., 2007; Yeung et al., 2002). Accordingly, in the present study it was expected to find an association between residential location of parents and their family environment. Specifically, megacity mothers were expected to provide more learning materials and rural-city mothers were expected to provide a healthier physical environment to their children. After controlling for differences in education, in support of expectations, it was found that rural-city mothers reported healthier physical environment; however, there was not a significant difference in terms of providing learning materials between rural-city and megacity mothers. It might be said that rural-city environments are relatively safe compared to megacities because of close-knit relationships in the community. Items related to safe outside play environment and/or esthetic neighborhoods might be the important indicators of healthier physical environment in rural-cities. Additionally, providing learning materials

is similar for both megacity and rural-city mothers which might be related to the importance of school success and academic achievement in all urban settings. These findings provided information about family context in urban- and rural-cities.

6.3 Maternal Education and Parenting Variables

Another aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between educational level of mothers and their developmental expectations, child-rearing practices, and quality of home environment. There are many studies that work with mothers living in big cities, and summarize findings as Turkish mothers. However, the differences in the education levels should also be examined (Baydar, et al., 2008; Göksun, et al., 2008; Kumru, et al., 2004; Kumru, et al., 2008; Sayıl, 2001; Yağmurlu, et al., 2009). Studies confirm that maternal education is the best predictor of mother and child behavior compared to other components of socio-economic status (Bornstein et al., 2003; Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997; Laosa, 1980).

In the present study, low- and high-educated mothers living in Istanbul were compared in terms of parenting variables. Istanbul was particularly chosen because it is suggested that there are different social groups in Istanbul (Mortan, 2000) which induces significant variations in parents' child-rearing beliefs, practices, and home environment. In this realm, the present study provided information regarding the relations between maternal education level and developmental expectations, child-rearing practices, and home context of Turkish mothers.

Results of the present study revealed significant differences between low-educated and high-educated mothers on their child-rearing behaviors. As expected, low-educated mothers reported using significantly more obedience-demanding behaviors which is congruent with previous reports (Solis-Camara & Fox, 1996). On the other hand, high-educated mothers reported displaying significantly more cognitive stimulation and permissiveness. It is argued that high-educated mothers engage in behaviors that support cognitive development of children such as reading books, buying educational toys, and asking questions as they know the importance of providing cognitive stimulation to the child from very early ages (Davis-Kean, 2005). Although providing high levels of cognitive stimulation and displaying high levels of permissiveness may appear as conflicting practices, previous findings suggest that mothers with high levels of education emphasize academic achievement as well as self-enhancement in their children. They display a permissive attitude that leaves the child room for exploration, making their choices, and self-direction. Specifically, Yağmurlu (2009) found that high-educated Turkish mothers wanted their children to run for their ideals and do what they believed to be true in addition to being self-confident, hard-working, and autonomous. It might, therefore, be argued that findings of the present study are consistent with previous studies which show differences between low- and high-educated mothers in terms of parenting.

Besides differences, there were also similarities between child-rearing practices of high- and low-educated mothers. Warmth and inductive reasoning were common

child-rearing practices reported by both high- and low-educated mothers. Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) claims that emotional interdependence is highly valued in Turkish culture; thus, the findings that shows no significant differences in levels of warmth as reported by low- and high-educated mothers is not surprising. However, the findings which reveal similar levels of inductive reasoning in low- and high-educated mothers was contrary to predictions in this study and needs to be replicated (Andrade et al., 2005).

With regard to developmental expectations, it was expected that high-educated mothers would report earlier ages for autonomy and agency, while low-educated mothers would report earlier ages for obedience and tradition/moral rules; high- and low-educated mothers would be similar in expectations about family orientation. In support of expectations, it was found that high-educated mothers reported earlier developmental expectations for domains of autonomy and agency in addition to physical, cognitive, and social development. Contrary to expectations high-educated mothers also reported earlier developmental expectations for domain of obedience and family orientation. Developmental timetables might be interpreted as an earlier age expectation for a particular domain and shows the importance of that particular domain among a social group (Roer-Strier & Rivlis, 1998). It might be argued that high educated mothers mentioned early developmental expectations about autonomy and agency because they are aware of the demands of today's world (such as school and work life) on the individual and see self-reliance and independence as required characteristics to succeed in life. On the other hand, they also value family relations

and obedience to parents because they also endorse close ties between family members and want their children to be close to them. In this regard, it might be said that high-educated Turkish mothers value independence but not total separation from the family. It was not the aim of the present study to test the Family Change Models proposed by Kağıtçıbaşı (2007); however, it was found that developmental expectations of the high-educated megacity sample provided support for the emotional-relatedness model. Developmental expectations for the domains of self-control, agency, and social development represent different aspects of psycho-social competence: being able to regulate oneself, having good social skills, and being self-confident. It might be argued that high-educated mothers believe that psycho-social competence is important for children's emotional and social well-being, thus reported earlier expectations (Williams, Williams et al, 2000).

In addition, results showed that there was a significant association between maternal education with learning stimulation at home and physical qualities of home context. In support of expectations, high-educated mothers had homes with healthier physical environment and provided their children more learning materials. Previous studies (Andrade et al., 2005) showed that low-educated mothers provide low environmental stimulation, do not engage in verbal reasoning often. It is suggested that (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1989) parents with low-education believe that children are not educable until children go to school, so they do not engage in practices that facilitate child development. Although low-educated mothers in the present study were residing in

Istanbul, most of them were born in rural parts of Turkey and later moved to less developed suburbs of Istanbul. It is quite common among low-educated mothers to work in less prestigious jobs with inadequate earnings. It can be, therefore, argued that most of the low-educated mothers did not have economic resources to live in a home with healthier physical environments (such as safer outside play environment and/or 9 squaremeters of living space per person at home) and to buy materials that support learning of children (such as puzzles, books, and toys).

6.4 Associations between Parenting Variables

Responses of high-educated megacity, low-educated megacity, and rural-city mothers were analyzed separately to examine association between parenting beliefs and practices. Results were partially support of the predictions made. However, all correlations were weak and results need to be replicated.

It was found that rural-city mothers who reported more punitive behaviors also reported early developmental expectations about autonomy which is not consistent with findings of previous studies. For example, previous findings had shown that parents who value independence in their children use less power assertion and display more responsivity (Yağmurlu & Sanson, 2009a). Findings were consistent with literature in other respects. For example, reported cognitive stimulation was significantly associated with mothers' early developmental expectations about cognitive skills, social skills, and

autonomy in the megacity-high-educated sample. Reported permissiveness was significantly associated with early developmental expectations of cognitive skills among low-educated megacity sample. Permissiveness items were about nonrestrictive parenting such as "I believe that my child should have his/her way as often as I do" and "My child does not have to obey rules simply because I say so". Thus, it is meaningful to find earlier developmental expectations for cognitive skills among mothers who reported more permissive practices. It was also interesting to find an association between reported warmth behaviors and early social skill expectation only among rural-city sample. As results showed, the links between beliefs and practices differ according to socio-demographic characteristics of mothers which needs more detailed examination for a better understanding of the role of social context in parenting in Turkey.

6.5 Strengths and Limitations

The present study contributes to the literature on parenting of Turkish mothers by examining different aspects of parenting and family context in samples who are assumed to differ in terms of determining socio-demographic characteristics such as education and residential area. This study is also one of the first studies to compare mothers who live in a megacity and rural-cities in terms of parenting and home context in Turkey.

The present study is also not free from limitations. A limitation is the methodology which depended solely on maternal ratings but did not involve fathers. Even though mothers spend more time with the child, fathers also have a significant role in child-rearing (Lamb, 1997). Parental cognitions and behaviors of fathers may also vary significantly in rural versus urban areas in a country. Therefore, examining parenting variables of both mothers and fathers can be suggested for future studies for a more complete understanding of parenting in Turkey (Black, Dubowitz, & Starr, 1999; Fox & Solis-Camara, 1997; Volkan & Çevik, 1989).

Another methodological issue that needs to be pointed out is the unequal sample size between megacity and rural-city samples. A larger sample size in rural-city sample might have provided a more elaborate picture of parenting among Turkish mothers.

6.6 Conclusion

Most research studies that examine parenting in relation to child development recruit their samples from cities. This is true for studies both conducted in Turkey (Baydar et al., 2008; Sayıl, 2001; Yağmurlu et al., 2009) and those carried out elsewhere in Western countries (Harris, Terrel, & Allen, 1999; Rao et al, 2003; Tudge et al., 2000). However, cities vary in size and demographic characteristics which might be related to traditionalism. Besides, big cities are usually quite heterogeneous in terms of characteristics of its populations (Mortan, 2000). Therefore it is also necessary to

understand within-city differences that may stem from basic demographic variables. The present study was an attempt to investigate similarities and differences between metropolitan and rural-cities in Turkey and to understand similarities and differences between high- and low-educated mothers in metropolitan cities in Turkey in terms of characteristics of family context such as parental cognitions, parenting behaviors, and physical conditions of home.

The present study points out the influence of social environment and education in Turkish mothers' developmental expectations, child-rearing practices, and family environment. It revealed that social context has a significant impact on power assertive child-rearing practices of mothers. Rural-city mothers reported more obedience-demanding and punitive behaviors compared to megacity mothers. In addition, the findings of the present study appear to indicate that high-educated mothers value autonomy while retaining their developmental expectations about relatedness. Overall results of the present study revealed that residential setting and parental education are good predictors of parenting for Turkish parents.

Investigating characteristics of family context and patterns of parenting in urban- and rural-cities of Turkey and among parents with different education levels is important to understand commonalities as well as differences that can be observed in contexts of child-rearing in various parts of Turkey. It is also informative about generalizability of findings obtained from affluent parts of the country.

REFERENCES

Abels, M., Keller, H., Mohite, P., Mankodi, H., Shastri, J., Bharğava, S. et al. (2005). Early socialization contexts and social experiences of infants in rural and urban Gujarat, India. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36,* 717-738.

Abidin, R. R. (1992). The determinants of parenting behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 21,* 407-412.

Abell, E., Clawson, M., Washington, W.N., Bost, K.K., & Vaughn, B. (1996). Parenting values, attitudes, behaviors, and goals of African American mothers form a low-income population in relation to social and societal contexts. *Journal of Family Issues, 17,* 593-613.

Amato, P. P., & Fowler, F. (2002). Parenting practices, child adjustment, and family diversity. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *64*, 703-716.

Andrade, S.A., Santos, D.N., Bastos, A.C., Pedromonico, M.R.M., Almeida-Filho, N.,& Barreto, M.L. (2005). Family environment and child's cognitive development: An epidemiological approach. *Rev Saude Publica, 39,* 1-6.

Ataca, B. & Sunar, D. (1999). Continuity and change in Turkish urban family life. *Psychology & Developing Societies, 11*, 77-90.

Aygün, K. Z., and İmamoğlu, E. O. (2002). Value domains of Turkish adults and university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *142*, 333-352.

Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. C*hild Development*, *37*, 887-907.

Baydar, N., Kagitçibasi, Ç, Küntay, A.C., & Göksen, F. (2008). Effects of an educational television program on preschoolers: Variability in benefits, *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29*, pp. 349-360.

Black, M.M., Dubowitz, H., & Starr, Jr., R.H. (1999). African American fathers in low income, urban families: Development, behavior, and home environment of their three-year-old children. *Child Development, 70*, 967-978.

Block, J.H. (1983). Differential premises arising from differential socialization of the sexes: Some conjectures. *Child Development, 54,* 1335-1354.

Bornstein, M.H. (1995). Parenting infants. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting:* Vol. 1. Children and parenting (pp. 3–39). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bornstein, M.H., & Cote, L.R. (2001). Mother-infant interaction and acculturation: I. Behavioral comparisons in Japanese American and South American families. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 25,* 549-563.

Bornstein, M.H., Hahn, C., Suwalsky, J.T.D., & Haynes O.M. (2003). The Hollingshead four factor index of social status and the socioeconomic index of occupations. In M.H. Bornstein and R.H. Bradley (Eds), *Socioeconomic status, parenting and child development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bornstein, M.H., Haynes, O.M., Azuma, H., Galperin, C., Maital, S., Ogino, M. et al. (1998). A cross-national study of self-evaluations and attributions in parenting: Argentina, Belgium, France, Israel, Italy, Japan, and the United States. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 662-676.

Bradley, R.H. (1995). Environment and parenting. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Biology and ecology of parenting* (pp. 281-314). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bradley, R.H. & Caldwell, B.M. (1984). The HOME Inventory and family demographics. *Developmental Psychology, 20,* 315-320.

Bradley, R.H., Caldwell, B.M., & Elardo, R. (1977). Home environment, social status, and mental test performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 69*, 697-701.

Bradley, R.H. & Corwyn, R.F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 371-399.

Bradley, R.H. & Corwyn, R.F. (2005). Caring for children around the world: A view form HOME. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29,* 468-478.

Buri, J.R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 57,* 110-119.

Caughy, M.O., Randolph, S.M., & O'Campo, P.J. (2002). The Africentric Home Environment Inventory: An observational measure of the racial socialization features of the home environment for African American preschool children. *Journal of Black Psychology, 28,* 37-52.

Clausen, J.A. (1996). Family structure, socialization, and personality. In L.W. Hoffman and M.L. Hofmann (Eds.), *Review of Child Development Research,* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Coleman, M., Ganong, L., Clark, J., & Madsen, R. (1989). Parenting perceptions in rural and urban families: Is there a difference? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51,* 329-33.

Cowan, P.A., Powell, D., & Cowan, C.P. (1998). Parenting interventions: A family systems perspective. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 4, pp. 3-72). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Çıtlak, B., Leyendecker, B., Schölmerich, A., Driessen, R., & Harwood, R.L. (2008). Socialization goals among first- and second-generation migrant Turkish and German mothers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32,* 56-65.

Daggett, J., O'Brien, M., Zanolli, K., & Peyton, V. (2000). Parents' attitudes about children: Associations with parental life histories and child-rearing quality. *Journal of Family Psychology, 14,* 187-199.

Darling, N. & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 487-496.

Davis-Kean, P.E. (2005). The influence of parent education and family income on child achievement: The indirect role of parental expectations and the home environment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*, 294-304.

Dekovic, M. & Janssens, J. (1992). Parents' child-rearing style and child's sociometric status. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 1065-1072.

Dix, T. (1992). Parenting on behalf of the child: Empathic goals in the regulation of responsive parenting. In I. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (pp. 319-346). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Duben, A. (1982). The significance of family and kinship in urban Turkey. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), *Sex roles, family, and community in Turkey.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies.

Duncan, G. J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1997). *Consequences of growing up poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Duncan, G.J. & Magnuson, K.A. (2003). Off with Hollingshead: Socioeconomic resources, parenting, and child development. In M.H. Bornstein and R.H. Bradley (eds.), *Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development*, Manwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Durgel, E.& van de Vijver, F. (2008, July). Developmental expectations of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers of preschoolers. *19th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology,* Bremen.

Ensminger, M.E. & Fothergill, K. (2003). A decade of measuring SES: What it tells us and where to go from here. In M.H. Bornstein and R.H. Bradley (eds.), *Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development*, Manwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Fischer, C.S. (1978). Urban-to-rural diffusion of opinions in contemporary America. *American Journal of Sociology, 84,* 151-159.

Fişek, G. O. (1982). Psychopathology and the Turkish family: A family system theory analysis. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), *Sex roles, family, and community in Turkey.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies.

Fogel, A., Stevenson, M.B., & Messinger, D. (1992). A comparison of parent-child relationship in Japan and the United States. In J.L.Roopnarine, and D.B.Carter (Eds.), *Parent-child socialization in diverse cultures* (pp.35-52*)*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Fox, R.A. & Solis-Camara, P. (1997). Parenting of young children by fathers in Mexico and the United States. The *Journal of Social Psychology, 137*, 489-495.

Frankel, D.G., Roer-Bornstein, D., & Le Vine, R.A. (1982). Traditional and modern contributions to changing infant-rearing ideologies of two ethnic communities. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 47,* 1-53.

Garcia Coll, C.T. & Pachter, L. (2002). Ethnic and Minority Parenting. In M. H. Bornstein, (Ed.), *Handbook of Parenting, Volume 4: Social Conditions and Applied Parenting*, (2nd ed). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Gershoff, E.T., Aber, J.L., Raver, C.C., & Lennon, M.C. (2007). Income is not enough: Incorporating material hardship into models of income associations with parenting and child development. *Child Development, 78,* 70-95.

Goodnow, J.J. (1988). Parents' ideas, actions, and feelings: Models and methods from developmental and social psychology. *Child Development, 59,* 286-320.

Goodnow, J., Cashmore, J., Cotton, S., & Knight, R. (1984). Mothers' developmental timetables in two cultural groups. *International Journal of Psychology, 19*, 193-205.

Göksun, T., Küntay, A.C., & Naigles, L. R. (2008). Turkish children use morphosyntactic bootstrapping in interpreting verb meaning. *Journal of Child Language, 35,* pp. 291-323.

Göregenli, M. (1997). Individualistic-collectivistic tendencies in a Turkish sample. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28,* 787-794.

Grusec, J.E. & Davidov, M. (2007). Socialization in the family: The role of parents. In J.E. Grusec & P.D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of Socialization*. New York: Guilford.

Harkness, S. & Super, C.M. (1995). Culture and Parenting. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Biology and ecology of parenting* (pp.253-280). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Harwood, R.L., Schoelmerich, A., Schulze, P.A., & Gonzalez, Z. (1999). Cultural differences in maternal beliefs and behaviors: A study of middle class Anglo and Puerto Rican mother-infant pairs in four everyday situations. *Child Development, 70*, 1005-1016.

Harwood, R.L., Schoelmerich, A., Ventura-Cook, E., Schulze, P.A., & Wilson, S.P. (1996). Culture and class influences on Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers' beliefs regarding long-term socialization goals and child behavior. *Child Development, 67*, 2446-2461.

Hernandez, D.J. (1997). Child development and the social demography of childhood. *Child Development, 68,* 149-169.

Hess, R.D., Kashiwagi, K., Azuma, H., Price, G.G., & Dickson, W.P. (1980). Maternal expectations for mastery of developmental tasks in Japan and the United States. *International Journal of Psychology, 15,* 259-271.

Hofstede, G. H. (2001). *Culture's consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Hoghughi, M. (2004). Parenting: An introduction. In M. Hoghughi, & N. Long, (Eds.), *Handbook of parenting: Theory and research for practice* (pp. 1-18). London: Sage Publications.

Hortaçsu, N., Ertem, L., Kurtoğlu, H., & Uzer, B. (2001). Family background and individual measures as predictors of Turkish primary school children's academic achievement. *The Journal of Psychology, 124,* 535-544.

Istanbul Province, 2008. *Istanbul with numbers; General statistics in 2008*. Retrieved from http://www.istanbul.gov.tr/Default.aspx?pid=33&cat=1

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1970). Social norms and authoritarianism: A Turkish-American comparison. *Journal of Personality Development, 16*, 444-451.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç (1982). Sex roles, value of children and fertility in Turkey. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), *Sex roles, family, and community in Turkey,* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1989). Child rearing in Turkey: Implications for immigration and intervention. In L. Eldering and J. Kloprogge (Eds.), *Different Cultures, Same School: Ethnic Minority Children in Europe*. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36,* 403-422.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theory and applications.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç, & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A 3-decade portrait form Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 54,* 317-337.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. & Sunar, D.G. (1992). Family and socialization in Turkey. J. L. Roopnarine & D. B. Carter (Eds.), *Parent-child relations in diverse cultural settings: Socialization for instrumental competency*. Annual Advances in Applied Developmental Psychology, Vol.5. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Keller, H. (2003). Socialization for competence: Cultural models of infancy. *Human Development, 46*, 288-311.

Keller, H., Borke, J., Yovsi, R, Lohaus, A., & Jensen, H. (2005). Cultural orientations and historical changes as predictors of parenting behavior. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*, 229-237.

Keller, H., Lohaus, A., Kuensemueller, P., Abels, M., Yovsi, R., Voelker, S., Jensen, H., Papaligoura, Z., Rosabal-Coto, M., Kulks, D., & Mohite, P. (2004). The bio-culture of parenting: Evidence from five cultural communities. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 4*, 25-50.

Kıray, M. (1976). The new role of mothers: changing intra-familial relationships in a small town in Turkey. In J.G. Peristiany (Ed.), *Mediterranean family structures,* London: Cambridge University Press.

Kohn, M.L. (1959). Social class and parental values. *The American Journal of Sociology, 64,* 337-351.

Kohn, M.L. (1963). Social class and parent-child relationships: An interpretation. *The American Journal of Sociology, 68*, 471-480.

Kongar, E. (1976). A survey of familial change in two Turkish gecekondu areas. In J.G. Peristiany (Ed.), *Mediterranean family structures*, London: Cambridge University Press.

Kuczynski, L. (1984). Socialization goals and mother-child interaction: Strategies for long-term and short-term compliance. *Developmental Psychology, 20,* 1061-1073.

Kumru, A. (2003). Prosocial behavior within the family context and its correlates among Turkish early adoloscents. *Dissertation abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 63,* pp. 6121.

Kumru, A., Carlo, G., & Edwards, C.P. (2004). Relational, cultural, cognitive, and affective predictors of prosocial behaviors. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 19,* 109-125.

Kumru, A, Yağmurlu, B., & Sayıl, M. (2008). Relations between maternal child-rearing and children's emotion regulation: Findings from families residing in big vs. small cities in Turkey. *Symposium, 20th Biennial Meeting of the International Society for the Study of Behavioural Development (ISSBD),* Wurzburg, Germany.

Kuper, A. and Kuper, J. (1996) *The Social Science Encyclopedia*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.

Küntay, A. C., & Ahtam, B. (2004). Annelerin çocuklarıyla geçmiş hakkındaki konuşmalarının anne eğitim düzeyiyle ilişkisi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 19* (54), 19-31.

Lamm, B., Keller, H., Yovsi, R.D., & Chaudhary, N. (2008). Grandmaternal and maternal ethnotheories about early child care. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22,* 80-88.

Lampard, J.E. Voigt, M.D., & Bornstein, M.H. (2000). Parenting, rural versus urban. In L. Balter & R. B. McCall (Eds.), *Parenthood in America: an encyclopedia,* 442-443. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO.

Laosa, L.M. (1980). Maternal teaching strategies in Chicano and Anglo-American families: The influence of culture and education on maternal behavior. *Child Development, 51,* 759-765.

Leaper, C., Anderson, K.J., & Sanders, P. (1998). Moderators of gender effects on parents' talk to their children: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 3-27.

Lee, S.M., Daniels, M.H., & Kissinger, D.B. (2006). Parental influence on adolescent adjustment: Parenting styles versus parenting practices. *The Family Journal, 14,* 253-259.

Leyendecker, B., Harwood, R.L., Lamb, M.E., & Schoelmerich, A. (2002). Mothers' socialization goals and evaluations of desirable and undesirable everyday situations in two diverse cultural groups. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26,* 248-258.

Llyod, A. & Fallers, M.C. (1976). Sex roles in Edremit. In J.G. Peristiany (Ed.), *Mediterranean family structures*, London: Cambridge University Press.

Luster, T., Rhoades, K., & Haas, B. (1989). The relation between parental values and parenting behavior: A test of the Kohn hypothesis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 139-147.

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development*(pp. 1–101). New York: Wiley.

McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A.V. (1980). The role of parental beliefs in the family as a system of mutual influences. *Family Relations, 29*, 317-323.

McNally, S., Eisenberg, N., & Harris, J.D. (1991). Consistency and change in maternal child-rearing practices and values: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 62,* 190-198.

Meadows, S. (1996). *Parenting behavior and children's cognitive development*. East Sussex: Psychology Press (p.35-55).

Miller, S.A. (1988). Parents' beliefs about children's cognitive development. *Child Development, 59,* 259-285.

Mortan, K. (2000). *İstanbul: Bir sosyo ekonomik değerlendirme*. İstanbul Valiliği: İstanbul.

Mueller, C.W. & Parcel, T.L. (1981). Measures of socioeconomic status: Alternatives and recommendations. *Child Development, 52*, 13-30.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2005). Duration and developmental timing of poverty and children's cognitive and social development from birth through third grade. *Child Development, 76,* 795-810.

Okagaki, L., & Bingham, G.E. (2005). Parents' social cognitions and their parenting behaviors. In T. Luster, & L. Okagaki (Eds.), *Parenting: An ecological perspective*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Paterson, G. & Sanson, A. (1999). The association of behavioral adjustment to temperament, parenting and family characteristics among 5 year old children, *Social Development,8,* 293–309.

Paulussen-Hoogeboom, M.C., Stams, G.J.J.M., Hermanns, J.M.A., Peetsma, T.T.D., & van den Wittenboer, G.L.H. (2008). Parenting style as a mediator between children's negative emotionality and problematic behavior in early childhood. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 169,* 209-226.

Rao, N., McHale, J.P., & Pearson, E. (2003). Links between socialization goals and child-rearing practices in Chinese and Indian mothers. *Infant and Child Development, 12,* 475-492.

Roer-Strier, D. & Rivlis, M. (1998). Timetables of psychological and behavioral autonomy expectations among parents from Israel and the former Soviet Union. *International Journal of Psychology, 33,* 123-135.

Ross, G.F. (1984). Styles of discipline: Reported responses to a variety of child behaviors. *Australian Journal of Sex, Marriage, and Family, 5,* 215-220.

Sanson, A. (1994). *Child Rearing Questionnaire*. Unpublished questionnaire, Department of Psychology, University of Melbourne.

Savage, S., & Gauvain, M. (1998). Parental beliefs and children's everyday planning in European American and Latino families. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 19*, 319-340.

Sayıl, M. (2001). Children's drawings of emotional faces. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology***,** 19, 493-505.

Scanzoni, J. & Arnett, C. (1987). Policy implications derived from a study of rural and urban marriages. *Family Relations*, 36, 430-436.

Schaffer, H.R. (2003). *Social Development*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Schaffer, H.R. (2006). *Key concepts in developmental psychology.* London: Sage Publications.

Schwarz, B., Schafermeier, E., & Trommsdorff, G. (2005). Relations betwen value orientation, child-rearing goals, and parenting: A comparison of German and South Korean mothers. In W. Friedlmeier, P. Chakkarath, & B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Culture and human development: The importance of cross-cultural research for the social science* (pp.203-230). New York: Psychology Press.

Solis-Camara, P. & Fox, R.A. (1995). Parenting among mothers with young children in Mexico and the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 591-599.

Solis-Camara, P., & Fox, R.A. (1996). Parenting practices and expectations among Mexican mothers with young children. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 157*, 465- 476.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS), 2000. Regional statistics, 2000. Retrieved from http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/Bolgesel/sorguSayfa.do?target=tablo

State Institute of Statistics (SIS), 2001. Regional statistics, 2001. Retrieved from http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/Bolgesel/sorguSayfa.do?target=tablo

Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1998). Parenting in different cultures: Time to focus. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 698-700.

Sunar, D. (2002). Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family. E. Ozdalga & R Liljestrom (Eds.), *Autonomy and dependence in family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective.* Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute.

Super, C.M. & Harkness, S. (1986). The developmental niche: A conceptualization at the interface of child and culture. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 9,* 545-569.

Szapocznik, J. & Kurtines, W.M. (1993). Family psychology and cultural diversity: Opportunities for theory, research, and application. *American Psychologist, 48*, 400-407.

Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Shannon, J.D., Cabrera, N.J., & Lamb, M.E. (2004). Fathers and mothers at play with their 2- and 3-year-olds: Contributions to language and cognitive development. *Child Development, 75*, 1806-1820.

Taylor, R.D. & Oskay, G. (1995). Identity formation in Turkish and American late adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26,* 8-22.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kağıtçıbaşı, S.-C. Choi & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp. 41–51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Triandis, H.C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C.H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 1006-1020.

Tudge, J. R. H., Hogan, D. M., Snezhkova, I.A., Kulakova, N.N., & Etz, K.E. (2000). Parent's child rearing values and beliefs in the United States and Russia: The impact of culture and social class. *Infant and Child Development, 9*, 105-121.

Vernon-Feagans, L., Pancsofar, N., Willoughby, M., Odom, E., Quade, A., & Cox, M. (2008). Predictors of maternal language to infants during a Picture book task in the home: Family SES, child characteristics, and the parenting environment. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 29*, 213-226.

Volkan, V.D. & Çevik, A. (1989). Turkish fathers and their families. In S.H. Cath, A. Gurwitt, and L. Gunsberg (Eds.), *Fathers and their families*, Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.

Wade, S. M. (2004). Parenting influences on intellectual development and educational achievement. In M. Hoghughi, & N. Long, (Eds.), *Handbook of parenting: Theory and research for practice* (pp. 198-212). London: Sage Publications.

Wenzel, F., Bendimerad, F, & Sinha R. (2007). Megacities-megarisks. *Natural Hazards, 42,* 481-491.

Willemsen, M.E., & van de Vijver, F.J.R. (1997). Developmental expectations of Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Zambian mothers: Towards an explanation of cross-cultural differences. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 21,* 837-854.

Williams, P.D., Soetjiningsih, & Williams, A.R. (2000). Balinese mothers' developmental timetables for young children. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 22,* 717-735.

Williams, P.D., Williams, A.R., Lopez, M., & Tayko, N.P. (2000). Mothers' developmental expectations for young children in the Philippines. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 37*, 291-301.

Yağmurlu, B. (2009). Culture and migration: a comparison of Turkish migrant and non-migrant mothers' long term socialization goals. In A. İçduygu and K. Kirişçi (Eds.), *Land of diverse migrations: Challenges of emigration and immigration in Turkey*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press.

Yağmurlu, B., Citlak, B., Dost, A. & Leyendecker, B. (2009). Türk Annelerin Çocuk Sosyallestirme Hedefleri: Egitime Bagli Kültür-Içi Degisimin Incelenmesi (Child Socialization Goals of Turkish Mothers: An investigation of Education Related Within-Culture Variation). *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 24*, 1-15.

Yağmurlu, B. & Sanson, A. (2009a). Acculturation and parenting among Turkish mothers in Australia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40, 361-380.

Yağmurlu, B. & Sanson, A. (2009b). Parenting and temperament as predictors of prosocial behavior in Australian and Turkish Australian children**.** *Australian Journal of Psychology, 61*, 77-88.

Yeung, J.W., Linver, M.R., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2002). How money matters for young children's development: Parental investment and family processes. *Child Development, 73*, 1861-1879.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Copy of Background Information Form

1. Annenin adı:_____

2. Annenin yaşı:_____

3. Çocuğun adı:_____

4. Çocuğun doğum günü: _____

5. Annenin medeni durumu?

1	Bekar
2	Evli
3	Evli ama esiyle yaşamıyor
4	Bir partnerle yaşıyor
5	Boşanmış
6	Dul
7	Tekrar evlenmiş

6. En son bitirdiğiniz okul nedir?

O Hiç okumadım
O İlkokuldan terk
O İlkokul
O Orta Okul
O Lise
O Üniversite, mezun
O Hala üniversitede okuyorum

7. Toplam kaç sene tam zamanlı eğitim gördünüz (ilkokuldan başlayarak)?

O … YADA Sene eğitim gördüm
O Hala okuldayım
O Hala üniversitedeyim Üniversite

8. Babanın (Esinizin) bitirdiği son okulun seviyesi ne idi?

O Hiç okumadı
O İlkokuldan terk
O İlkokul
O Orta Okul
O Lise
O Üniversite, mezun
O Hala üniversitede okuyor

9. Ailenizde aşağıda belirtilen bireylerin aldıkları en son eğitim seviyesi nedir?

Annenin annesi:

O Hiç okumadı
O İlkokuldan terk
O İlkokul
O Orta Okul
O Lise
O Üniversite, mezun
O Hala üniversitede okuyor

Annenin babası:

O Hiç okumadı
O İlkokuldan terk
O İlkokul
O Orta Okul
O Lise
O Üniversite, mezun
O Hala üniversitede okuyor

Babanın annesi:

O Hiç okumadı
O İlkokuldan terk
O İlkokul
O Orta Okul
O Lise
O Üniversite, mezun
O Hala üniversitede okuyor

Babanın babası:

O Hiç okumadı
O İlkokuldan terk
O İlkokul
O Orta Okul
O Lise
O Üniversite, mezun
O Hala üniversitede okuyor

10. Çocuğunuzun cinsiyeti?
(0) Kız (1) Erkek

11. Bu kızım/oğlum (1) İlk çocuğum (2) İlk çocuğum değil, _____ . çocuğum

12. Mahallenizde/yaşadığınız yerde Türk komsularınız var mi?
( ) Hiç yok ( ) Az sayıda ( ) Çok sayıda

13. Mahallenizde/yaşadığınız yerde Hollandalı komsularınız var mi?
( ) Hiç yok ( ) Az sayıda ( ) Çok sayıda

14. Mahallenizde/yaşadığınız yerde başka etnik kökenlere ait kişiler var mi?
( ) Hiç yok ( ) Az sayıda ( ) Çok sayıda

15. Dininiz?
(0)Yok
(1)Protestan
(2)Katolik
(3)Sünni
(4)Alevi
(6) Diğer_____

Appendix B

Copy of Child-Rearing Questionnaire

Aşağıdaki maddeler, çocuk yetiştirmeye ait bazı durumları anlatmaktadır. Lütfen her bir ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyunuz ve bu ifadelerin size ne kadar uyduğunu 1'den (hiç bir zaman) 5'e (her zaman) kadar rakamlarla gösterilen ölçek üzerinde değerlendiriniz. Doğru veya yanlış cevap yoktur. Amacımız, yalnızca annelerin çocuk yetiştirme konusundaki düşüncelerini öğrenmektir. Lütfen her bir maddeye olabildiğince içtenlikle cevap veriniz.

		Hiç bir Zaman	**Çok Seyrek**	**Bazen**	**Çoğu Zaman**	**Her Zaman**
1. Çocuğumun kendisine söyleneni açıklamasız yapmasını beklerim.	**OD**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2. Tokat atmanın, çocuğumun daha iyi davranmasını sağlayacak iyi bir yol olduğunu düşünüyorum.	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3. Çocuğum korkmuş ya da üzüntülü olduğu zaman, onu rahatlatır ve ona anlayışlı davranırım.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
4. Ondan istediğim bir şeyi, çocuğumun oyalanmadan hemen yapmasını beklerim.	**OD**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
5.Çocuğumdan bir şey istediğimde, onun isteklerine ya da itirazlarına aldırmam.	**OD**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
6. Çocuğuma sevgimi, onu kucaklayarak, öperek ve sarılarak ifade ederim.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
7. Çocuğumun, anne ve babasına sorgusuz itaat etmesini beklerim.	**OD**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
8. Çocuğumun davranışını kontrol etmek için ona tokat atar veya vururum.	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
9. Belirli bir neden olmaksızın, çocuğuma sarılırım.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

		Hiç bir Zaman	Çok Seyrek	Bazen	Çoğu Zaman	Her Zaman
10. Çocuğuma, davranışlarının sonuçlarını açıklarım.	**IR**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
11. Çocuğum yanlış davrandığında ona bağırırım.	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
12. Çocuğuma bazı şeylerin neden gerekli olduğunu açıklamaya çalışırım.	**IR**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
13. Çocuğuma, onun beni ne kadar mutlu ettiğini söylerim.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
14. Çocuğum yanlış davrandığında fazla açıklama yapmadan, onu yanımdan uzaklaştırırım.	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
15. Çocuğumun, kendisine söyleneni tartışmasız yapmasını isterim.	**OD**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
16. Çocuğumla benim, sıcak ve çok yakın olduğumuz anlar vardır.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
17. Yanlış davrandığı zaman çocuğuma, sevdiği bir şeyi yasaklarım (TV seyretmek ya da arkadaşlarıyla oynamak gibi).	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
18. Çocuğumu dinlemek ve onunla bir şeyler yapmaktan zevk alırım.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
19. Çocuğuma, kurallara neden uyması gerektiğini açıklarım.	**IR**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
20. Canımı sıktığı zaman, kendimi çocuğumdan uzaklaştırırım.	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
21. Çok kötü davrandığında, çocuğuma fiziksel ceza veririm; örnek, tokat atarım.	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
22. Çocuğuma, neden cezalandırıldığını açıklarım.	**IR**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
23. Çocuğumu kucaklamayı ve öpmeyi severim.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
24. Fiziksel cezalandırmanın (örnek: itme, vurma, çimdik atma gibi), çocuğumun davranışını düzeltmede en iyi yol olduğuna inanırım.	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
25. Çocuğuma, kuralların nedenini açıklarım.	**IR**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
26. Çocuğum mutlu olduğunda da, endişeli olduğunda da kendimi ona yakın hissederim.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
27. Çocuğum itaatkar davranmadığı zaman, ona tokat atarım.	**P**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

		Hiç bir Zaman	Çok Seyrek	Bazen	Çoğu Zaman	Her Zaman
28. Çocuğum yanlış davrandığı zaman, onunla mantıklı bir şekilde konuşur ve olayın üzerinden geçerim.	**IR**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
29. Çocuğumla şakalaşır ve oyun oynarım.	**W**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
30. Çocuğum itiraz etse bile, önüne koyduğum yemeği sonuna kadar yemesini sağlarım.	**OD**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
31. Benim yaptığım kadar çocuğumun da kendi istediklerini yapması gerektiğine inanıyorum.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
32. Benim istediklerime uymasa bile çocuğumun istediğini yapmasına izin veririm.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
33. Çocuğumun sadece ben öyle söyledim diye kurallara uyması gerekmez.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
34. Çocuğuma davranışları konusunda beklentilerimi söylerim ve ona kılavuzluk ederim.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
35. Çocuğumun mümkün olan her şeyde kendi tercihini yapmasına izin veririm.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
36. Çocuğumun davranışlarını ve aktivitelerini kontrol etmem.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
37. Çocuğumu fazla yönlendirmeden pek çok şeyde kendisi için karar vermesine izin veririm.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
38. Çocuğumun davranışlarını yönlendirmek ve rehberlik etmekle sorumlu olduğumu düşünmüyorum.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
39. Aile meseleleri konusunda çocuğumun kendi bakış açısını kendisinin oluşturmasına izin veririm.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

		Hiç bir Zaman	Çok Seyrek	Bazen	Çoğu Zaman	Her Zaman
40. Çocuğuma karışmadan kendi kararlarını kendisinin vermesine izin veririm.*	**PE**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
41. Çocuğumun zeka gelişimini desteklemek için ona kitap okurum.*	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
42. Çocuğuma hikayeler anlatırım.*	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
43. Çocuğumun resimli bir kitaptan bana anlattığı hikayeleri dinlemekten hoşlanırım.*	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
44. Ben ve çocuğum, birlikte, benim ona doğayı anlattığım kısa yürüyüşler yaparız.*	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
45. Çocuğuma eğitici televizyon programlarını seyrettirmeye çalışırım.*	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
46. Çocuğuma iyi bir model oluşturmak açısından evde gazete ve dergi okumanın önemine inanıyorum.*	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
47. Alışveriş için dışarı çıktığımda bir çocuk kitabı ya da çocuğumun zekasını geliştirecek bir oyuncak alırım.*	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
48. Çocuğuma detaylı cevaplar vermesini gerektirecek sorular sorarım. *	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
49. Çocuğumdan benim için resim yapmasını isterim çünkü bu onun okula hazırlanmasına yardımcı olur.*	**CS**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Note. New items are presented by *. OD refers to obedience-demanding behaviors, P refers to punishment, W refers to warmth, IR refers to inductive reasoning, PE refers to permissiveness, and CS refers to cognitive stimulation.

Appendix C

Developmental Expectations Questionnaire

Lütfen aşağıda listelenmiş becerileri herhangi bir çocuğunun ilk kez kaç yaşında (yıl olarak) yapabileceğini belirtiniz.

Sizce bir çocuk kaç yaşında aşağıdaki becerileri yapabilir?

Daha erken	1	1½	2	2½	3	3½	4	4½	5	5½	6	Daha geç

1. Onunla konuşan kişiye bakmak* (P)
2. 1 dakikadan daha fazla desteksiz ayakta durmak (P)
3. Elleri ve dizleri üzerinde emeklemek * (P)
4. Yardımsız 10 adımdan fazla yürümek (P)
5. Yardımsız oturabilmek* (P)
6. Merdivenlerden yürüyerek inip çıkmak (P)
7. Müziğe beden hareketleriyle karşılık vermek (P)
8. Topu yakalamak (P)
9. Tek ayak üstünde birkaç kez zıplamak* (P)
10. Çizmek için bir kalem tutmak* (P)
11. Bir kitabın sayfalarını çevirmek (P)
12. Düz bir çizgi üstünde yürümek* (P)
13. Ayakkabılarını doğru giymek* (P)
14. Ayakkabı bağcıklarını bağlamak* (P)
15. Dökmeden bir bardak suyu taşımak (P)
16. Duzgun bir daire çizmek (P)
17. Çizgilerin arasını taşırmadan boyamak (P)
18. Çizilmiş bir çizgi üzerinden makasla kesmek (P)
19. Kaşığı dökmeden kullanmak (P)
20. Sorulduğunda gözlerini, kulaklarını, ya da burnunu göstermek* (C)
21. Kendi yaşını söylemek* (C)
22. 2'den daha fazla kelimeden oluşan cümleler kurmak* (C)
23. Resimlerden basit hikayeler anlatmak* (C)

Daha erken	1	1½	2	2½	3	3½	4	4½	5	5½	6	Daha geç

24. Resimli kitaptaki bir hayvanı tanımak* (C)
25. En az üç rengi isimlendirmek (siyah ve beyaz hariç)* (C)
26. Bazı harfleri okumak (C)
27. Kendi adını yazmak (C)
28. 10'a kadar saymak (C)
29. Basit toplama ve çıkarma işlemleri (örn., 1+1=2) (C)
30. 'Yarın' gibi zaman kavramlarını anlamak* (C)
31. Nesneleri büyüklüğüne göre sınıflamak* (C)
32. 'daha çok', 'daha az', ve 'aynı' kavramlarını anlamak * (C)
33. Kadın ve erkeği ayırdetmek (C)
34. Hangi mevsimde olduğunu söylemek (C)
35. Haftanın günlerini isimlendirmek (C)
36. Saatin kaç olduğunu söylemek (C)
37. Sağ ve solun ne olduğunu söylemek* (C)
38. Oyunlarda sırasını beklemek (SC)
39. Bir fikre katılmadığını tartismadan belirtmek (SC)
40. Hayal kırıklıklarına ağlamadan dayanmak (SC)
41. Bir şeyi elde edemediğinde ağlamamak (SC)
42. Kaybetse bile oyunu kuralına göre oynamaya devam etmek (SC)
43. Arkadaşlarıyla ilişkilerinde olumsuz duygularını sergilemeyi kontrol etmek * (SC)
44. Üzüntü ile ağlamadan başa çıkmak *(SC)
45. Yemekten hemen önce bir şeyler atıştırmamak* (SC)
46. Bir sırada sabirla beklemek * (SC)
47. Kararlastirilan zamandan daha fazla sure bilgisayar oyunu oynamak için pazarlık etmemek * (SC)
48. Bir iş üzerinde (örn, yap-boz) bitirinceye kadar hiç durmadan çalışmak * (SC)
49. Başka çocuklarla oyuncakları paylaşmak (SS)
50. Oyunda işbirliği yapmak (SS)
51. Diğer çocuklarla olan anlaşmazlıkları yetişkin yardımı olmadan çözmek (SS)
52. Arkadaşlarını oyuna katılmak için davet etmek (SS)
53. Birlikte oynadigi bir en iyi arkadaşının olması (SS)
54. Dağınıklığı temizlemekte diğer çocuklara yardım etmek * (SS)

Daha erken	1	1½	2	2½	3	3½	4	4½	5	5½	6	Daha geç

55. Arkadaşlarının oyuncak ve eşyalarıyla dikkatli bir şekilde oynamak * (SS)
56. Birisinin öfkeli oldugunu anlamak * (SS)
57. Birisinin üzgün olup olmadığını anlamak *(SS)
58. Oynarken ve konuşurken sırasını bilmek (SS)
59. Arkadaşları ağlayınca onları teselli etmek * (SS)
60. Sır tutmak * (SS)
61. Bir hata yaptiktan sonra 'özür dilerim' demek * (SS)
62. Tuvaletini tutabilmek (A)
63. Ne giyeceğine karar vermek (A)
64. Öğlen yemeğinde ne yiyeceğine karar vermek (A)
65. Kendi yatağını yardımsız toplamak *(A)
66. Televizyonda ne izlemek istediğini belirtmek (A)
67. Tek başına 30 dakika boyunca vakit geçirmek (A)
68. Tatilde gidilecek yer hakkındaki karardan memnun değilse karşı çıkmak * (A)
69. Pazar gününde ne yapılacağı konusunda fikrini söylemek (A)
70. Doğum gününü nasıl kutlamak istediği konusunda fikrini söylemek (A)
71. Boş zaman aktivitesi konusunda kendi seçimini belirtmek (A)
72. Birisinin davranışıyla ilgili olarak neyi sevmediğini net bir şekilde açıklamak * (A)
73. Kendi başına bakkaldan alışveriş yapmak * (A)
74. Bir karar onunkine ters düştüğünde açıklama istemek (A)
75. Başkalarıyla oyun oynama konusunda girisken olmak * (A)
76. Eğer istemiyorsa arkadaşının oyun teklifini geri çevirmek * (A)
77. Onu üzen kişiyle sorunu halletmek uzere konuşmak * (A)
78. Civardaki bir markete gün içinde tek başına yürümek (A)
79. Evde tek başına1 saat kalmak (A)
80. Soylendiğinde küçük kardeşlere bakmak (O)
81. Aile kurallarına hiç pazarlık etmeden uymak (örn., akşam yemeği, TV ve bilgisayar saatleri) * (O)
82. Annesi yardım etmesini istediğinde TV ya da okumaktan vazgeçmek (O)
83. Söylendiğinde yaramazlık yapmayı kesmek (O)

Daha erken	1	1½	2	2½	3	3½	4	4½	5	5½	6	Daha geç

84. Söylenince odasını hemen toplamak * (O)
85. Çağrılınca gelmek ya da cevap vermek (O)
86. Ebeveynlerin yasakladığı şeyleri yapmamak (O)
87. Annesi çağırır çağırmaz arkadaşlarıyla oynamayı kesmek * (O)
88. Büyük kardeşlerin sözünü dinlemek * (O)
89. Anne-babasi bir şey istediğinde 'hayır' dememek * (O)
90. Anne-babasi konuşurken sözlerini kesmemek * (O)
91. Anne-babasi ister istemez yaptigi isten vazgeçmek * (O)
92. Büyükanne ve büyükbabayı ziyaret etmekten hoşlanmak (O)
93. Kuzenlerini doğum günlerinde aramak istemek (FO)
94. Basit ev işlerine yardım etmek (örn., bulaşıkları kurulamak)* (FO)
95. Kimin aileden olduğunu kimin olmadığını bilmek * (FO)
96. Kuzenlerle iyi anlaşmanın önemli olduğunu bilmek * (FO)
97. Aile üyelerine karşı cömert olması gerektiğini bilmek * (FO)
98. Ailesinin kendisinden beklentilerini önemsemek * (FO)
99. Yabancılarla aile meseleleri hakkında konuşmamak * (FO)
100. Aile üyelerinin birbirlerini desteklediklerini bilmek* (FO)
101. Aile üyelerinin zor zamanlarda birbirlerini gözettiklerini anlamak * (FO)
102. Ev eşyalarını kardeşleriyle paylaşması gerektiğini bilmek * (FO)
103. Aile üyelerinin birbirine güvendiğini bilmek * (FO)
104. Aile toplantılarına katılması gerektiğini bilmek* (FO)
105. Kendi cinsiyetine uygun oyuncak tercihinin olması (örn., kızlar-bebek, erkekler-araba)* (TMR)
106. 'doğru' ve 'yanlış' anlayışının olması * (TMR)
107. Ayıp ve utanç anlayışının olması * (TMR)
108. Terbiyeli olmak * (TMR)
109. Büyüklerine saygılı davranmak (TMR)
110. Anne-babasina saygı göstermek *(TMR)
111. 'Doğru' olmadığı için yalan söylememek *(TMR)
112. Yaşlılara yerini vermek * (TMR)

Daha erken	1	1½	2	2½	3	3½	4	4½	5	5½	6	Daha geç

113. Akraba olmayan yetişkinlere ‘Bay’ ‘Bayan’ diye hitap etmek * (TMR)
114. Doğru zamanda ‘teşekkür ederim’ demek *(TMR)
115. İnsanları selamlamak * (TMR)
116. Ne zaman el sallanacağını bilmek * (TMR)
117. Yasitlarından daha ileride olmaya çalışmak *(AG)
118. Oyunda arkadaşlarıyla yarışmaktan hoşlanmak (AG)
119. Kazanani (galibi) kıskanmak* (AG)
120. Bir işi ne kadar iyi yaptığını başkalarıyla kıyaslamak (örn., resim)* (AG)
121. En iyisini yapmayı arzulamak* (AG)
122. Baskalarindan daha çok elde etmek için çabalamak * (AG)
123. Arkadaşları tarafından hayran olunmak istemek * (AG)
124. Rekabetçilik geliştirmek * (AG)
125. Başarıdan zevk almak * (AG)
126. Oyun kurmada inisiyatif almak * (AG)
127. Oyunda arkadaşlarına rol dağıtmaktan hoşlanmak* (AG)

Note. New items are presented by *. P refers to physical skills, C refers to cognitive skills, SC refers to self-control skills, SS refers social skills, A refers autonomy, O refers obedience, FO refers family orientation, TMR refers traditional/moral rules, and AG refers agency.

Appendix D

Questions for Home Context

EV ORTAMI

I. ÖĞRENME MALZEMELERİ	II. FİZİKSEL ÇEVRE
1. Çocuk, renkleri, boyut ve şekilleri öğreten oyuncaklara sahiptir.	12. Bina güvenli ve hasarsız görünmektedir.
2. Çocuk, üç ya da daha fazla yapboza sahiptir.	13. Ev dışındaki oyun alanı güvenli görünmektedir.
3. Çocuk, pikap, kaset çalar, ya da CD çalar ile yaşına uygun en az 5 plak, kaset ya da CD'ye sahiptir.	14. Evin ya da apartmanın içi karanlık ve görsel açıdan monoton değildir.
4. Çocuk, serbest ifadeye imkan veren oyuncak ve oyunlara sahiptir.	15. Mahalle estetik açıdan güzeldir.
5. Çocuk, gelişmiş hareketler gerektiren oyuncak ve oyunlara sahiptir.	16. Evde, evin her bir bireyi için 9 metrekarelik bir yaşama alanı vardır.
6. Çocuk, rakamları öğreten oyuncak ve oyunlara sahiptir.	17. Odalar mobilya ile dolup taşmamaktadır.
7. Çocuk en az 10 kitaba sahiptir.	18. Ev makul ölçüde temizdir ve dağınıklığı minimal ölçüdedir.
8. Dairede gözle görülür en az 10 kitap bulunmaktadır.	
9. Aile günlük gazete satın alır ve okur.	
10. Aile en az bir dergiye abonedir.	
11. Çocuk şekilleri öğrenmeye teşvik edilir.	

Appendix E

Reliability Coefficients for Child Rearing Behaviors, Developmental Expectations, and Home Variables for Megacity-High-Educated, Megacity-Low-Educated, and Rural-City Samples

Table E1

Reliability Coefficients for Child Rearing Behaviors Scales for Megacity-High-Educated, Megacity-Low-Educated, and Rural-City Samples

	Total (N = 235)	Megacity-high-educated (n = 88)	Megacity-low-educated (n = 74)	Rural-cities (n = 73)
Variables	α	α	α	α
Child-rearing Behaviors				
Punishment (8 items)	.76	.77	.73	.79
Obedience demanding (5 items)	.73	.83	.54	.62
Warmth (9 items)	.74	.64	.75	.77
Inductive reasoning (6 items)	.75	.76	.73	.78
Permissiveness (5 items)	.70	.71	.59	.79
Cognitive stimulation (9 items)	.82	.82	.84	.78

Table E2

Reliability Coefficients for Developmental Expectations Scale for Megacity-High-Educated, Megacity-Low-Educated, and Rural-City Samples

	Total (N = 235)	Megacity-high-educated (n = 88)	Megacity-low-educated (n = 74)	Rural-cities (n = 73)
Variables	α	α	α	α
Developmental Expectations				
Physical skills (19 items)	.89	.82	.91	.89
Cognitive skills (18 items)	.92	.90	.90	.94
Self-control (11 items)	.90	.89	.89	.91
Social skills (13 items)	.93	.91	.94	.93
Autonomy (17 items)	.93	.91	.93	.92
Obedience (12 items)	.91	.92	.89	.92
Family orientation (13 items)	.92	.90	.94	.89
Traditional/moral rules (12 items)	.91	.91	.91	.92
Agency (11 items)	.95	.95	.95	.92

Table E3

Reliability Coefficients for Home Variables for Megacity-High-Educated, Megacity-Low-Educated, and Rural-City Samples

	Total (N = 235)	Megacity-high-educated (n = 88)	Megacity-low-educated (n = 74)	Rural-cities (n = 73)
Variables	α	α	α	α
HOME Inventory	.74	.66	.61	.76
Learning materials	.70	.58	.66	.83
Physical environment				

Appendix F

Percentages of Maternal Education Categories for Megacity-High-Educated (*n* = 88), Megacity-Low-Educated (*n* = 73), and Rural-City (*n* = 72) Samples

Variables	Megacity-high- educated	Megacity-low-educated	Rural-city
(1) Dropped out of primary school	-	5.5%	1.4%
(2) Primary school	-	57.5%	37.5%
(3) Secondary school	-	37%	16.7%
(4) High school	40.9%	-	37.5%
(5) University-graduate	59.1%	-	6.9%

Appendix G

Pearson Correlations between Child Age, Maternal Education, Maternal Developmental Expectations and Child-rearing Practices

Table G1

Pearson Correlations between Child Age, Maternal Education, Maternal Developmental Expectations, and Child-rearing Practices in Total Sample (n = 235)

Variables	Obedience-demanding	Punishment	Warmth	Inductive reasoning	Permissiveness	Cognitive stimulation
Physical	.11	.00	-.13	-.01	-.04	-.16*
Cognitive	.20**	.13	-.19**	-.08	-.09	-.31**
Self-control	.08	-.05	-.06	.00	-.02	-.24**
Social skills	.17**	-.01	-.17*	-.09	-.02	-.26**
Autonomy	.13*	-.11	-.14*	-.05	-.11	-.26**
Obedience	.09	.00	-.15*	-.03	-.04	-.28**
Family orientation	.15*	.00	-.10	.03	-.06	-.26**
Tradition/moral rules	.11	-.08	-.14*	-.08	-.05	-.27**
Agency	.18**	-.06	-.15*	-.04	-.10	-.26**
Child age	-.01	.06	-.23**	-.02	.02	-.10
Maternal education	-.43**	-.21**	.16*	.13	.22**	.16*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$

Table G2

Pearson Correlations between Child Age, Maternal Education, Maternal Developmental Expectations, and Child-rearing Practices in Megacity-High-Educated Sample (n = 88)

Variables	Obedience-demanding	Punishment	Warmth	Inductive reasoning	Permissiveness	Cognitive stimulation
Physical	-.02	-.07	-.12	.09	-.05	-.17
Cognitive	.13	.04	-.10	.06	-.08	-.33**
Self-control	-.03	-.03	.09	.12	.03	-.18
Social skills	.17	.02	-.06	.03	.03	-.29**
Autonomy	.17	-.02	-.16	.02	-.11	-.30**
Obedience	.06	.01	-.12	.09	.08	-.25*
Family orientation	.04	-.02	-.04	.13	.08	-.20
Tradition/moral rules	.01	-.12	-.04	-.02	.05	-.19
Agency	.10	.08	-.06	.09	.01	-.18
Child age	.16	.26*	-.23*	.06	.01	-.18
Maternal education	-.11	-.17	.14	.16	.06	.10

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$

Tablo G3

Pearson Correlations between Child Age, Maternal Education, Maternal Developmental Expectations, and Child-rearing Practices in Megacity-Low-Educated Sample (n = 74)

Variables	Obedience-demanding	Punishment	Warmth	Inductive reasoning	Permissiveness	Cognitive stimulation
Physical	.04	-.05	.00	.04	-.04	-.11
Cognitive	.01	.09	-.15	-.15	.24*	.37**
Self-control	-.08	-.08	.06	-.02	-.01	.24*
Social skills	-.02	-.15	-.06	-.06	.00	-.15
Autonomy	-.10	-.14	-.03	-.10	-.08	.25*
Obedience	-.05	-.08	-.12	-.09	-.06	.26*
Family orientation	.10	-.10	-.05	.03	-.15	-.23
Tradition/moral rules	.04	-.12	-.07	-.04	-.06	.26*
Agency	.07	.26*	-.10	.00	-.17	.27*
Child age	-.13	-.03	-.13	-.05	.07	-.06
Maternal education	-.23	-.05	.02	.02	.15	.11

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$

Tablo G4

Pearson Correlations between Child Age, Maternal Education, Maternal Developmental Expectations and Child-rearing Practices in Rural-City Sample (n = 73)

Variables	Obedience-demanding	Punishment	Warmth	Inductive reasoning	Permissiveness	Cognitive stimulation
Physical	.08	-.06	-.22	-.09	.05	-.15
Cognitive	.10	.06	-.20	-.05	.15	-.21
Self-control	.10	-.12	-.22	.00	.03	-.22
Social skills	.10	-.02	.31**	-.17	.05	.31**
Autonomy	.04	.26*	-.14	.04	-.02	-.15
Obedience	.03	-.04	-.14	-.03	-.03	.30*
Family orientation	.17	.08	-.13	-.01	-.01	.26*
Tradition/moral rules	.14	-.01	-.21	-.12	-.04	.29*
Agency	.10	-.12	-.21	-.13	-.02	.26*
Child age	-.02	.03	-.36**	-.09	-.04	-.09
Maternal education	-.33	-.15	-.03	-.17	.14	.11

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$