THE IMPACT OF PARENTAL CONTROL AND SUPPORT ON THE
DEVELOPMENT OF CHRONIC SELF-REGULATORY FOCUS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
THE MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

BURAK DOĞRUYOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIEREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2008

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name : Burak Doğruyol

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE IMPACT OF PARENTAL CONTROL AND SUPPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRONIC SELF-REGULATORY FOCUS

Burak Doğruyol

M. Sc., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer

September 2008, 131 pages

This study examined the interplay between parenting behaviors and self-regulatory focus in a sample of 320 university freshmen. Considering the theoretical assumptions and cultural differences, it is expected that specific parenting behaviors predict prevention and/or promotion self-regulatory focus. Especially, the dimensions of parental psychological control were expected to predict prevention focus. Participants completed multiple measures of parenting behaviors and self-regulatory focus. Self-regulatory focus was measured using both direct and indirect measures (i.e., value domains) considering the theoretical formulations underlying the indirect measures. The measures of specific parenting behaviors included parental support, behavioral control, psychological control, and overprotection. Results suggested that psychological control mainly predicts prevention focus. Whereas parental blaming and love withdrawal predicted prevention focus, guilt induction predicted promotion focus under certain conditions. Besides, parental overprotection was related with higher levels of both promotion and prevention self-regulatory focuses. As expected, parental behavioral control was associated with

lower levels of prevention focus and parental support was associated with higher levels of promotion focus. Examination of the relationships between both types of self-regulatory focuses and the subscales of indirect measure comprised of value domains yielded results contradictory to the original formulations. For instance, contrary to the theoretical expectations, value domain of security was strongly associated with promotion focus rather than prevention focus, signifying a potential cultural difference. Finally, results have suggested that direct and indirect measures of self-regulatory focuses do not consistently overlap and they may measure different constructs. Results were discussed on the basis of the previous work in this area and further exploration was suggested to clarify the link between direct and indirect measures of self-regulatory focus and their links to parenting behaviors.

Keywords: Psychological control, behavioral control, parental support, promotion focus, prevention focus, Portrait Values Questionnaire.

ÖZ

EBEVEYN KONTROLÜNÜN VE DESTEĞİNİN KRONİK BENLİK DÜZENLEME ODAĞININ GELİŞİMİNE ETKİSİ

Burak Doğruyol

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer

Eylül 2008, 131 sayfa

Bu çalışmada 320 üniversite öğrencinin katılımıyla ebeveynlik davranışları ve benlik düzenleme odakları arasındaki ilişkiler araştırılmıştır. Kuramsal varsayımlar ve kültürel farklılıklar gözönünde tutularak ebeveynlik davranışlarının yaklaşmacı (promotion) ve/veya önleyici (prevention) benlik düzenleme odağını yordayacağı beklenmiştir. Özelde, ebeveyn psikolojik kontrolünün boyutlarının önleyici odağı yordayacağı beklenmiştir. Katılımcılar ebeveynlik davranışları ve benlik düzenleme odağı ile ilgili çeşitli ölçekler doldurmuştur. Benlik düzenleme odağı altta yatan kuramsal önermeler gözetilerek doğrudan ve dolaylı (örn., değer alanları) olmak üzere iki ayrı ölçüm ile değerlendirilmiştir. Ele alınan ebeveynlik davranışları; ebeveyn desteği, davranışsal kontrol, psikolojik kontrol ve aşırı korumacılığı içermektedir. Sonuçlar psikolojik kontrolün temel olarak önleyici benlik düzenleme odağını yordadığını göstermiştir. Özelde, suçlama ve sevgiyi geri çekme davranışları önleyici odağı yordarken, suçluluk yaratma sadece belirli koşullar altında yaklaşmacı odağı yordamıştır. Beklentilere uygun olarak, davranışsal kontrol önleyici odağın düşük düzeyleri ile ilgili ve ebeveyn desteği yaklaşmacı odağın yüksek düzeyleri ile ilgili çıkmıştır. Benlik düzenleme odağının her iki tipi ile değerlerden oluşan dolaylı ölçüm altölçeklerinin karşılaştırılması, orjinal formulasyonlarla çelişen sonuçlar ortaya koymuştur. Örneğin, kuramsal beklentilerin tersine, güvenlik değeri kültürel

bir farklılığı gösterir şekilde yaklaşmacı odakla kuvvetli şekilde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Sonuç olarak, bulgular benlik düzenleme odağının doğrudan ve dolaylı ölçümlerinin tutarlı bir biçimde binişmediğini ve bunların değişik yapıları ölçüyor olabileceğini göstermiştir. Doğrudan ve dolaylı ölçümler arasındaki ilişkiler ve bunların ebeveynlik davranışları ile ilişkisi bu alandaki önceki çalışmalar gözönünde bulundurularak değerlendirilmiş ve gelecek araştırmalar için bu ilişkilere ışık tutacak öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Psikolojik kontrol, davranışsal kontrol, ebeveyn desteği, yaklaşmacı benlik düzenleme odağı, kaçınmacı benlik düzenleme odağı, Portre Değerler Anketi.

To my parents Atilla & Semra,
my wife Emel and my brother Buğra

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Selin, and Mehmet for creating a warm working atmosphere in our small project room.

I want to thank to my cousin Çiğdem Haser for her valuable contributions to my thesis and reminding me this process' being usual for every academician.

Last but never the least, I want to express my gratitude to my parents, my brother and my other parents Kazım and Ayşe. They always supported me and tolerated my grumpy manners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER1

INTRODUCTION

Self-regulation is one of the most important developmental tasks that individuals face throughout their lives. Self-regulation is indeed an ongoing process in which individuals learn to compare their behavior and/or attributes with a goal or standard in order to determine whether to maintain the given attribute/behavior or to adjust it according to a reference (Carver & Scheier, 1990). Thus, self-regulation serves as an adjustment function. According to parenting and self theories, self-regulation grows first within the relationship between children and parents (Higgins, 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). From the child's perspective, self-regulation is the ability for internalizing his/her parents' standards and controlling his/her behaviors in response to the demands of environment including parental demands (Higgins & Silberman, 1998; Kochanska, 1993). A number of theories in social and developmental psychology, such as attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973), parental control (e.g., Barber, 1996), and self-discrepancy (Higgins, 1989), emphasize how social regulation processes and/or socialization shape self-regulation abilities. Although there is a great body of research on the parent-child interactions and the self-regulation processes, the link between parenting and self-regulation, especially how socialization process affects different self-regulatory styles need further exploration. Thus, in the current study, effects of parenting behaviors on self-regulation orientations will be investigated in terms of specific self-regulatory focuses.

Regulatory focus theory (RFT) (Higgins 1997, 1987) explains how individual differences in self-motives occur within the socialization process and how these differences operate. That is, individuals develop either *promotion* or *prevention* self-regulatory focus depending on their past experiences with parents. While, promotion oriented self-regulatory focus is related to approaching positive outcomes using the guidance of ideal self or other standards, prevention oriented self-regulatory focus is

related to avoiding negative outcomes using the guidance of ought self or other standards in terms of ought guides. RFT asserts that different types of parenting behaviors are independently related with differences in chronic self-regulatory focus and their effectiveness. Specifically, in the one hand, "positive" or "promotive" parenting behaviors such as warmth and nurturance are assumed to lead promotion focus orientation in children by fostering their attention to the presence and absence of positive outcomes. On the other hand, "negative" or "preventive" parenting behaviors such as punishment and criticism are assumed to lead prevention focus orientation that divert the child's primary attention to the presence and absence of negative outcomes. These self-regulatory orientations depending on parent-child interactions take a new insight to the basic hedonic principle that affects the self-regulation process. Accordingly, promotion and prevention focuses operate in different ways to regulate behavior, emotion and motivation (Higgins, 1997). Moreover, the relationship between two distinct trajectories and their correlates have been assessed by several measures including direct and indirect assessment tools. For instance, value domains relevant to each focuses or subjective past parenting experiences have been used to explore the effects of self-regulatory focus on behavior, emotion and motivation. Although, effects of self-regulatory focus on various outcomes have been widely investigated by various measures, there are only few empirical tests of socialization of self-regulation.

Research on the socialization of self-regulation has accumulated in recent years; however it still needs further exploration, especially on parenting and cross-cultural aspects. For instance, the vast majority of past research on this issue was conducted in Western individualistic samples and the assumptions on cultural variation of self-regulatory focus are still speculative and await further research (Higgins, 1996). Thus, this study aims to investigate culture-specific aspects considering the specific parenting behaviors influence the two basic regulatory focuses (i.e., prevention and promotion) in Turkish cultural context. Furthermore, past research has partially investigated the relationship between parenting and self-regulatory focus, ignored the effects of fathers and specific relations between father-daughter or mother-son dyads on regulatory-focuses. Finally, this study aims to test

2

the assumptions of RFT on parenting by employing and adopting Barber's (1996) tripartite classification with a Turkish sample.

In the following sections, relevant literature on Regulatory Focus Theory and its behavioral, cognitive and motivational aspects will be summarized. Afterwards, development of chronic self-regulatory will be presented in terms of parent-child relationships. Following these sections, studies on specific parenting behaviors will also be briefly reviewed. Finally, considering the relevant theoretical backgrounds, specific hypotheses regarding the relationships between parenting variables and chronic self-regulatory focus will be presented.

In sum, using the framework of self-regulation and parenting theories, the current study has three main purposes. First is to examine the relationship between parenting behaviors and the promotion and prevention self-regulatory focuses. Second is to investigate and to compare the effectiveness of the direct and indirect measures of self-regulatory focus. Promotion/Prevention Scale (PPS) and Portrait Values Questionnaires (PVQ) will be compared to assess whether promotion focus is related with self-actualization values and prevention focus is related with security-relevant values. Final purpose is to explore the interplay between parenting and self-regulatory focuses considering their cultural implications. Specifically, certain culturally relevant parenting behaviors, such as overprotection, are assumed to be associated with promotion focus given that they are functional within the "relational" or "interdependent" cultural contexts.

1.1 Self-Regulation

1.1.1 Self-Discrepancy Theory as the Precursor of Regulatory Focus Theory

Self-Discrepancy Theory (SDT) provides a motivational-emotional conceptualization to the self-concept (Higgins, 1987; Van Hook & Higgins, 1988). SDT explains how discrepancies between self-state representations affect emotion and motivation from a dual-motive and dual-emotion perspective (Higgins, 1999a; Moretti & Higgins, 1990; Strauman & Higgins, 1987). According to SDT, the perceived discrepancies between self-states are assumed to be related to different negative emotional states and they have potential to change the subsequent

behaviors. Self-discrepancies are assumed to motivate individuals to reduce the discrepancy between current self-state and self-guides to adjust their emotions (Boldero & Francis, 1999; Strauman, 1990; Strauman & Higgins, 1987).

SDT postulates a systematic framework for the self-discrepancies (Higgins, 1987). These self-discrepancies are organized along two important and orthogonal cognitive dimensions that individuals organize their self-knowledge: the domains of the self and the standpoints of the self. SDT proposes that there are two standpoints of the self reflecting the perspectives on the self: a person's own standpoint and the standpoint of some significant others. There are three basic domain of the self: actual self, ideal self, and ought self. The actual self, from the self standpoint, defined as one's actual representation of his/her attributes and/or what significant others believe that one actually possesses, from others' standpoint. The ideal self, which is one's representation of the attributes that are ideally desired (e. g., representation of hopes, aspirations, or wishes) and/or what significant others believe that one could ultimately ideally possess; and the ought self, which is one's representations of the attributes that one and/or significant others believe that one should or ought to possess (e.g., representation of duties, obligations or responsibilities) (Higgins, 1987).

The combination of each domain and the standpoint of the self represent six different types of self-representation and/or discrepancies, namely, actual/own, actual/other, ideal/own, ideal/other, ought/own, and ought/other. While the actual self-representations reflects one's self-concept, remaining representations reflecting one's self-guide (Higgins, 1987). These self-guides are used to make comparisons with the actual self-concept and these self-concepts unlike the self-descriptions are found to be stable over time (Strauman, 1996). When comparisons between actual-self states and desired states either ideal or ought self-guides do not match each other, individuals are motivated to reduce the discrepancy occurred between actual-self and the self-guides (Higgins, 1989; 1987). Past studies testing the assumptions of SDT have focused on the four main discrepancies: actual-own / ideal-own, actual-own / ought-own, actual-own / ideal-other and actual-own / ought-other.

If a match occurs between an individual's actual self and self-guides, the individual experience relevant positive emotions and a mismatch between actual self and self-guides elicits corresponding negative emotions. Specifically, the discrepancy between actual-own and ideal-own leads to absence of positive outcomes because individual could not reach his/her own hopes and desires and as a result, dejection-related emotions are experienced. Hence, the individual becomes vulnerable to disappointment and dissatisfaction. Motivational nature of this kind of discrepancy proposes that it is associated with frustration. The discrepancy between actual-own and ideal-other states elicits the dejection-related emotions as well. In this case, the individual becomes vulnerable to shame, embracement and sadness because of the perception of that he/she has lost their esteem on the others' view. Motivational nature of this kind of discrepancy proposes that it is associated with losing the affection and esteem of others. The discrepancy between actual-own and ought-other is related with agitation-related emotions, such as fear, feeling threat and resentment. Since, the individual perceives that he/she has violated the duties and obligations that significant others consider. Hence, the psychological situation of this type of discrepancy is the presence of negative outcomes. Furthermore, actual-own/ought-own discrepancy also makes one vulnerable to feelings of guilt, self-contempt and uneasiness. The reason is that, this type of discrepancy leads the perception of breaking the rules and the moral standards of own. The motivation behind this kind of discrepancy is associated with moral worthlessness or weakness (Higgins, 1987; Strauman, 1989).

Availability and accessibility of aforementioned discrepancies for reaching individual's awareness is closely linked with the magnitude of a given discrepancy. All of these self-attributes after comparing with each other are coded as a "match" or a "mismatch". Then, the magnitude of a specific type of discrepancy occurred from the comparison, increases the availability of the specific discrepancy. The cognitive processes of the accessibility of an available self-discrepancy as a cognitive construct are similar to other cognitive constructs (Higgins, Bargh, & Lombardi, 1985). That is, a recently activated construct will be more accessible in further situation. Moreover, the accessibility of a construct depends on the extent to which the frequency of the activation of a construct. It is also suggested that the availability and

5

accessibility of the self-discrepancies (matches and mismatches) can influence information processing about the self (Higgins, 1996a; Bargh, Lombardi, & Higgins, 1988).

A body of research using Selves Questionnaire and Self-Guide Strength Measure developed by Higgins and his colleagues (Higgins, Shah, & Friedman, 1997) has supported the basic premises of SDT. For instance, actual-ideal discrepancies have been found to be related to low self-esteem, frustration, anger at self, disappointment, and dissatisfaction. However, actual-ought discrepancy have been shown to be related with fear, restlessness, and increased interpersonal sensitivity (Higgins, 1989; Moretti & Higgins, 1990; Van Hook & Higgins, 1988). Moreover, the stability of self-discrepancies and their power in predicting emotional syndromes were also supported in previous research (e.g., Moretti, 1996; 1992).

Self-discrepancies have been found to be stable over time since self-guides are assumed to be associated with childhood experiences and memories. Therefore, once self-guides are composed and crystallized via childhood experiences, they become a kind of reference point for self-knowledge. These stable reference points lead individual to construct chronic strategic tendencies (i.e., promotion and prevention focus) that direct the current behaviors and underlying motivations (Higgins, 2000) outlined within Regulatory Focus Theory.

1.1.2 Regulatory Focus Theory

Regulatory focus theory is an extension of the basic hedonic principle that people are innately motivated to approach pleasure and avoid pain. Higgins (1997) proposed that there are two main strategic tendencies for the hedonic principle: promotion focus and prevention focus. These two self-regulatory focuses are distinguished by the inclination to ideal-guides and ought-guides, focusing on the positive and negative outcomes, approach and avoidance motivations, and agitation and dejection related emotions.

The goal of a promotion oriented strategic inclination is to maximize positive outcomes (pleasure) and minimize the absence of positive outcomes (pain). Furthermore, in the promotion focus, strategic inclination is to approach to a desired

goal (i.e. match an ideal self-guide) (Higgins, Roney, Crowe, & Hymes, 1994), or to attenuate the discrepancy between actual and ideal self (Higgins, 1996b). That is, focusing on ideals, wishes or aspirations makes achieving those ideals salient and predisposes individuals to approaching ideal positive outcomes. For instance, a promotion focused student's goal will be receiving A from an exam and so, not receiving an A will cause pain. Moreover, promotion focus is associated with the emotions range on a dimension from cheerfulness to dejection. Specifically, the presence of positive outcomes is related with happiness and the absence of positive outcomes is related with sadness. In another words, a working (motivation for approaching a single self and/or other ideal standard) promotion focus elicits cheerful feelings such as happy and satisfied, however if it does not work (conflicting ideals or setting unattainable ideal self/other standards) it leads to dejection feeling, such as sadness and disappointment.

The goal of the prevention oriented strategic inclination is however, to maximize the absence of negative outcomes (pleasure) and minimize the presence of negative outcomes (pain). Also, the aim of the prevention focus strategic inclination is to avoid threat to a desired goal (i.e. mismatch an ought self-guide) or to attenuate the discrepancy between actual and ought self (Higgins, 1997). That is, focusing on oughts, safety, duties and obligations makes avoiding the failure salient to fulfill those oughts and predisposes individuals to avoiding negative outcomes. For example, a student with prevention focus will achieve pleasure when he/she does not receive D and will feel pain when he/she receives D. In addition, the prevention focus is associated with emotions on quiescence-agitation dimension. Specifically, the presence of negative outcomes is related with nervousness and the absence of negative outcomes is related with calmness. In another words, working prevention focus elicits quiescent feelings (calm, relaxed), however if it is not working, people feel agitation (nervousness, worry). Moreover, these emotions are important in terms of their contribution to self-regulatory effectiveness, since, these emotional experiences serve as a feedback function about self-regulatory success or failure (Higgins, 2001). Additionally, Higgins (1996b) suggested that while strong other standpoints cause interpersonal problems for both self-regulatory focuses, own standpoints does not cause such problems.

1.1.3 Measuring Promotion and Prevention Focus

Researchers studying on the promotion and prevention focus deal with both chronic, individual difference variable and temporarily or situationally induced variables (Higgins & Spiegel, 2004). That is, chronic self-regulatory focus refers to a stable self-feature developing throughout to adolescence, and situationally induced regulatory focus refers to a momentary strategy based on the current task or context. Studies that used regulatory focus as situationally induced variable manipulated these focuses in different ways. For instance, Shah, Higgins, and Friedman (1998) primed monetary task incentives in terms of gain/nongain and loss/nonloss situations (see also, Shah & Higgins, 1997). Moreover, ideal and ought self-guides primed by using Selves Questionnaire before the experiment session to receive the participants attributes (Higgins et al., 1994; Liberman, Molden, Idson, & Higgins, 2001).

There are various measures assessing chronic promotion and prevention focuses both directly and implicitly. Selves Questionnaire and Self-Guide Strength Measure are the two implicit measures have been used to assess chronic focus. In Selves Questionnaire, participants list ten attributes for each actual, ideal, and ought discrepancies for both to own standpoint and other standpoint such as father, mother or close friend. If an attribute takes part in any two lists, this attribute is assigned to match attributes for the stated lists. Then, the matches and mismatches in the lists are compared with each other. Finally, the number of mismatches is subtracted from number of matches for each self-guide. Thus, a discrepancy score is obtained between these guides.

Self-Guide Strength Measure is derived from the computerized version of Selves Questionnaires. Similar to the self-report version, in the computerized version participants list their traits and attributes in terms of self-representations from their own standpoint (Higgins, Shah, & Friedman, 1997; Shah & Higgins, 1997). Participants are provided the definitions of ideal and ought self. Ideal self refers that an individual ideally would like to be, whereas ought self is defined as the type of person they believe they ought to be. Participants are told that they should provide attributes as quickly and accurately as possible. Three response times are measured

for ideal or ought attributes, rating of how they ideally or ought to possess and the rating of how they actually possess that attribute.

A recent version of Self-Guide Strength measure was developed by Shah, Brazy, and Higgins (2004). The new version adopted the classic lexical decision task that participants determine whether letter strings are words or nonwords to the strength measure. Assessing lexical decision speed provides a better control of extraneous variables such as typing speed rather than earlier version of the measure. In this measure, participants are told that a letter string will appear on the screen and asked to determine the letter strings are whether words or nonwords as quickly and possible. Faster response times for ideals and oughts also reflect their strength. Three reaction time indices are calculated; the accessibility of the participants' ideal strength (promotion focus), ought strength (prevention focus), and general lexical decision speed (control). There is supporting evidence for internal consistency, construct validity and temporal reliability of these measures (Brazy & Shah, 2006).

There are a number of questionnaires measuring promotion and prevention focus indirectly. Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ) assesses the subjective promotion and prevention pride histories (Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001). The RFQ depends on the assertion that chronic regulatory focus is developed in childhood experiences. Schwartz's Portrait Values Questionnaires (PVQ) has also been used to measure promotion and prevention focus implicitly (Kluger, Yaniv, & Kühberger, 2001). Schwartz (1992) defined a value system that guides the people's lives and needs. Security and safety needs related to value domains are chosen to tap the promotion and prevention focus respectively. According to the RFT, other-related values including security needs, conformity, and tradition are assumed to be related with prevention focus, and individual values including self-actualization needs, hedonism, and self-direction are related with promotion focus. However, while value domains have been suggested to be opposing ends and negatively correlated, promotion and prevention focus have been suggested to be orthogonal dimensions. Moreover, in the contrary with the proposition of the RFT, Schwartz (1992) yielded that security needs includes both other-related and individual interests Although, PVQ have been used to tap the self-regulatory focus

9

dimensions, the link between the two regulatory focus and value domains was not investigated by comparing with a direct measure of promotion and prevention. Another recently developed measure of chronic self-regulatory focus is Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda's (2002) Promotion/Prevention Scale (PPS). In their study on the role model, these authors found that the role models who fit the participants' promotion or prevention goals are the best inspirers. The PPS includes items directly asking the participants' self-regulatory orientation on different situations.

1.1.4 Prevention Focus versus Promotion Focus

There are some competing approaches on the dominancy of one regulatory focus on another. That is, one focus can be basic strategy for individuals or they can operate simultaneously. Recently, Kluger et al. (2001) proposed that prevention-focus by default dominates the individuals' motivations and behaviors, and promotion-focus inclinations can occur only under certain contexts. They asserted that these regulatory focuses are compatible with Maslow's (1965) proposition on the hierarchy of needs. The hierarchy on needs assumes that passing through the higher need requires satisfying former needs. People need to satisfy security needs (i.e., prevention needs) first so that they can deal with self-actualization needs (i.e., promotion needs). Whereas, threat perception can occur in any level and any domain of life and needs, in contrast, opportunities for achieving success can only occur in some restricted conditions. Besides these suggestions, they stressed that promotion-focus orientation may be more important despite its rarity in terms of its influence on innovators and artists. For instance, researcher assumed that intellectual persons and students from psychology, arts and philosophy may be dominantly promotion-focused and may have an important influence on society.

Contrary to this, attachment theory asserts that prevention-focus is not the main tendency if the person has "secure" orientation. Mikulincer and Shaver (2005) proposed that the representation of attachment security reduces prevention focus and the mental representation of attachment security leads to promotion focus rather than defensive strategies, such as protecting fragile or false self-concept. Alternatively, Higgins (1996b) proposed that the dominance of one focus on another differentiates according to cultural characteristics. He claimed that the self in Western cultures

10

emphasizes own standpoint and more on promotion-focus since, caregiver-child interactions in these cultures rely on encouragements and compliments and includes increased attention on child's positive attributes. In contrast, Eastern collectivist cultures emphasize on other standpoint and more on prevention focus. In these cultures caregivers give attention to child's problems, and negative attributes and interaction modes between caregivers and children emphasize meeting the demands of relationships.

1.1.5 Regulatory Focus as Motivational and Cognitive Processes

Regulatory Focus Theory (RFT) proposes that promotion and prevention focuses influence strategic motivational processes besides the basic hedonic principle (Higgins, 2001). A dual-process model has been suggested for the motivational and cognitive processes (Higgins, 1999b). Promotion-focused individuals are motivated to approach the matches to desired end-states and sensitive to the positive outcomes to achieve pleasure. However, prevention-focused individuals are motivated to avoid the mismatches to desired end-states and sensitive to the negative outcomes (Higgins, 1997). From this perspective, promotion focused individuals are eager to attain advancement and gains. However, prevention focused individuals are vigilant to insure safety and nonlosses, so they attain correct rejections and avoid false alarms such as making mistakes in decision-making (Crowe & Higgins, 1997). These strategic tendencies have critical effects on the decision-making process. Shah and Higgins (1997) found that promotion-focused individuals' eagerness (ensuring hits and ensuring against errors of omission or mises) strategy let them to motivate to high expectancy of goal attainment in valued attainment situation. This process worked in a reverse way for prevention-focused individuals because of their vigilant means (ensuring correct rejections and ensuring against errors of commission or false alarms): interactive effects of expectancy and value related to approach goals were negative on performance. It is also found that promotion and prevention focus have different effects on the goal pursuing initiation motivation. Because prevention-focus is related to oughts and necessities, quicker goal pursuit initiation occurs to meet the standards of the specific goal. Conversely, promotion-focused individuals, in relation with ideals and accomplishments, initiated the goal pursuit later, because of the

11

tendency to view goal as a progress toward some maximum ideal goal (Freitas, Liberman, Salovey, & Higgins, 2002).

In addition, these strategic tendencies have implications for judgmental processes and outcome behaviors (Higgins & Spiegel, 2004). If, individuals with promotion-focus use eager means, they feel greater regulatory fit and place greater importance on goal pursuit. In contrast, if individuals with prevention-focus use vigilant means, they feel greater regulatory fit and place greater importance on goal pursuit (Higgins, 2000). This regulatory fit also leads to feeling good besides the feeling right. Freitas and Higgins (2002) found that using eager means leads promotion-focused individuals enjoying the task more than using vigilance means. Moreover, prevention-focused individuals who were used vigilance means reported that they enjoy the task more. Regulatory fit between chronic regulatory focus and strategic means (eagerness and vigilance) have implications on behavior. Researchers found that greater regulatory fit increases goal performance for both promotion-focused and prevention-focused individuals (Förster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998; Freitas, Liberman, & Higgins, 2002; Shah, Higgins, & Friedman, 1998).

Regulatory Focus Theory's dual motivational explanations have also implications on task performance. Crowe and Higgins (1997) found that in a study on sorting and describing objects, promotion-focused individuals generated more criteria and characteristics. In contrast, prevention-focused individuals generated few criteria and characteristics because of the underlying motivation that do not make mistakes. Moreover, the chronic promotion focus group used different criteria and characteristics as compared to the chronic prevention focus group. Furthermore, RFT proposes that promotion focus causes being quicker (quantity) at studying on a task and prevention focus causes accuracy (quality). These different strategies can be explained by the promotion focus' emphasize on achieving success and prevention focus' emphasize on minimizing the possible errors.

Motivational aspects, cognitive and behavioral consequences of the RFT are similar to Gray's (1982) Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (RST) (Higgins, et al., 2001). RST also proposes a dual-motive model and focuses on feelings of fear and anxiety. Two major types of personality have been defined in terms of their

sensitivity of the two neurological systems that regulates the individual responses to relevant environmental cues. Behavior Inhibition System (BIS) regulate the aversive motivation focusing on representations of punishment and nonreward and inhibits behavior to prevent negative and/or painful outcomes. Besides, BIS is related to the feelings of fear, anxiety and sadness. Behavioral Approach System (BAS) regulates the appetitive motivation focusing on the signals of reward and nonpunishment and increases the movement toward goals (i.e., promotion motive).

In sum, duality on hedonic principle on approaching pleasure and avoiding pain is the basic tenet for motivation in RFT. Moreover, this principle is also expected to operate in more than one way. For instance, it is expected that the principle will operate differentially when it serves as a function for fundamentally different needs as nurturance (promotion) and security (prevention). Thus, RFT has potential to explain how distinct dual motivations develop in parent-child relationships (Higgins, 1999b) that base on both nurturance and security.

1.1.6 Development of Regulatory Focus in terms of Nurturance and Security Needs

Regulatory Focus Theory (RFT) asserts a set of conceptual explanations for the development of regulatory focus across the life span (see Higgins, 1989; Higgins & Silberman, 1998; Moretti & Higins, 1999, for detailed reviews) including five levels.

The first level was labeled as *Early Sensorimotor Development* (From birth to first year). In this stage, children learn how to represent the relationship between the two events and they are capable of experiencing four psychological situations: presence and absence of positive outcomes, presence and absence of negative outcomes. In the second level involving *Late Sensorimotor and Early Interrelational Development* (between 18-24 months), symbolic representations occur and children are able to represent higher order relationships. They are also capable of representing self-other contingencies which are the precursor of the self-guide representations. At this stage, children learn to interpret their features in the referent of their own past action, others' actions and possible alternatives. At the end of this level, children have the motivational and representational capacity to acquire self-guide representations. In the third stage named as *Late Interrelational Early Dimensional*

13

Development (between 4-6 years old) children can self-evaluate and self-regulate themselves via comparing the value of a feature for them and the representations of others. Hence, in this level, children reach the ability of planning, evaluating and monitoring themselves by using the matches or mismatches between self-standards and self-guides that others hold for them. The fourth level involves *Late Dimensional and Early Vectorial Development* (between 9-11 years old), children are capable of coordinating values along two distinct dimensions. That is, children can compare differences by using two distinct dimensions such as age and effort to compare individuals' athletic performance. In this level, children can differ own and others' viewpoint on an object. Finally, at the fifth level named as *Late Vectorial Development* (between 13-16 and going on to adulthood), adolescents and adults are able to interrelate perspectives on the same object, can also perceive the self as an object. Individuals at this stage can compare the actual self-guide with the past or future states.

In the final stage, individuals have the full capacity to compare not only the alternative actions but also the alternative self-guides, such as self-guides from own standpoint and peer standpoint. Therefore, these self-guides can conflict with each other while evaluating even a single feature and this type of conflict is called double approach-avoidance conflict. As in other self-discrepancies, double approach-avoidance conflict has some motivational and emotional consequences. For example, when a discrepancy occurs between two self-guides, decision-making for a goal-directed action becomes more difficult and child feels uncertainty and confusion (see Higgins, 1989 for more details).

The stage model explaining development of self-evaluative and self-regulatory processes from the acquisition of self-other contingency knowledge to the acquisition of self-guides is based on the parent-child interactions. Since RFT assumes that human survival depends on the adaptation to social environment (Buss, 1996), self standards and guides can first develop in this adaptational process. Therefore, children must maintain proximity via close relationship with parents to fulfill their basic needs. In this process children come to learn how to regulate their behaviors in terms of sustaining adaptation process, which in turn influence their parents'

14

behaviors such as providing support and protection (Bowlby, 1973). Specifically, RFT defines two basic survival needs, operationalized as nurturance and security needs. Higgins (1997) proposed that focusing on nurturance and security has different effects on child's developmental trajectories in terms of approaching pleasure and avoiding pain. Whereas self-regulation style regarding the hopes and aspirations are related to nurturance (e.g. nourishment) needs, self-regulation style about duties and obligations are related to security (e.g. protection) needs. Emphasizing nurturance to support desired outcomes and withdrawing love when the desired outcome is not achieved is believed to lead the development of promotion focus. For instance, when a desired outcome exists mother hugs and kisses the child. Mother in a promotion-focused interaction, arranges rewarding environments so that the child overcomes difficulties and reaches ideals set by mother. Besides, when child can not fulfill the hopes such as throwing a toy, mother finishes interaction and/or act as disappointed. Therefore, the concern in the promotion-focused interaction is advancement, growth, and accomplishments.

Emphasizing security to support desired outcomes and criticizing when the desired outcome does not exist is assumed to lead prevention focus. In this interaction style, children feel pleasure in the absence of negative outcomes. For example, mother focuses on training the child on alerting or preventing potential dangers. Furthermore, in a prevention-focused interaction, child feels pain when the presence of negative outcomes. For example, mothers yells, criticizes and punishes the child for making a mistake. Therefore, the fundamental concern in the prevention-focused interaction is protection, safety, and responsibility. Children who develop in an interaction manner which chronically emphasizes hopes and aspirations turn their attentions to these hopes and aspirations, so an "ideal self-regulatory system" develops, that is a primary regulatory concern to approaching ideal self-standards. If duties and obligations are chronically appraised and prioritized, this in turn, may causes the child turn his/her attention to protection and safety and an "ought self-regulatory system" activated that is a primary regulatory concern to avoiding from not to meet ought self-standards (Manian, Papadakis, Strauman, & Essex, 2006).

15

1.2. Parenting

Although RFT bases its assumptions on the ways parent raise their children, research investigating the relationship between parenting behaviors and self-regulatory focus are limited. Manian, Strauman, and Denney (1998) investigated how general parenting dimensions such as warmth and rejection influence self-regulatory tendencies. Warmth was found to be related to promotion focus and rejection was found to be related to prevention focus. Another study investigating the relationship between parenting and regulatory focus, used various measures including interviews with mothers about parenting practices and mother's self-reports on their child-rearing practices. After about three years from the assessment of parenting, self-regulatory focus of their children was measured via developmentally appropriate version to the first-graders of Selves Questionnaire (Manian, Papadakis, Strauman, & Essex, 2006). Although, these studies examined the effects of parenting on self-regulation, they did not investigate the role of more specific parenting behaviors. For instance, they explored the effect of parental control as one-dimensional concept without looking the effects of different types of parental control such as psychological control and behavioral control. However, Barber (1996) differentiated between psychological control and behavioral control by suggesting that they are associated with divergent child outcomes.

Child's socialization research has been progressed along the two traditions investigating the parenting practices and parenting styles (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Researchers asserted that the distinction between parenting practices and styles is useful to explain existing contradictory findings between cultures. Whereas parenting practices was defined as specific behaviors and socialization goals, parenting styles refers a more global concept that creates an emotional climate including practices, attitudes and parents' belief systems. Therefore, it is assumed that the effects of parenting styles are similar in all cultures, but practices and goals can be varied among the contexts.

In this arena, first Baldwin (1948) defined two major parenting styles, named democratic and controlling parenting. He defined democratic style as a combination of general permissiveness and restrain on emotionality. This style includes higher

levels of verbal contact, verbal explanations about family rules and verbal responses to child's curiosity. Contrary to this, controlling style was, defined as the lack of conflict on disciplining situations and also restriction of child's behaviors. Besides, it was assumed that restricting child's behaviors can either be performed in a democratic fashion or not. After a few decades from Baldwin, Baumrind (1980, 1972) developed the well-known three parenting styles; authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive style. She asserted that these three parenting styles that help parents to transfer their values and goals to their children. The permissive parent was described as making fewer maturity demands, less nurturing and controlling. Moreover, permissive parenting is characterized with weaker emotional bonds to child. Authoritarian parent "…believes in keeping the child in his place, in restricting his autonomy…" (Baumrind, 1966, p. 890). Furthermore, authoritarian parents favor obedience, want to manipulate child's actions and behave in a strict, unilateral manner. Authoritative parent "…attempts to direct the child's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner. She encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind her policy, and solicits his objections when he refuses to conform." (Baumrind, 1966, p. 891). Later, authoritativeness was linked to the Schaefer's (1965) parenting dimensions of acceptance/involvement, firm control and psychological autonomy (Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991). Various levels of parental control underlie the differences between these parenting styles and their effects on child adjustment (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Literature on the Baumrind's typology have yielded that authoritative parenting is the most effective parenting style for the child adjustment (e.g., Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts & Dornbusch, 1994; Steinberg et al., 1991).

Maccoby and Martin (1983) explained two basic parenting dimensions underlying the Baumrind's typology and labeled them as responsiveness and demandingness. Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, and Dornbusch (1991) developed a fourfold parenting typology by crossing the demandingness and responsiveness. Accordingly, while authoritarian parents are high in demandingness and low in responsiveness, indulgent parents are low in demandingness and high in responsiveness. Furthermore, authoritative parenting is comprised of both high levels of demandingness and responsiveness, inversely; neglecting parents are low on both

17

dimensions. Research on fourfold typology yielded that while adolescents of authoritative parents scored the highest on adolescent adjustment, adolescents of neglectful families scored the lowest (e.g., Steinberg et al., 1994).

In an attempt to bridge the gap between parenting attitudes and parenting practices, Schaefer (1965a, 1965b) used a configurational approach similar to Baumrind's approach in which she identified parenting typologies. Configurational analysis is more advantageous to other approaches for it takes into account other parenting dimensions while explaining the effects of a parenting dimension. For instance, authoritative parents are different from permissive parents not only on the level of nurturance but also the level of maturity demands. Schafer (1965) developed an inventory including twenty-six subscales on parenting behaviors and then these dimensions were used to constitute broader categories labeled as molar dimensions.

The theoretical work on parenting usually proposes two fundamental components; controlling and supportive parenting (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Schaefer, 1965b). However, Barber (1996) developed a detailed conceptualization of parenting basing on parental support with different positive parenting dimensions, such as warmth and nurturance and controlling parenting including different aspects of psychological and behavioral control. The distinction between psychological and behavioral control clearly differentiate the modes of parent-child interaction defined by RFT, such as spoiling, punitive/critical. Although the parenting constructs defined by Barber has many advantages over other approaches, the lack of some other related parenting behaviors having implications for parental control, such as parental overprotection can be seen as limitation. Parental overprotection as a psychological control dimension may have distinct effects on the various child adolescent outcomes and it has certain cultural implications which will be discussed below.

1.2.1 Psychological Control

Parental control is one of the fundamental parenting constructs in child socialization literature (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005). However, parental control is rather a complex and multidimensional construct. Numerous dimensions have been defined to tap the parental control behaviors such as discipline, maturity demands, coercion, guilt induction, love withdrawal, and monitoring. Moreover, effects of

these dimensions on child and adolescent development have been yielded inconsistent findings (Barber, 2002).

In early studies, Schaefer (1965a, 1965b) distinguished between psychological and behavioral control, and conceptualized control in three dimensions: acceptance versus rejection, psychological autonomy versus psychological control and firm control versus lax control. He defined psychological control as "behaviors that would not permit the child to develop as an individual apart from the parent" (Schaefer, 1965b, p. 555). For a long time, several researchers have focused on the parenting typologies, which are aggregated forms of specific parenting behaviors (Baumrind & Black, 1967; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). Then, research focus shifted to investigate specific parenting behaviors in order to distinguish these parenting behaviors and effects of them on the child and adolescent better (Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989).

Extending the previous work on psychological control, Barber (1992) developed an eclectic model by synthesizing the research findings on parent-child interactions, family processes, and family stress. Barber, Olsen, and Shagle (1994, p.1121) defined psychological control as

> The patterns of family interaction that intrude upon or impede the child's individuation process, or the relative degree of psychological distance a child experiences from his/her parents and family and it has been viewed as important correlate of identity formation, a central task for adolescence.

Psychological control is also seen as an intrusion and manipulation to child's feelings, thoughts and attachment (Barber & Harmon, 2002). Psychologically controlling parents commonly use conditional regard in disciplining the child (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004; Barber, 1996). Barber and Harmon (2002) specified the basic characteristics of psychological control. Their classification includes three main types: manipulative, constraining, and miscellaneous. Guilt induction, love withdrawal, and instilling anxiety are the subgroups of the manipulation. Constraining, in general, was defined as constraining and binding behaviors such as constraining verbal expressions. These subtypes do not embrace all aspects of psychological control. Certain aspects such as personal attack, erratic emotional

behavior, and invalidating feelings were not included in the previous classification (Barber, 1996).

Olsen et al. (2002) developed an item pool to tap the majority of psychological control dimensions. In a cross-cultural study conducted by these authors, psychological control items yielded four dimensions; personal attack, erratic emotional behavior, guilt induction, and love withdrawal. Personal attack implies reminding the past mistakes to the child while criticizing his or her actions. Erratic emotional behavior was defined as the inconsistent behaviors directed to the child. Love withdrawal refers to parents' control attempts over the child via separation and/or threats of separation either physically or psychologically. Finally, guilt induction is the control through instilling child that he/she is responsible for the stress of family members (Smith, 1983).

A number of studies have been conducted to explore the effects of psychological control on the child outcome variables. The majority of past studies conceptualized outcome characteristics within the framework of internalizing and externalizing behavioral dichotomy. Internalizing problem behaviors refer to cognitive, emotional and psychosomatic problems that the child experiences such as depression and social withdrawal. Externalizing problems, however, are the overt and violent behaviors, such as aggression and delinquency.

Although psychological control has been found to affect both internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors, its effect on the externalizing problems are less consistent (Barber, 2002). Reviewed studies showed that, psychological control is related to most of the internalizing problems, such as low self-esteem and depression (Barber, 1992; Barber, Chadwick, & Oerter, 1992; Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994; Bean, Bush, McKenry, & Wilson, 2003; Krishnakumar, Buehler & Barber, 2003). Barber (1996) also found that psychological control is related to both depression (internalizing) and to some extent delinquency (externalizing) (see also, Anuola & Nurmi, 2005; Nelson & Crick, 2002). Moreover, van Leeuwen, Mervielde, Braet, and Bosmans (2004) found that psychological control predicts both types of problem behaviors, but within the interaction with child temperament. Longitudinal studies also supported the relationship between both problem behaviors (Rogers, Buchanan,

& Winchell, 2003). Psychological control was also found to be related to disturbances in self-processes, such as maladaptive perfectionism (Soenens, Elliot, Goossens, Vansteenkiste, Luyten, & Duriez, 2005; Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Luyten, Duriez, & Goossens, 2004), slow progress in mathematic learning (Anuola & Nurmi, 2004) and decreased academic achievement (Barber, 2002; Bean et al., 2003).

Although the link between psychological control and different types of adjustment problems have been well established in previous studies, the findings from cross-cultural studies were mixed (Barber et al., 2005; Hasebe, Nucci, & Nucci, 2004; Shek, 2006; Vazonyi, Hibbert, & Snider, 2003). A recent study conducted by Bean, Barber, and Crane (2006) showed that psychological control was not associated with any of the adjustment problem and it is even positively related with parental support among African-American participants. Moreover, other studies on the relationship between psychological control and outcome variables yielded contradictory findings in different cultural contexts (Greenfeld, Keller, Fuligni, & Maynard, 2003; Mason, Cauce, Gonzales, & Hiraga, 1996; Rudy & Grusec, 2006; Stewart & Bond, 2002). In a recent study, it was found that psychological control did not predict both males' and females' self-esteem in Turkish culture (Kındap, Sayıl, & Kumru, 2008). Besides, although psychological control was found to be related with problem behaviors, it was not related with parental knowledge and child's self-disclousure (Kındap & Sayıl, 2008).

Inconsistent findings on the link between psychological control and child's or adolescent's problem behaviors have been widely reported. In an effort to explain these mixed findings, Rudy and Grusec (2006) claimed that since certain psychological control behaviors are perceived as normative, expected and even valued in nonwestern cultures, neither parents nor children perceive psychological control as harmful to the child's self. Similarly, Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) asserts that the goals of parents are not to allow development of self-schema implying separateness from close others, rather they emphasizes "psychological/emotional interdependence". Accordingly, in "relational" cultures specific aspects of psychological control such as guilt induction and parental overprotection serve to maintain the interdependence as a goal of parents. Thus, in any context not

emphasizing "individualistic independence" higher levels of psychological control seems to be common and it does not always result in negative child outcomes, even under certain conditions associated with positive outcomes (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

There is also research finding showing that psychological control is related to the externalizing problems only if it coexists with high behavioral control (Galambos, Barker, & Almeida, 2003). Therefore, it is imperative to distinguish between psychological control and behavioral control and to examine the culturally relevant meaning and functions of these parental control constructs.

1.2.2 Behavioral Control

Schaefer (1965b) initially distinguished psychological control as the type of control over the adolescent's world and behavioral control as the type of control over adolescent's behaviors. Barber and his colleagues (1994) justify the distinction between psychological and behavioral control from human development perspective. For behavioral control, child or adolescent has to require

> Sufficient regulation of behavior to enable them to learn that social interaction is governed by rules and structures that must be recognized and adhered to in order to be a competent member of society

Besides, after emphized the requirements, they also defined behavioral control as "family interaction that is disengaged and provides insufficient parental regulation of the child's behavior autonomy, lack of rules and restrictions, and /or lack of knowledge of a child's day-to-day behavior" (Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994, p.1121). In other words, behavioral control is a group of behaviors that helps parents manage, regulate and supervise their children (Pettit, Laird, Dodge, Bates, & Criss, 2001). Moreover, monitoring behavior and limit setting are defined as behavioral control (Silk, Morris, Kanaya, & Steinberg, 2003). Past studies usually showed that unlike psychological control, behavioral control has positive effects on outcomes. For example, in an early study, Steinberg and his colleagues' (1989) demonstrated that behavioral control is positively related to academic success.

Most of the research on behavioral control uses the same measure which depends on the Barber's framework. However, current measure has some conceptual

and practical limitations. In these measures, various controlling behaviors such as maternal affection, parental knowledge, and especially parental monitoring have been used to tap the same behavioral control variable. Stattin and Kerr (2000) argued that parental monitoring is only parents' knowledge about child whereabouts and this knowledge may derive from either parent-child communication or child's trait about self-disclosure. Therefore, monitoring concept measures only what parents know but does not asks how parent knows. Researchers suggested that child's self-disclosure should be the part of measuring behavioral control (Kerr & Stattin, 2000). On contrary to these findings, it was found that effects of parental monitoring as a measure of behavioral control still exists even after controlling child's self-disclosure (Barber et al., 2005).

Smentana and Daddis (2002) found that psychological control and behavioral control have different domain-specific antecedents and can be thought as different styles (see also, Mills & Rubin, 1998). Consistently, Grey and Steinberg (1999) reported that behavioral control has positive effects on adolescents in contrast to psychological control. Bean et al. (2006) also reported that higher levels of behavioral control are associated with better adolescent functioning. Whereas, lack of sufficient or inconsistent regulation on child elevates the risk of externalizing symptoms (Barber, 1996; Barber et al., 1994), behavioral control was found to be moderately related with internalizing problems, however, it was highly associated with externalizing problems such as drug use, truant and swear (Barber et al., 1994) and it was also found to be related with only (decreased) externalizing problem behaviors such as delinquency (Barber, 1992; Barber, 1996; Bean et al., 2006; Galambos et. al., 2003; Pettit et al., 2001).

In parallel with reviewed studies, while low behavioral control was found to predict youth maladjustment (Krishnakumar et al., 2003), high behavioral control was shown to predict high academic achievement and self-esteem (Bean et al., 2003). The effects of behavioral control on academic achievement and self-esteem were also found in different cultures (Supple, Peterson, & Bush, 2004). Furthermore, interacting with low levels of psychological control, higher behavioral control was found to be related with decreased externalizing problems (Anuola & Nurmi, 2005).

Longitudinal studies supported the findings obtained for early ages (Chen, Liu, & Li, 2000; Laird, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2003) and in interaction with child's temperament (Pettit, Keiley, Laird, Bates, & Dodge, 2007).

Frequency of behavioral control was, however, found to decrease across the later developmental phases such as adolescence (Barber, Maughan, & Olsen, 2005). The relationship between behavioral control and problem behaviors was also mediated by a number of variables such as parental knowledge and child's self-disclosure (Soenens, Vansteenkiste, Luyckx, & Goossens, 2006).

1.2.3 Parental Overprotection

Schaefer (1965a) defined protectiveness as a specific parenting behavior under the love and control molar dimension. According to Schaefer's (1965b) configurational analysis protectiveness falls between acceptance and psychological control. Therefore, as the level of protection exercised by parents increases (overprotection), it is assumed to approach to psychological control dimension. In Western conceptualization, parental overprotection is seen as parents' restriction and intrusion to the child's ability to manipulate the environment independently (e.g., Gerlsma, Emmelkamp, & Arrindell, 1990). For example, Thomasgaard and Metz (1993) defined the overprotective parent who: "is highly supervising and vigilant, has difficulties with separation from the child, discourages independent behavior and is highly controlling" (p. 68). Although, there exists limited work on parental overprotection, it did not gain enough attention from the researchers studying parenting behaviors, especially parental control.

Overprotection is basically associated with parental protection which parents invest physical and emotional energy to their child's as an important component of attachment (Trivers, 1974). This protection helps child's survival and plays role on development of secure attachment. On the one hand, lack of parental care has some harmful effects on later functioning such as constructing insecure attachment style in relation with the reconstruction of parenting experiences (Gerlsma, 2000; Perris & Anderson, 2000). On the other hand, during the early adolescence this parental protection is expected diminish as the autonomy develops independent from the degree of closeness and warmth (Delaney, 1996). When parents continue to protect

24

their child at a similar level in later developmental phases, this may be problematic. Because it becomes an intrusion to the child's autonomy development and leads various adjustment problems (Chorpita, Brown, & Barlow, 1998). These conceptualization and developmental effects of "over" protection on socialization process are criticized because they reflect and overemphasize traditional Western mainstream. In almost all studies parental overprotection refers to high degrees of intrusiveness, strict regulations and monitoring (Dekovic et al., 2006). Moreover, parental overprotection with autonomy granting is conceptualized as a bipolar construct representing opposite poles (e. g., Bögels & van Melick, 2004). Constructing overprotection and autonomy granting in a bipolar fashion assumes that absence of overprotection indicates the presence of autonomy and vice versa.

However, it should be considered that parenting attitudes and practices are guided and determined by parental goals, beliefs and values (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). These parental goals, beliefs and values vary across cultures. That is, specific behaviors of children may not be emphasized and valued as much in the same way in different cultures; this in turn influences parenting attitudes and practices (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Thus, in cultures where the socialization goal is to maintain interdependence and relations with close others, parental overprotection is exerted at higher levels (Chen, Hustings, Rubin, Chen, Cen, & Stewart, 1998). Since, parents want to foster dependency to provide a safe and appropriate environment for the child and to give better response to the child signals. Furthermore, parental overprotection fits the cultural demands and serves as adaptive function. Therefore, demand for dependency and obedience means to protect, not dominate or inhibit. In such a context, parental overprotection is not perceived as "over" protection and has not detrimental effects on child adjustment (Wu et al., 2002).

Previous studies in Western cultural context on the link between parental overprotection and child's problems have focused on anxiety. Chorpita and Barlow (1998) proposed a model that identifies the link between overprotection and anxiety. According to their model, parents' use of overprotection leads to feelings of anxiety via the development of specific cognitions such as external locus of control. Perception of uncontrollable and unpredictable stimuli induced by external locus of

control activates the Behavioral Inhibition System and triggers anxiety. Muris, Meesters and van Brakel's (2003) findings supported the model and it was supported by using multiple informants as well (Bögels & van Melick, 2004). Similar to the findings on anxiety, overprotection was also found to be linked with the levels of personal distress (Britton & Fuendeling, 2005), antisocial behavior (Veenstra, Lindenberg, Oldehinkel, De Winter, & Ormel, 2006), depressive symptoms (Oldehinkel, Veenstra, Ormel, de Winter, & Verhulst, 2006), worse mental health and psychosomatic symptoms (Xia & Qian, 2001), temperament dimensions of harm avoidance and reward dependence (Schlette, Brandstrom, Eisemann, Sigvardsson, Nylander, Adolfsson, & Perris, 1998). Moreover, high overprotection combined with low care predicted higher psycho-pathological symptoms (Canetti, Laura, Bachar, & Eytan, 1997). However, few cross-cultural studies provided evidence for the significant relationship between parental overprotection and child adjustment (Ruchkin, Eisemann, & Haglöff, 1998; Xia & Qian, 2001). On the contrary, Herz and Gullone (1999) found that Vietnamese adolescences reported higher levels affectionless control (high overprotection and low care) than the Australian adolescence. Similarly, parental overprotection was found to be one of the emphasized parenting constructs in Chinese sample (Wu et al., 2002).

1.2.4 Parental Support

Unlike parental control constructs, parental support is more well-differentiated and well-documented construct in Barber's (Barber et al., 2005) theoretical framework. Parental support is generally defined as the level of acceptance or warmth that parents express toward their children (Bean et al., 2006). It has been measured with a number of specific parental behaviors such as nurturance, warmth, responsiveness, acceptance and attachment (Barber, 2002). All of these specific behaviors are closely associated with positive child outcomes (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Moreover, a body of research found that parental support is negatively associated with both internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors (Barber et al., 1994).

The effects of parental support on child development have been extensively formulated within the framework of attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969). According to

attachment theory, secure attachment is distinguished from insecure attachment by the level and consistency of parental support they receive from parents. Research on attachment theory revealed that securely attached children have plenty of positive outcomes including better peer relations and high competency in social and academic domains (see for a review Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

The association between parental support and better adjustment has been well-documented. Parental support was found to be related with internal locus of control, creativity, cognitive development and self-esteem even when other parenting variables controlled (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Barber and his colleagues (2005) found that parental support was associated with adolescent social competence and lower levels of depression. Research on parental support yielded that supported children have fewer psychological and physical symptoms in adolescence (Wickrama, Lorenz, & Conger, 1997). Additionally, lack of parental support in early years predicted later internalized distress, substance use and abuse (Wills & Cleary, 1996). Similar findings showed that parental support predicts risky peer context and problem behaviors (Goldstein, Davis-Kean, & Eccles, 2005). Furthermore, it was found that parental support predicts academic achievement and self-esteem (Harter, 1999; Supple et al., 2004). Furthermore, the link between parental support and adjustment was found to be consistent after controlling for psychological and behavioral control. However, the effects of parental support on academic achievement was found to decrease after entering the psychological and behavioral control as an independent predictors (Bean et al., 2003).Parental support was also found to mediate the relationship between interparental conflict and children's depression and conduct disorder (Gonzales, Pitts, Hill, & Roosa, 2000).

Cross-cultural evidence was also obtained for the relationship between parental support and various adolescent internalizing and externalizing outcomes (Vazonyi et al., 2003). A recent study investigating the differential effects of mothers and fathers found that father support was more important than mother support for social initiative referring adolescent efforts to initiate social interaction with others in different social contexts (Stolz et al., 2005).

1.3. Socialization of Self-regulatory Focus

Regulatory focus theory explains how specific types of parent-child interactions contribute to the strengths and vulnerabilities of child's self-regulation. While explaining the socialization of self-regulation process, RFT defines various parent-child interactions modes (Higgins & Silberman, 1998). During these interactions children learn and internalize the values and standards, and in turn, they partly determine the self-regulatory and emotional tendencies. The modes of parent-child interactions or parenting behaviors are distinctively associated with the chronic self-regulatory focuses. Although previous theories defined various modes of parent-child interactions such as authoritative, authoritarian and permissive (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983), RFT proposes an alternative model on child's acquisition of a message about the world as a result of the interaction with significant others (Higgins & Silberman, 1998).

Higgins (1989) stressed that parent-child interactions have some features that contribute to the children's acquisition of messages conveyed by parents. Strength of self-other contingency determined by the availability/accessibility (availability of knowledge for retrieval from long-term memory), coherence of knowledge (whether the knowledge has uniform direction), and commitment to knowledge (child's motivation to using this knowledge in his or her self-regulatory and self-evaluative processes). Furthermore, there are some specific interaction patterns between parents and children which influence acquisition of self-other contingency knowledge as in other socialization literature: frequency, consistency, clarity and significance. The more consistent, frequent and clear the significant other's response following the specific self-feature the more likely children will acquire the strong self-other contingency knowledge. Additionally, emotional and motivational significance of the psychological situation as a result of the relevant other's responses help to acquire contingency.

Quality of parental involvement determines the variation between individual differences in self-regulation (Higgins & Silberman, 1998). Parenting including high involvement, responsiveness and usage of induction leads high self-regulation and this parenting manner is related with high prosocial behavior and low antisocial

behavior. Naturally, low involved parenting is associated with disobedience, aggression and lack of social responsibility. High levels of parental responsiveness and sensitivity are related to compliance, whereas low levels are related to child aggression. Parenting styles including maternal rejection, parental neglect or negativism, poor parental supervision, permissiveness and erratic discipline cause weak self-regulatory processes such as antisocial behavior and behavior disturbances.

Using these features, RFT specifies parent-child interaction modes that are linked to strong and weak self-regulatory knowledge. Higgins (1989) asserted that classification based on interaction modes is more advantageous than the parenting styles defined by the socialization literature (e.g., Baumrind, 1991). Managing modes include two subcategories which reflect a strong self-regulatory knowledge. When the interaction mode is "prudent", parents teach child how to avoid potential dangers. This type of interaction leads to development of prevention focus and to an interest about protection, safety and responsibility. Furthermore, "overprotective" mode contributes to the development of both prevention focus and weak strength of self-other contingency from the RFT perspective. When the interaction mode is "bolstering" parents give rewards to desired behaviors, emphasize the importance of overcoming the difficulties. This type of interaction leads to development of promotion focus and divert the child's interest to advancement, growth and accomplishment (Higgins, 1989). Moreover, disciplining mode including love withdrawal and punishment/criticism is related to presence of positive outcomes and the absence of negative outcomes respectively. When parents exert rejecting and abusive parenting behaviors implying low or inconsistent frequency and low clarity, weak self-contingencies develop (Higgins & Silberman, 1998).

Along with these predictions, RFT organizes the relationship between socialization patterns, regulatory focus and self-contingencies. When parent-child interactions have desired end state as a reference point, bolstering and love withdrawal mode leads to development of promotion focus, whereas the prudent and critical/punitive mode leads to development of prevention focus.

RFT well-differentiates the parent-child interactions contributing to the development of regulatory focus and aims to go beyond the warm and cold parenting simplicity of traditional parenting variables. However, only few studies empirically examined the relationship between parenting and regulatory focus. Moreover, because of the absence of the specific parenting measures tapping the predefined parent-child interaction modes, parenting dimensions of child socialization literature have been used to assess the relationships. Findings somewhat challenged the RFT's conceptualization on socialization of self-regulatory focus. That is, RFT assumes neither of the focuses implies adaptive or maladaptive strategy. However, previous studies on the socialization of self-regulatory focus yielded that promotive parenting behaviors such as warmth and acceptance emphasize "making good things happen" and following ideal guides.

Previous findings revealed that some negative forms of parenting behaviors are related to prevention focus since, these negative parenting behaviors divert the individual's attention to the negative outcomes and to avoiding from them. Therefore, negative forms of parental control are likely to be related to ought self-guides and/or prevention focus. These findings partially supported the assumptions of attachment theory on self-regulation challenging the RFT. Attachment theory assumes that prevention focus is a fragile defensive strategy and promotion focus is associated with attachment security (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005).

Bowlby (1973) proposed that attachment working models organizes people's cognitions, affects and behaviors. These cognitive structures include attachment related memories, beliefs, attitudes and expectations about self and others, attachment related goals, needs, strategies and plans (Collins, Guichard, Ford, & Feeney, 2004). Similar to parenting literature, attachment theory explains children's socialization process. Secure attachment leads to adaptive self-regulation with a history of sensitive parent-child interaction and insecure attachment leads to maladaptive self-regulation with a history of rejecting parent-child interaction. Mikulincer (1995) showed that while secure individuals have lower self-discrepancies, insecure individuals have higher self-discrepancies. However, type of discrepancy was not investigated. Although, there is no study directly investigating

the relation between attachment styles and self-regulatory focus, a body of research revealed findings supporting the premises of attachment theory on self-regulatory focuses.

For instance, both anxious and avoidant individuals showed primacy effect making judgments with first information and ignoring future data. Both of the insecure styles were found to be related to cognitive rigidity, whereas primed attachment security led to cognitive openness. (Mikulincer, 1997; Mikulincer & Arad, 1999). Besides, representation of attachment security was associated with creative problem-solving (Mikulincer & Sheffi, 2000). Mikulincer, Shaver, Gillath, & Nitzberg (2005) found that anxious-ambivalent individuals did not show compassion and helping behavior and feel greater distress, while avoidant individuals showed helping behaviors only when they have egoistic benefits. Authors suggested that prevention focus orientation may compensate the absence of attachment security and may help to maintain emotional equanimity.

In parallel with this line of research, according to RFT, promotion focused individuals are less likely to generalize behavior in future situation and to consider more possible causes for an effect than prevention focused individuals (Liberman et al., 2001). Moreover, promotion focus is related with risky bias in the recognition memory task by saying "Yes" and prevention focused individuals have a conservative bias on recognition memory task by saying "No" (Crowe & Higgins, 1997). Individuals who have promotion focus can change their ongoing activities (Liberman, Idson, Camacho, & Higgins, 1999), can change their plans more quickly while studying on a task (Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001). They can generate and use more alternatives (Liberman et al., 2001). However, prevention focus leads to conservative bias and they use less alternative while performing on a task. Freitas, Liberman, Salovey, and Higgins (2002) found that while prevention strength is associated with immediate action initiation, promotion strength is associated with later action initiation in a hypothetical academic fellowship task.

Sullivan, Worth, Baldwin and Rothman (2006) compared two assumptions depending on RFT and attachment theory. To clarifying the relationship between

31

approach and avoidance motivations on academic outcomes, they examined the effectiveness of two challenging findings. Elliot and Sheldon (1997) found that avoidance motivation have harmful effects on outcomes related to goal pursuit such as satisfaction with process. However Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda (2002) found that both promotion and prevention focused individuals can achieve positive outcomes only by using promotion and prevention goal referents respectively. Results supported the findings of the Elliot and Sheldon's study based on the premises of attachment theory: avoidance goals predicted lower grades.

In the light of these assumptions on socialization of self-regulatory focus, psychological control is assumed to be associated with prevention focus. Using the perspective of self-discrepancy theory Manian, Strauman, and Denney (1998) showed that rejecting parenting is related with actual-ought mismatch and/or prevention focus. Manian, Papadakis, Strauman, and Essex (2006) also investigated the development of ideal and ought self-guides on first-graders. They conducted two different studies using various measurement methods, such as interviews and questionnaires. The results with factor analysis yielded three parenting dimensions: nurturance (warmth, appreciation and affection) tapping the presence/absence of positive outcomes, punishment (denial of love, punitive behaviors etc.), and control, tapping the presence/absence of negative outcomes. Results showed that controlling and punishing parenting behaviors did not predict ought self-guides unexpectedly. Assessing parental control as a single construct may cause such findings. Since, both types of parental control -psychological and behavioral control- have different effects on the child's self (Barber, 1996). Moreover, both psychological control and behavioral control have subdimensions tapping diverse specific parenting practices (Barber & Harmon, 2002; Kerr & Stattin, 2000). Assessing parental control as a very general construct may neutralize the effects of psychological control's harmful aspects. Moreover, various types of psychological control may have different effects on self-regulatory focus. That is, culturally adaptive and normative forms of psychological control may be related to ideal self-guides, since they are idealized and valued by context and parents. Thus, insignificant relationship between controlling parenting and prevention focus should be deeply investigated to explore the possible relationships.

There is only one study investigating the relationship between chronic self-regulatory focus and problem behaviors were noticed in the literature review. In this study, Keller, Hurst, and Üskül (2008) found that prevention focus is related to externalizing problem behaviors; aggression and cynical hostility. Furthermore, prevention-focused individuals were found to be more sensitive to violations of norms and became aggressive under such conditions. Similarly, prevention focus was also found to be negatively associated with relationship quality (Frank & Brandstatter, 2002). Strage's (1998) study on academic self-regulation of college students indirectly supported the assumptions of the RFT. In this study, it was found that authoritative parenting predicted the focusing presence of negative outcomes such as course, time and effort difficulties. Moreover, studies within the framework of attachment theory also provided supporting evidence. For instance, Elliot and Reis (2003) showed that while attachment avoidance is related with weaker need for achievement and lower endorsement of mastery goals, attachment anxiety is related to stronger fear of failure, and unrelated to approached-based measures. Besides, avoidance social motives were found to be related to more loneliness, negative social attitudes and relationship insecurity (Gable, 2006).

Behavioral control is also, proposed to be related to self-regulatory focuses. Higher levels of behavioral control were found to be associated with decreased levels of externalizing problems (Barber, 1996; Barber et al., 1994). Behavioral control appears to be negatively associated with prevention focus. Since behaviorally controlling parenting is high in consistency and frequency in terms of parents' responses to the child, unlike those using psychologically controlling parents, it is plausible to assume that these two types of parental control results in divergent self-regulatory focuses. Moreover, Higgins (1989) assumed that highly permissive and neglecting parenting behaviors especially including inattentive and indifferent manner, leads to development of weak-self other contingency knowledge and also helps to development of prevention focus. Thus, behaviorally controlling parenting including limit setting and monitoring is suggested to be related to low levels of prevention focus by providing self-other contingency knowledge.

33

Parental overprotection is one of the parent-child interaction modes defined by the RFT regarding supervising, restricting and controlling every behavior of the child (Higgins & Silberman, 1998). Although the findings did not support any possible impact of overprotection (Manian, Strauman, & Denney, 1998), it may contribute to the development of self-regulatory focus in accordance with the assumptions of the RFT. Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (RST) supported this proposition (Gray, 1982). Threatening stimuli activates aversive system (BIS) to avoid negative consequences (Carver & White, 1994), and feeling anxiety due to threathning stimuli leads to increased BIS activity (avoiding punishment and nonreward). Chorpita and Barlow (1998) integrated the BIS activity and emotional consequences of parental overprotection in their theory explaining the development of anxiety. Accordingly, experiences of parental overprotection were found to be related to anxiety as a result of increased BIS activity (Bögels & van Melick, 2004; Muris, Meesters, & van Brakel, 2003). Briefly, experiences of parental overprotection lead to heightened anxiety and BIS activity which is related to focusing on punishment/nonreward. Thus, according to the RFT perspective, parental overprotection is expected to influence the development of prevention focus in two ways. First, experiences of overprotection motivate individual to focus on presence/absence of negative outcomes. Second, overprotection causes experiences of dejection-related emotions, especially anxiety. Furthermore, since overprotective parenting emphasizes dependence and obedience, the individual focuses on ought self-guides (prevention focus) to fulfill the parents' goals. However, it should be considered that if parents idealize and expects obedience from their children, relevant parenting behaviors such as parental overprotection with an emphasis on obedience can help to achieve parents' ideals. Therefore, overprotection may play a promotive role to achieve parents' ideals and can be related to achievement and accomplishment. That is, in interdependent cultural contexts, overprotection may be perceived as normative and adaptive via serving function to maintain close relationships with significant others. Thus, overprotection may contribute to the individual's promotion orientation by fulfilling parental achievement expectations and emphasizing the contextually idealized self-guides.

Parental support is assumed to be related to promotion focus. Effects of positive parenting on self-regulatory focus have yielded robust findings. Maternal warmth was found to be related to actual-ideal match and/or promotion focus (Manian, Strauman, & Denney, 1998). In another study, promotion focus was predicted by nurturing parenting (Manian, Papadakis, Strauman, & Essex, 2006). Similarly, according to attachment theory, promotion focus associated with attachment security is determined by maternal sensitivity and responsiveness. A body of research supported the proposed relationship. Feeney and Collins (2003) showed that approach motivation was predicted by attachment security. Besides, promotion focus predicted relationship quality (Frank & Brandstatter, 2002). Strage (1998) showed that authoritarian parenting predicted the focusing on positive outcomes, adjustment to college and goal-orientation. They were also found to be more skilled about setting attainable goals and monitoring these goals.

Level of one regulatory-focus relative to other at the individual level is explained by several approaches. Attachment theory suggested that promotion focus dominates the prevention focus in accordance with attachment security. Whereas Kluger and his colleagues (2001) asserted a hierarchy between focuses. They claimed that prevention focus is the basic strategy and promotion focused motivation can exist after satisfying prevention needs. Moreover, RFT assumes that regulatory focuses exist at similar levels and differences may occur only at cultural level. However, these predictions were not tested extensively. Dickson (2006) yielded that intriguing findings contradicted some of the assumptions of RFT and hierarchy hypothesis. He found that anxious individuals generated more avoidance goals and perceived more negative consequences associated with goal non-attainment. However, anxious and non-anxious groups were not differed among the number of approach goals and positive consequences associated with goal attainment. Namely, anxiety or focusing on negative outcomes were related to increased Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS), but had no effect on the decrease or any changes on Behavioral Activation System (BAS). Accordingly, he proposed that approach motivation is salient for individuals and avoidance motivation can occur in certain contexts. Therefore, these results supported the prediction of promotion orientation's dominance on prevention orientation.

Considering the reviewed research results, it seems that promotion focused parenting is similar to authoritative parenting or warmth dimension in parenting, since both of them focus on bolstering child behaviors. In contrast, prevention focused parenting seems to be similar to authoritarian or controlling parenting because both focus on disciplining negative child behaviors. However, these findings on the socialization of regulatory focus are somewhat contradictory (Higgins, 1989). Since, both positive and negative types of parenting behaviors can contribute to the development of both self-regulatory focuses. RFT describes different modes of parent-child interactions rather than "good" or "bad" parenting. According to limited research, negative parenting behaviors are related to prevention orientation, and positive parenting behaviors are related to promotion orientation, independent from adding value to these self-guides. Therefore, promotion and prevention orientations may not be "adaptive" or "maladaptive" in nature but they may be the different ways of approaching pleasure and avoiding pain depending on parent-child interaction history or parenting contingencies. It is plausible to suggest that, prevention orientation may serve as an adjusting strategy for the negative parenting behaviors.

1.4 The present study

In sum, socialization of chronic self-regulatory focus is assumed to be developed within the framework of parent-child interaction patterns. Although there are only a few empirical studies testing these assumed relationships, certain parenting behaviors were found to contribute to the development of promotion or prevention focuses. Rejecting and controlling parenting are related to child's focus on presence of negative outcomes. However, warmth and nurturing parenting are assumed to be related to child's focus on positive outcomes. Since there are conceptual contradictions between theories explaining socialization processes, the relationship between chronic self-regulatory focus and parenting behaviors need to have further investigation. Moreover, there are some confounding assumptions among the nature of promotion and prevention focus and the relationship between them. Though the RFT has proposed a detailed differentiation for parenting behaviors predicting the self-regulatory focuses, there is not enough empirical findings supporting its theoretical assumptions. Thus, examination of both common

and specific parenting behaviors, especially culturally relevant parenting behaviors, such as controlling and "over" protecting parenting may shed some light to understanding the socialization process of self-regulation orientations in terms of chronic promotion and chronic prevention focuses.

Based the theoretical approaches and empirical findings summarized above this study aims to test the following predictions.

1. Prevention focus is expected to occur at modest levels and promotion focus is expected to occur at high levels at the individual level and no or weak correlation is expected between the two regulatory focuses. Moreover, promotion focus is expected to be the primary focus considering the sample characteristics (Kluger, Yaniv, & Kühberger, 2001) and in parallel with the assumptions of attachment theory (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005).

2. Considering that parental support mirrors warm and sensitive parenting behaviors that contribute to the development of promotion focus orientation as suggested by both attachment theory and RFT (Higgins & Silberman, 1998; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005), parental support is expected to predict the promotion-focused self-regulatory style stronger than prevention based style.

3. Given that negative parenting behaviors such as maternal rejection and criticizing/punishment were found to be associated with prevention focus (e.g., Manian et al., 2006; Manian, Stauman, & Denney, 1998), parental psychological control and parental overprotection are expected to be primarily associated with prevention-focused self-regulatory style. However, contrary to this prediction, considering past research suggesting that the effects of psychological control is somewhat different in non-Western samples (e.g., Galambos, Barker & Almeida, 2003; Rudy & Grusec, 2006), certain dimensions of psychological control and overprotection may not be linked with prevention focus in Turkish cultural context having an emotionally interdependent parent-child interaction pattern (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Therefore, both alternative hypotheses will be tested in this study.

4. Although some aspects of parental behavioral control such as child self-disclosure do not convey messages about the world to the child in terms of hedonic

principle (Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994), considering the main aspects of behavioral control, such as monitoring are expected to be related with lower levels of prevention focus in line with the assumptions of attachment theory and RFT.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

The sample of the study consisted of 331 students from Middle East Technical University. Of the sample, 282 students were attending the Department of Basic English (139 female and 143 male) and 49 were attending to an elective psychology course (17 female and 32 male). Of the participants, 156 were female (47.10 %) and 175 were male (52.90 %). The average age of the participants was 19.27 (SD = 1.51, Range = 17-25). Mean years spent at the university was 1.42 (SD = 0.97, Range = 1-7). Participants reported that their fathers' level of education was higher than that of their mothers. About half of the participants' fathers were university graduates (53.70%). While only few participants (1.7%) had illiterate mothers, about one third of mothers were university graduates (36%). Participants rated their family income on a five point scale and then two lower and two higher income levels merged. The majority of the participants indicated that their family income was at moderate level (76.70%), 10% of the participants reported lower income and 13.10% of the participants reported higher level of family income. Participants were asked to report if they were living with their family; 38.1% of the participants were living with their family and 61.9% of the participants were living by themselves. The mean time they live apart from their families was 1.64 years (SD = 0.50, Range=1-10). About half of the participants (56.50%) reported that they lived most in cities or metropolitan areas. Demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 2.1

Table 2.1Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Demographic Variables	Mean	SD	Range
Age	19.27	1.51	17-25
Gender			
Female		47.1%	
Male		52.9%	
Year at the University	1.42	.97	1-7
Father Education			
Below High School		20.2%	
High School		27.2%	
Above High School		57.6%	
Mother Education			
Below High School		36.0%	
High School		24.3%	
Above High School		39.7%	
Income Level			
Low		10%	
Middle		76.7%	
High		13.1%	
Living with the Family			
Yes		38.1%	
No		61.9%	
Time Live Apart	1.64	.50	1-10
Region		4.2	
Village		17.5	
Town		22.8	
City		29.3	
Metropolis		27.2	

2.2 Instruments

Besides the demographic questions (Appendix C11), participants filled out a number of measures for the major variables. Two groups of measures were used in the study. The first group measures representing the independent variables were parenting scales including Psychological Control Scale, Behavioral Control Scale, Parental Support Scale and Parental Overprotection Scale. The second groups of measures representing dependent variables were Portrait Values Questionnaire and Prevention/Promotion Scale. Because of the retrospective nature of the study, participants were instructed to consider their early years as they respond to questionnaires on parenting. All of the items in parenting measures were reworded considering their past experiences. Two forms of parenting measures were prepared for maternal and paternal behaviors and participants completed the measures twice for both their fathers and mothers separately.

2.2.1 Perceived Psychological Control

In this study two forms of psychological control scale were used. One of them was Olsen and his colleagues' (2002) Parental Psychological Scale (PPS), and the other one was Barber's (1996) Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self Report (PCS-YSR).

2.2.1.1 Psychological Control Scale

The parental psychological control was measured using Olsen et al.'s (2002) measure of psychological control which was develop using Barber's (1996) Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self Report (PCS-YSR). The measure composed of 32 items assessing different aspects of psychological control. Sixteen of these items were from PCS-YSR, developed by Barber (1996) and 16 additional items were developed by Olsen and his colleagues (2002) aiming to tap the culture-specific psychological control behaviors. These were constraining verbal expressions (e.g., "interrupts our child when he/she is speaking"), invalidating feelings (e.g., tries to change how our child feels or thinks about things), personal attack (e.g., "blames our child for other family member's problems), erratic emotional behavior (e.g., "show impatience with our child"), love withdrawal (e.g., "doesn't pay attention when our

41

child is speaking to us") and guilt induction (e.g., "acts disappointed when our child misbehaves"). In the original study, parents rated items on a 5 point Likert-type scales. Olsen et al. (2002) specified four main dimensions after testing the factor structure on different samples by using confirmatory factor analyses.

In the present study, first, the items were translated into Turkish from English and back translated by two different graduate students who are fluent in both languages. The final set was formed by reaching an agreement among translators on the wording of the items.

Principle components analysis with direct oblimin rotation was performed on 32 items to assess the factor structure of the scale. After the extraction, 6 components were found to have eigenvalues higher than 1 for both mother and father forms. Cattel's scree plot test suggested two factors for both forms. Considering both scree plot and the interpretability of factor solution, it was decided to limit the number of factors to two factors. Because the relatively high correlations between components, (.65 for mothers and .64 for fathers) promax rotation was used which allows correlation among factors (Tabachnich & Fidell, 2001).

Results of factor analysis indicated that two factors accounted for 48.65% of the total variance for mother form and 48.07% of the total variance for fathers. The first factor had an eigenvalue of 13.33 and explained 41.67% of the total variance and the second factor had an eigenvalue of 2.23 and explained 6.98% of the total variance for perceived psychological control for mother form. For perceived psychological control from fathers, the first factor had an eigenvalue of 12.11 and explained 37.84% of the total variance. The second factor had an eigenvalue of 2.32 and explained 7.24% of the total variance. The loadings of the items on mother form ranged from .36 to .85 for the first factor and .24 to .96 for the second factor. Also item loadings on father form ranged from .34 to .87 for the first factor and from .41 to .89 for the second factor.

Since four items (4, 7, 22, and 32, see Appendix C 10) loaded on the different factors on the mother and father forms, they were excluded from the analysis in order to maintain consistency between the forms completed for mothers and fathers. Also

one item (5th item) was excluded because of low loading on mother form, which was under the cut-off point of .32 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Furthermore, two items (6, 18) were also omitted from the analysis because they did not load on the theoretically expected factors (for confirmatory factor analyses results see Appendix A1).

The first factor consisting fifteen items was named "Blaming and Love Withdrawal" and the second factor consisting ten items was named "Guilt Induction". Inter-item correlations ranged from .43 to .75 for mother form and .52 to .71 for father form. Reliability scores of blaming and love withdrawal subscale (.93 and .92 for mothers and fathers respectively) and guilt induction were satisfactory (.90 and .88 for mothers and fathers respectively). Psychological Control Scale is presented in Appendix C1 (mother form) and C7 (father form).

2.2.1.2 Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self Report (PCS-YSR)

Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self Report (PCS-YSR) (Barber, 1996) was used to measure parental psychological control. The questionnaire was consisted of 16 items tapping specific aspects of psychological control, which are constraining verbal expression, invalidating feeling, personal attack, guilt induction, love withdrawal and erratic emotional behavior. Barber (1996) tested the factor structure of PCS-YSR considering the gender of the parent, income level, and race. He used 8 out of these 16 items consisting one component named psychological control after factor analysis. Factor loadings of the items were between .59 and .74. Reliabilities for the eight-item scale were ranged from .72 to .85 in different subsamples for mothers and .74 to .86 in different subsamples for fathers.

In this study, explanatory factor analysis revealed one interpretable factor for both mother and father forms. Eight items accounted for 45.33% of the variance for mother form and 47.97% of the variance for father form. Alpha reliabilities were .82 for mothers and .84 for fathers (for confirmatory factor analyses results see Appendix A2).

2.2.2 Behavioral Control Scale

Behavioral control was measured using Kerr and Stattin's (2000) 22-item behavioral control questionnaire. Originally, this scale consisted of two subscales: parental knowledge (9 items) and parental monitoring (15 items) with two forms for 14-year-old youths and their parents (example item for parental monitoring, "Do you: know what your child does during his or her free time?" and for parental knowledge, "Do you: keep a lot of secrets from your parents about what you do during nights and weekends?"). Alpha reliabilities of the parental monitoring were found to be .85 for child-report and .82 for parent report. Parental monitoring subscale includes three separate subscales: child disclosure (5 items e.g., Child keeps secrets about free time), parental solicitation (5 items e.g., Parents talk to child's friends very often) and parental control (5 items e.g., Child must explain if out past curfew). For all subscales 5 point Likert-type was used (1= no, never, 5=yes, always). Factor loadings of parental knowledge items were ranged from .56 to .82. Alpha reliabilities for child disclosure, parental solicitation and parental control were .78, .70 and .78 for youth report respectively and 80, .69 and .75 for parent report respectively.

Items on the behavioral control scale were translated to Turkish and backtranslated by two different graduate students who are fluent in both languages to test semantic equivalence an interpretation differences. After translation, two items (e.g., Do your parents know where you go when you are out with friends at night?) from parental monitoring and four items from parental knowledge (e.g., Child hides what happens nights and weekends) were excluded from the scale because most of the students were living apart from their family in the university and it would be difficult to answer these questions. Moreover, four items (39, 40, 44, and 46) were developed to capture culturally appropriate behavioral control practices (e.g., Do your parents consult with your teachers about your courses at school?). Finally, 20 items were used to measure behavioral control employed by parents.

Principal component analysis indicated that single factor (component) solution best represented the scale with eigenvalue of 10.64 and explained 53.21% of the variance. The loadings of the items on the factor ranged from .54 to .83. The highest

inter-item correlations were .77 and .80 for mothers and fathers respectively, the lowest were .48 and .50. Reliability coefficient for mother version was .94 for mothers and for fathers was .95 (for confirmatory factor analyses results see Appendix A5). Behavioral Control Scale is presented in Appendix C2 (mother form) and C8 (father form).

2.2.3 Parental Support Scale

The revised form of the acceptance subscale (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005) of Child Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI; Schaefer, 1965a) was used to assess the perceived parental support. In original scale there were 260 items consists of 26 subscales with 10 items for each. Factors were acceptance versus rejection, psychological autonomy versus psychological control and firm control versus lax control. Reliabilities for the CRPBI were tested on 12-14 year old youths. Median reliability coefficients for two molar dimensions (love vs. hostility and autonomy vs. control) were .84 for love, .78 for hostility, .69 for autonomy and .66 for control. Barber et al. (2005) revised the ten-item acceptance subscale and administered to fifth and eighth graders on a 3 point Likert-type (1=not like her/him, to 3=a lot like her/him). Example items were "Smiles at me very often" and "Is easy to talk to". Parental support was found to be significantly correlated with both psychological control and behavioral control (-.60 and .50 respectively). Standardized factor loadings ranged from .35 to .41 on predicting social initiative at different ages and ranged from -.18 to -.24 on predicting depression at different ages.

The items were translated into Turkish from English and back translated by two different graduate students who are fluent in both languages for the present study. The final set was formed by reaching an agreement among translators on the wording of the items. Factor analysis with the principle components analysis was performed to assess the factor structure of the measure. After the extraction two components were found with eigenvalues 5.98 and 1.00 for mothers and one component was found with eigenvalue 6.49 for fathers. Considering both scree plot and interpretability of factors, it was decided to limit to a single factor solution. For mother form, single factor explained %59.83 of the variance and for father form single factor explained %64.94 of the variance. Loadings of the items were ranged

from .55 to .86 for mothers and .66 to .90 for fathers. Inter-item correlations were .48 to .81 for mothers and .64 to .83 for fathers. Alpha reliabilities for mothers and fathers were .92 and .94 respectively. (for confirmatory factor analyses results see Appendix A3). Parental Support Scale is presented in Appendix C4 (mother form) and C10 (father form).

2.2.4 Parental Overprotection Scale

To assess the perceived parental overprotection, 7-item parental overprotection scale developed for a research project was used (Sümer, 2006). This measure aims to tap theoretical frame of the overprotection with culturally relevant items. Three of the items were taken from EMBU Parental Overprotection Subscale (Arrindell et al., 1999). Remaining four items were developed to tap culture-specific overprotective behaviors. Example item for parental overprotection was "It happened that I wished my parents would worry less about what I was doing". Parental overprotection scale was conducted to high school students and rated on a four point Likert-type (1=never, to 4=always). Reliability coefficient of mother form was .78 and father form was .83.

Factor analysis was conducted to assess the factor structure of parental overprotection scale. Analysis yielded one factor solution for both mothers and fathers with eigenvalues of 3.79 and 3.80 respectively. Single factor solution explained %54.17 of the total variance for mother version and %54.28 of the variance for father version. Loadings of items were ranged from .66 to .80 for mothers and .63 to .80 for fathers. Inter-item correlations were .54 to .71 for mothers and .52 to .69 for fathers (for confirmatory factor analyses results see Appendix A4). Alpha reliability coefficients for mothers and fathers were .86 and .85 respectively. Parental Overprotection Scale is presented in Appendix C3 (mother form) and C9 (father form).

2.2.5 Promotion/Prevention Scale

To assess the chronic self-regulatory focus of participants, Prevention/Promotion Scale was used (Lockwood, Jordan, & Kunda, 2002). Participants reported to what extent they endorse to promotion goals (e.g., "In

general, I am focused on achieving positive outcomes in my life") and prevention goals (e.g., "I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my academic goals"). Researchers reported that the scale is congruent with the theoretical constructs of Event Reaction Questionnaire (Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Chen Idson, Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001). However, researchers tended to measure regulatory focus directly by asking regulatory focus goals rather than self-regulatory pride. Eighteen items were designed to measure chronic promotion focus (9 items) and prevention focus (9 items) on a 9 point Likert-type (1= not at all true of me, and 9= very true of me). Alpha reliability coefficients of subscales were .81 for promotion focus and .75 for prevention focus. The correlation between subscales was moderate (r=.17, p<.01).

The items were translated to Turkish and backtranslated by two graduate students who are fluent in both English and Turkish. To assess the factor structure of promotion/prevention focus scale, principle components analysis with direct oblimin rotation was performed on 18 items. After the extraction, 4 components were found to be having eigenvalues higher than 1: However, the scree plot test suggested 2 factors. Considering both scree plot and interpretability of factor solution, it was decided to employ two-factor solution. Eigenvalues of two factors were 4.59 and 2.96 and factors explained %41.98 of the total variance. First factor representing promotion focus explained %25.51 and the second factor representing prevention focus explained %16.47 of the total variance. One item (12) from promotion focus subscale excluded from the analysis, since it cross-loaded on both factors (Appendix D2). The highest inter-item correlations were .69 and .55 for promotion focus and prevention focus respectively. Alpha reliability coefficients of the final set with 17 items were .83 for promotion focus and the .77 for the prevention focus. The zero-order correlation between subscales were found to be significant (r=.18, p<.01). Promotion/Prevention Scale is presented in Appendix C5.

2.2.6 Portrait Values Questionnaire

For an alternative measure for assessing the participants' chronic regulatory focus, Portrait Values Questionnaire was used (Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris, & Owens, 2001). Originally, PVQ includes 40 items characterizing to different value domains that explain personal goals, aspirations, and wishes (e.g.,

"She really wants to enjoy life; Having a good time is very important to her"). The questionnaire includes ten value domains: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security. Six point Likert-type was used (1= not like me at all, and 6= very much like me).

Kluger, Yaniv, and Kühberger (2001) used the PVQ to assess the chronic promotion and prevention focus because of the link between security needs with the prevention focus and self actualization needs with the promotion focus. Higgins (1997) claimed that security needs constitute prevention focus and nurturance needs constitute promotion focus. Similar constructs were defined by Schwartz (1992) that competing values as desirable goals serve guiding principles and reflect biological needs. Researchers used security (items 2, 8, 11, 17, 19), conformity (items 4, 15, 20) and tradition (items 5, 10, 13, 22) subscales to compose prevention focus and stimulation (items 3, 9, 16), self-direction (1, 7, 12, 18) and hedonism (6, 14, 21) subscales to compose promotion focus. Kisbu (2006) used these value composit to assess the Turkish drivers' chronic self regulatory focus and reported satisfactory reliability coefficients (.74 and .81 for promotion and prevention focus respectively).

Demirutku (2007) adapted the full set of the PVQ to Turkish. The PVQ was administered to a university sample two times with four week interval in the adaptation study. Alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .56 to .84 and test-retest reliabilities ranged from .65 to .82 for subscales. According to the results of the smallest space analysis, tradition and conformity subscales were merged because of the collectivist tendencies of the Turkish culture.

In this study, Demirutku's (2007) adapted form was used. In order to determine the factor structure of the PVQ, 23 items tapping the promotion and prevention focus were analyzed using principle components exploratory analysis. Initially, analysis yielded six factors. Considering both scree plot and interpretability of factor solution, it was decided to limit to a two-factor solution. Because of the correlations among factors were less than .36 of the factors varimax rotation was used. Eigenvalues of the two components were 4.17 and 3.93, factors explained %35.23 of the total variance. First factor explained %18.14 and the second factor explained %17.09.

Loadings of items ranged from .34 to .70 for the first factor and .46 to .75 for the second factor. The highest inter-item correlations were .63 and .60 for promotion focus and prevention focus respectively (Appendix D3). Alpha reliability coefficients were .81 for both promotion and prevention focus. The zero-order correlation among promotion and prevention subscales were found to be insignificant (r=-.03, p<.ns.). Portrait Values Questionnaire Scale is presented in Appendix C6.

2.3 Procedure

First, the ethic committee approval was taken from the METU UEAM (Human Participants Ethic Committee) for conducting the study. Following the approval, the teachers from the Department of Basic English were contacted for the appointment for the data collection session. Of the 282 (%85.2) participants fulfilled the questionnaire in a class section in their school. The rest of the participants, 51 (%14.8) were attending an elective psychology course and received a course credit for their participation. They also filled the questionnaires at a course session. All of the students were participated in the study voluntarily.

Participants were required not to write their names or ID to assure for anonymity and they were informed that their responses will only be used for research purposes. Questionnaire administration lasted about 30 minutes. After the completion of the questionnaire, the participants were debriefed by informing about the objectives of the study.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Descriptive Statistics for the Major Variables in the Study

Mean values and standard deviations of variables in the study can be seen in Table 3.1. It should be noted that highest possible mean score varied between self-regulatory focus scales. Whereas, highest possible mean score would be 6 in Portrait Values Questionnaire, indicating an extreme level of agreement with the construct and a mean score of 1 would show extreme level of disagreement with the construct, highest possible mean score would be 9 in Promotion/Prevention Scale. The results revealed that overall, participants reported higher levels of promotion focus (M = 6.76, SD = 1.31) and moderate levels of prevention focus (M = 4.92, SD = .76) on Promotion/Prevention Scale, and the mean difference between promotion and prevention self-regulatory focuses was significant (t (319) = 19.14, p < .01). Furthermore, participants reported moderate levels of promotion (M = 4.73, SD = .75) and prevention focus (M = 4.21, SD = .76) when they were measured via value domains, although the difference between these constructs was significant (t (319) = 8.49, p < .01).

Participants reported higher levels of behavioral control and support than the psychological control for both mothers and fathers. Specifically, for behavioral control and support, mean scores were 4.52 (SD = 1.01) and 4.24 (SD = 1.01) for mothers, respectively and 3.92 (SD = 1.28) and 3.64 (SD = 1.14) for fathers, respectively. Moreover, mean differences between mothers and fathers for both support (t (319) = 10.87, p < .01) and behavioral control (t (319) = 8.01, p < .01) was significant. Participants reported that their mothers exerted moderate levels of overprotection (M = 2.95, SD = 1.15) and guilt induction (M = 2.59, SD = 1.07), while lower levels of blaming and love withdrawal (M = 1.85, SD = .88). Furthermore, participants reported slightly moderate levels of paternal overprotection (M = 2.29, SD = 1.07) and guilt induction (M = 2.31, SD = .96), whereas they

reported low levels of blaming and love withdrawal (M = 1.84, SD = .83). Although, there was no significant difference between maternal and paternal blaming and love withdrawal, significant mean differences were found for both overprotection (t (319) = 10.19, p < .01) and guilt induction (t (319) = 5.08, p < .01). Gender differences were found on a number of study variables. For both maternal and paternal behavioral control, females reported higher levels than males (t (318) = 6.09, p < .001 and t (318) = 3.98, p < .001 respectively). Besides, there were also gender differences on maternal overprotection and paternal support, males perceived higher levels overprotection from their mothers than females (t (318) = -2.32, p < .05) and females perceived higher support from their fathers than males (t (318) = 4.35, p < .01) (see Table 3.1). To sum up, while participants reported higher levels of positive parenting behaviors, they reported lower levels of negative parenting behaviors.

Table 3.1 Means and Gender Differences among Study Variables

	General		Males		Females		
Variables	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	t
Promotion Focus (PPS)	6.76	1.31	6.63	1.34	6.91	1.27	1.92
Prevention Focus (PPS)	4.92	1.37	5.02	1.40	4.82	1.34	-1.34
Promotion Focus (PVQ)	4.73	.75	4.56	.76	4.92	.68	4.45[**]
Prevention Focus (PVQ)	4.21	.76	4.16	.80	4.28	.72	1.40
Maternal Support	4.52	1.08	4.48	.98	4.57	1.18	.74
Maternal Behavioral Control	4.24	1.01	3.93	.94	4.58	.98	6.09[**]
Maternal Psychological Control	2.37	.89	2.32	.78	2.42	1.00	1.04
Maternal Overprotection	2.95	1.15	3.09	1.09	2.80	1.20	-2.32[*]
Maternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	1.85	.88	1.79	.79	1.92	.96	1.27
Maternal Guilt Induction	2.59	1.08	2.56	1.03	2.63	1.12	.51
Paternal Support	3.92	1.27	3.63	1.21	4.24	1.28	4.35[**]
Paternal Behavioral Control	3.64	1.14	3.40	1.07	3.90	1.16	3.98[**]

Paternal Psychological Control	2.22	.90	2.25	.92	2.19	.87	-.60
Paternal Overprotection	2.29	1.07	2.27	1.03	2.31	1.13	.36
Paternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	1.84	.83	1.90	.85	1.78	.80	-1.26
Paternal Guilt Induction	2.31	.96	2.30	.97	2.33	.94	.29

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

3.2 Correlations between Variables

Pearson correlations were computed to see the pattern and the strength of the associations between variables. Table 3.2 demonstrates the correlation coefficients between promotion and prevention focuses for both scales and parenting dimensions.

The correlations between direct and indirect (implicit) measure of self-regulatory focus were partially supported the expectations. Prevention focus from Promotion/Prevention Scale (PPS) was positively correlated with prevention focus ($r = .32$, $p < .01$) and negatively correlated with promotion focus ($r = -.16$, $p < .01$) from Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ). In addition, promotion focus by the PPS was positively correlated with both promotion ($r = .33$, $p < .01$) and prevention focus ($r = .25$, $p < .01$) by PVQ. Moreover, promotion and prevention measured with the PPS was positively correlated ($r = .18$, $p < .01$) and the correlation between promotion and prevention measured with the PVQ was insignificant ($r = -.03$, *n.s.*).

The prevention focus measured with the PVQ was positively correlated with maternal overprotection ($r = .12$, $p < .05$), paternal behavioral control ($r = .15$, $p < .01$) and paternal overprotection ($r = .15$, $p < .01$). However, correlation between promotion focus measured with the PVQ and all of the parenting dimensions was

insignificant. Correlations also revealed that prevention focus measured with the PPS was positively correlated with maternal overprotection ($r = .24$, $p < .01$) and paternal overprotection ($r = .20$, $p < .01$), maternal psychological control ($r = .23$, $p < .01$) and paternal psychological control ($r = .27$, $p < .01$), maternal blaming and love withdrawal ($r = .21$, $p < .01$) and paternal blaming and love withdrawal ($r = .21$, $p < .01$), maternal guilt induction ($r = .13$, $p < .05$) and paternal guilt induction ($r = .18$, $p < .01$). In addition, promotion focus measured with the PPS was positively correlated with maternal support ($r = .22$, $p < .01$) and paternal support ($r = .17$, $p < .01$), maternal behavioral control ($r = .16$, $p < .01$) and paternal behavioral control ($r = .16$, $p < .01$) and paternal overprotection ($r = .12$, $p < .05$).

Maternal and paternal behavioral control were strongly correlated ($r = .58$, $p < .01$) and, the correlation between maternal and paternal support was moderate ($r = .36$, $p < .01$). The, correlation between maternal and paternal psychological control ($r = .46$, $p < .01$), maternal and paternal overprotection ($r = .46$, $p < .01$), maternal and paternal blaming and love withdrawal ($r = .44$, $p < .01$), and maternal and paternal guilt induction ($r = .52$, $p < .01$) were all strongly correlated that participants perceived maternal and paternal behaviors similarly.

Finally, maternal support was positively correlated with maternal behavioral control ($r = .56$, $p < .01$), negatively correlated with maternal overprotection ($r = -.18$, $p < .01$). Moreover, maternal psychological control was negatively correlated with maternal behavioral control ($r = -.19$, $p < .01$) and support ($r = -.44$, $p < .01$), while positively correlated with maternal overprotection ($r = .48$, $p < .01$). Moreover, paternal overprotection was found to be positively correlated with paternal psychological control ($r = .43$, $p < .01$), guilt induction ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) and blaming and love withdrawal ($r = .36$, $p < .01$). Inversely, paternal support was negatively correlated with paternal psychological control ($r = -.28$, $p < .01$), guilt induction ($r = -.28$, $p < .01$) and blaming and love withdrawal ($r = -.46$, $p < .01$).

Table 3.2 Pearson Correlations between the Promotion and Prevention Focus and Parenting Variables (N = 320)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Promotion Focus	-													
Prevention Focus	.18**	-												
Maternal Support	.22**	-.05	-											
Maternal Behavioral Control	.16**	-.09	.56**	-										
Maternal Psychological Control	-.02	.23**	-.44**	-.19**	-									
Maternal Overprotection	.11	.24**	-.18**	.02	.48**	-								
Maternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	-.09	.21**	-.56**	-.27**	.80**	.44**	-							
Maternal Guilt Induction	-.04	.13*	-.35**	-.09	.65**	.48**	.69**	-						
Paternal Support	.17**	-.10	.36**	.34**	-.17**	-.15**	-.19**	-.19**	-					
Paternal Behavioral Control	.16**	-.09	.34**	.58**	-.16**	-.06	-.17**	-.15**	.66**	-				
Paternal Psychological Control	.01	.27**	-.17**	-.12*	.46**	.35**	.38**	.36**	-.28**	-.11	-			
Paternal Overprotection	.12**	.20**	.05	.06	.32**	.46**	.30**	.26**	.04	.19*	.43**	-		
Paternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	-.08	.21**	-.17**	-.15**	.43**	.34**	.44**	.44**	-.46**	-.29**	.77**	.36**	-	
Paternal Guilt Induction	.09	.18**	-.15**	-.10	.38**	.31**	.37**	.52**	-.27**	-.11	.65**	.38**	.65**	

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2–tailed), **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

3.3 Value Domains

In this section, first, to further investigate the relationship between direct and indirect measures of self-regulatory focus, Pearson correlations between value domains of PVQ, promotion-prevention focus and parenting behaviors were computed. As expected, hedonism was significantly positively correlated with promotion focus ($r = .14$, $p < .01$) and negatively correlated with prevention focus ($r = -.22$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the correlation between hedonism and paternal/maternal support was positive ($r = .14$, $p < .05$, $r = .12$, $p < .05$ respectively), whereas correlation between hedonism and maternal overprotection was negative ($r = -.13$, $p < .01$). Both stimulation and self-direction were correlated with promotion focus only ($r = .17$, $p < .01$, $r = .29$, $p < .01$ respectively). Tradition was found to be positively correlated with promotion ($r = .11$, $p < .05$) and prevention focus ($r = .28$, $p < .01$), and also with parenting behaviors of maternal and paternal overprotection ($r = .12$, $p < .05$, $r = .12$, $p < .05$ respectively). Furthermore, conformity was significantly positively correlated with self- regulatory focuses ($r = .28$, $p < .01$, $r = .29$, $p < .01$ for promotion and prevention respectively), maternal support ($r = .13$, $p < .05$) and paternal behavioral control ($r = .14$, $p < .05$). Finally, the correlation between security and promotion-prevention focuses was significant ($r = .41$, $p < .01$, $r = .23$, $p < .01$ respectively). Besides, security was positively correlated with maternal and paternal support ($r = .12$, $p < .05$, $r = .14$, $p < .05$ respectively), maternal and paternal behavioral control ($r = .15$, $p < .01$, $r = .20$, $p < .01$ respectively), and maternal and paternal overprotection ($r = .12$, $p < .05$, $r = .15$, $p < .01$ respectively). Overall, the correlations between the PVQ value domains and parenting were either insignificant or weakly significant.

Table 3.3 Pearson Correlations between the PVQ Value Domains, Promotion and Prevention Focus and Parenting Variables (N = 320)

	Hedonism	Stimulation	Self-Direction	Tradition	Conformity	Security
Promotion Focus	.14[*]	.17[**]	.29[**]	.11[*]	.28[**]	.41[**]
Prevention Focus	-.22[**]	-.05	-.11	.28[**]	.29[**]	.23[**]
Maternal Support	.12[*]	.04	.06	-.02	.13[*]	.12[*]
Maternal Behavioral Control	.06	-.03	-.02	-.05	.10	15[**]
Maternal Psychological Control	-.05	.08	.05	.02	-.03	.05
Maternal Overprotection	-.13[*]	-.05	-.05	.12[*]	.05	.12[*]
Maternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	-.08	-.01	-.06	.05	-.09	-.02
Maternal Guilt Induction	-.01	.00	.00	.00	-.06	-.02
Paternal Support	.14[*]	.05	.04	-.02	.11	.14[*]
Paternal Behavioral Control	.02	.01	-.01	.02	.14[*]	.20[**]
Paternal Psychological Control	-.04	.05	.07	.07	-.07	-.01
Paternal Overprotection	-.05	-.03	-.03	.12[*]	.08	.15[**]
Paternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	.02	.06	.00	.02	-.10	-.04
Paternal Guilt Induction	-.03	.02	.07	.07	.01	.09

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2–tailed),

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression analyses were conducted to test the unique power of parenting variables in predicting promotion and prevention focuses measured by the PVQ, and the PPS. In addition, whether of the value domains composing promotion (self-direction, stimulation, and hedonism) and prevention (security, tradition, and conformity) predict the two regulatory focuses measured by the PPS regression analyses were run.

Results indicated that chronic promotion focus was significantly predicted by self-direction (β =.24, $p < .01$) and security (β =.33, $p < .01$, R^2 =. 23, F (6, 308) = 15.32, $p < .01$), suggesting that as the level of self-direction (promotion focus related value domain) and security needs (prevention focus related value domain) increases, level of promotion focus increased.

Regression predicting prevention focus on the same value domains showed that, hedonism (β = -.21, $p < .05$), self-direction (β = -.12, $p < .06$) and security (β =.16, $p < .05$) significantly predicted prevention focus (R^2 =. 15, F (6, 308) = 8.65, $p < .01$). As expected, low levels of hedonism and self-direction (marginally significant) and high levels of security needs are associated with prevention focus. In sum, results demonstrated that security needs were related to both self-regulatory focuses in this sample. Moreover, value domains predicting promotion focus negatively predicted the prevention focus.

Table 3.4 Regression Analyses Examining the Value-Based Predictors of Chronic Prevention and Promotion Focus

Variables	Promotion Focus β	Prevention Focus β
Hedonism (Promotion Related)	.05	-.21[**]
Stimulation (Promotion Related)	-.04	.12
Self-Direction (Promotion Related)	.24[***]	-.12[†]
Tradition (Prevention Related)	-.03	.06
Conformity (Prevention Related)	.10	.14
Security (Prevention Related)	.33[***]	.16[*]
R²	.23	.15

[*] p<.05, [**] p<.05, [***] p<.001, [†] p<.06

3.4 Predicting Promotion Focus from Parenting Variables

Promotion and prevention focuses were predicted from the maternal and paternal parenting variables separately using a series of regression analyses. Analyses were repeated for both genders separately to see if the patterns of the predicted relationships vary by gender. Mother education and father education were controlled to remove the effects of these variables on the relationship between chronic self-regulatory focus and parenting behaviors. Direct (PPS) and indirect (PVQ) measures of self-regulatory focuses were included in the regression analyses. However, none of the maternal and paternal parenting behaviors predicted promotion and prevention regulatory focuses measured with the PVQ.

Chronic promotion focus was predicted by maternal overprotection (β = .15, p < .05), and maternal support (β =.24, p < .01), maternal behavioral control and psychological control were insignificant (R^2 =. 06, F (4, 313) = 5.32, p < .01). Results indicated that as the level of overprotection and support exerted by mothers increased, level of promotion focus increased. Any of the maternal parenting variables did not significantly predict females' promotion focus. However, same variables predicted males' promotion focus (β =.20, p < .05 for maternal overprotection, β =.38, p < .01 for maternal support, R^2 =. 14, F (4, 162) = 6.64, p < .01). Besides, none of the paternal parenting variables predicted chronic promotion focus (Table 3.5).

When the subscales of psychological control were considered, regression analysis was yielded that only maternal overprotection (β = .17, p < .01) and maternal support (β =.19, p < .01) predicted chronic promotion focus (R^2 =. 07, F (5, 311) = 4.61, p < .01). Moreover, any of the maternal parenting variables did not predict females' promotion focus, whereas maternal overprotection (β = .23, p < .01) and support (β =.27, p < .01, R^2 =. 14, F (5, 161) = 5.25, p < .01) were significant predictors of males' promotion focus. Besides, for paternal parenting variables, only paternal guilt induction predicted promotion focus (β =.16, p < .05, R^2 =. 06, F (5, 312) = 4.12, p < .01), suggesting that higher levels of paternal guilt induction increased the likelihood of chronic promotion focus. While paternal parenting

variables did not predict males' promotion focus, only guilt induction predicted females' promotion focus (β =.27, p < .05, R^2 =. 10, F (5, 145) = 3.08, p < .05) (Table 3.6).

In summary, the results of the analyses yielded that maternal overprotection, and support were associated with chronic promotion focus. Moreover, gender effects revealed that these relations were occurred only among males. However, interestingly paternal guilt induction was found to be associated with females' promotion focus. All of these parenting variables were found to be related with high levels of promotion focus.

Table 3.5 Model Summary of Regression Analyses Examining the Predictors of Chronic Promotion Focus

	Promotion Focus		
	General	Male	Female
Variables	β	β	β
Maternal Support	.24**	.38***	.09
Maternal Behavioral Control	.00	-.14	.10
Maternal Psychological Control	.01	-.08	.04
Maternal Overprotection	.15*	.20*	.12
R²	.06	.14	.04
Paternal Support	.11	.14	.05
Paternal Behavioral Control	.08	-.01	.19
Paternal Psychological Control	.04	.02	.11
Paternal Overprotection	.11	.10	.09
R²	.05	.03	.07

*p<.05, **p<.05, ***p<.001

Table 3.6 Regression Analyses Examining the Predictors of Chronic Promotion Focus from the Subscales of Psychological Control

	Promotion Focus		
	General	Male	Female
Variables	β	β	β
Maternal Support	.19*	.27**	.11
Maternal Behavioral Control	.03	-.07	.10
Maternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	-.04	-.18	.05
Maternal Guilt Induction	-.03	.00	-.04
Maternal Overprotection	.17**	.23**	.14
R²	.07	.14	.04
Paternal Support	.11	.16	.02
Paternal Behavioral Control	.05	-.04	.16
Paternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	-.12	-.05	-.18
Paternal Guilt Induction	.16*	.08	.27*
Paternal Overprotection	.11	.11	.08
R²	.06	.04	.10

*p<.05, **p<.05, ***p<.001

3.5 Predicting Prevention Focus

The same procedure used for chronic promotion focus was followed to predict the effects of parenting variables on chronic prevention focus. Firstly, psychological control was used as a single dimension. Regression analysis yielded that chronic prevention focus was predicted by maternal behavioral control ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$), overprotection ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$) and psychological control ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .09$, $F(4, 313) = 7.42$, $p < .01$). Thus, while the behavioral control exerted by mothers increased, level of chronic prevention focus decreased. Conversely, high maternal overprotection and support were found to be associated with high levels of chronic prevention focus. When gender added to analyses, only maternal behavioral control ($\beta = -.26$, $p < .05$) and overprotection significantly predicted female prevention focus ($\beta = .30$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .17$, $F(4, 146) = 7.29$, $p < .01$). Furthermore, the maternal parenting variables did not predict the males' prevention focus. Results of the analysis conducted with paternal parenting variables revealed that psychological control ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$) predicted prevention focus and paternal overprotection marginally significantly predicted prevention focus ($\beta = .12$, $p < .06$, $R^2 = .08$, $F(4, 314) = 6.73$, $p < .01$). In consequence, high levels of paternal psychological control and to some extent overprotection were linked with high levels of chronic prevention focus. While paternal behavioral control ($\beta = -.23$, $p < .05$) and psychological control ($\beta = .25$, $p < .05$) were significant predictors of females' prevention focus ($R^2 = .15$, $F(4, 146) = 6.62$, $p < .01$), only paternal overprotection ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$) predicted males' prevention focus ($R^2 = .07$, $F(4, 163) = 2.83$, $p < .05$). That is, as the levels of maternal behavioral control decreased and psychological control increased, females became more prevention focused. Moreover, increased levels of paternal overprotection, led to increase on males' chronic prevention focus (Table 3.7).

Guilt induction and blaming and love withdrawal were added to the analyses to clarify the effects of psychological control on prevention focus. Maternal overprotection ($\beta = .19$, $p < .01$) and blaming and love withdrawal ($\beta = .28$, $p < .01$) predicted prevention focus, also maternal support marginally significantly predicted prevention focus ($\beta = .15$, $p < .10$, $R^2 = .10$, $F(5, 311) = 6.68$, $p < .01$) indicating that

high maternal overprotection, blaming and love withdrawal and support seem to result in a prevention focus tendency among the participants.

The potential gender effects were also investigated by conducting the analyses separately for males and females. Results yielded that maternal behavioral control (β = -.23, $p < .05$), overprotection ($\beta = .26$, $p < .01$), support ($\beta = .28$, $p < .05$) and blaming and love withdrawal ($\beta = .38$, $p < .01$) were significant predictors of females' prevention focus ($R^2 =. 21$, $F (5, 144) = 7.51$, $p < .05$). Besides, none of the maternal parenting variables predicted prevention focus in the male group. Finally, only paternal overprotection predicted prevention focus ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$, $R^2 =. 06$, $F (5, 312) = 4.02$, $p < .01$). In predicting prevention focus, paternal behavioral control significantly predicted females' prevention focus ($\beta = -.25$, $p < .05$, $R^2 =. 14$, $F (5, 145) = 4.56$, $p < .01$) and paternal overprotection significantly predicted males' prevention focus ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$, $R^2 =. 06$, $F (5, 161) = 1.95$, $p < .10$). While higher paternal overprotection led to higher levels of males' prevention focus, lower paternal behavioral control led to higher levels of males' prevention focus (Table 3.8).

In sum, results of these analysis revealed that while maternal behavioral control was found to be related with low levels of chronic prevention focus, recollections of maternal overprotection and psychological control, paternal psychological control and overprotection (marginally significant) were found to be related with high levels of chronic prevention focus. Furthermore, maternal and paternal behavioral control, maternal overprotection and paternal psychological control were found to be uniquely related to females' prevention focus. However, only paternal overprotection predicted males' prevention focus. Among subscales of psychological control, blaming and love withdrawal was significantly associated with prevention focus with maternal and paternal overprotection, maternal support (marginally significant). When gender was added to the analyses, while all of the maternal parenting variables except guilt induction were related with prevention focus of females', any of theses variables did not predict males' prevention focus.

Table 3.7 Regression Analyses Examining the Parenting Predictors of Chronic Prevention Focus

	Prevention Focus		
	General	Male	Female
Variables	β	β	β
Maternal Support	.13	.09	.19
Maternal Behavioral Control	-.14[*]	-.02	-.26[*]
Maternal Psychological Control	.17[*]	.15	.14
Maternal Overprotection	.18[**]	.07	.30[**]
R²	.09	.04	.17
Paternal Support	.02	.03	.02
Paternal Behavioral Control	-.10	.05	-.23[*]
Paternal Psychological Control	.20[**]	.11	.25[*]
Paternal Overprotection	.12[†]	.17[*]	.07
R²	.08	.07	.15

[*]p<.05, [**]p<.01, [***]p<.001, [†]p<.06

Table 3.8 Regression Analyses Examining the Predictors of Chronic Prevention Focus from the Subscales of Psychological Control

	Prevention Focus		
	General	Male	Female
Variables	β	β	β
Maternal Support	.15†	.09	.28*
Maternal Behavioral Control	-.12	.02	-.23*
Maternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	.28***	.20	.38**
Maternal Guilt Induction	-.11	-.14	-.09
Maternal Overprotection	.19**	.10	.26**
R²	.10	.04	.21
Paternal Support	.02	.02	.01
Paternal Behavioral Control	-.11	.07	-.25*
Paternal Blaming and Love Withdrawal	.07	.05	.02
Paternal Guilt Induction	.07	.00	.16
Paternal Overprotection	.15*	.19*	.11
R²	.06	.06	.14

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, †p<.06

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of the study was to examine the parenting behaviors predicting promotion and prevention focus. Perceived parenting behaviors were psychological control, behavioral control, support, overprotection, blaming and love withdrawal and guilt induction assessed for mothers and fathers separately. Besides, chronic self-regulatory focus was measured by two devices including a direct measure, namely Promotion/Prevention Scale (PPS) and an indirect measure, namely Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ). In order to assess the chronic self-regulatory focus from different perspective, the sample was selected from university freshmen considering the assumptions of Regulatory Focus Theory (RFT) suggesting that regulatory focus fully develops up to sixteen years. The results of the current study were discussed below considering the relevant literature.

4.1 Descriptive Information about the Study Variables

In general, means and correlations between study variables were mostly in expected direction. First, as would be expected, positive parenting behaviors were perceived at higher levels than the negative parenting behaviors. Furthermore, the means for maternal parenting behaviors were perceived higher than the paternal parenting behaviors suggesting that maternal behaviors are still perceived higher than paternal behaviors consistent with mothers' primary role in child socialization process (Collins, 1992).

The mean values for maternal and paternal support were the highest among the parenting variables in parallel with the conceptualization of the support derived from the attachment theory. Parental support appears to be the most salient parenting behavior implying the critical role of attachment security over the attachment insecurity (Barber et al., 2005). Moreover, in numerous studies positive effects of parental support have been shown and it is assumed that parental support is one of the universal parenting behaviors with no or little cultural variation (Kağıtçıbaşı,

2007). As expected, levels of maternal and paternal behavioral control were perceived similar to the level of parental support, suggesting that behavioral control is perceived positively by late adolescents in Turkish culture, and participants reported higher levels of behavioral control for their mothers than their fathers. Results were consistent with the past research showing that mothers are more behaviorally controlling than fathers and this control is more influential than the father control, because of the fathers' routine absence from daily family management activities in general (Barber et al., 2005).

Psychological control dimensions were perceived at various levels. Accordingly, overprotection and guilt induction were perceived higher than the blaming and love withdrawal. This finding can be explained by the particular emphasis on overprotection and guilt induction in Turkish culture. Wu and his colleagues (2002) showed that culturally valued and normative parenting behaviors are widely used and performed at higher levels relative to other parenting behaviors. Hence, overprotection and guilt induction seem to be normative and widely used parenting behaviors in Turkish culture. Moreover, Rudy and Grusec (2006) found that psychologically controlling behaviors are not harmful in cultures valuing these behaviors. Therefore, it is assumed that while blaming and love withdrawal represents relatively detrimental aspects of psychological control, overprotection and guilt induction seem to correspond to the normative aspects of psychological control in Turkish culture.

Correlational analysis demonstrated that the relationships between variables were mostly in expected direction. Promotion focus was correlated with promoting parenting behaviors such as support and behavioral control for both mothers and fathers, and promotion focus was also positively correlated with overprotection. These findings are consistent with the cultural emphasis on the parental overprotection (Wu et al., 2002). In relational cultures parental overprotection may be perceived as just "protective" and "supportive" behaviors since it mirrors the parents' ideals and expectations from the child in terms of emotional interdependence which children are expected to achieve. Prevention focus was correlated with the psychological control and dimensions of psychological control in

69

congruence with the assumption of the RFT that proposes punishing, criticizing, and controlling behaviors may result in prevention focus (Manian et al., 1998).

Psychological control was strongly negatively correlated with maternal and paternal support, as expected. Moreover, maternal psychological control was moderately correlated with maternal behavioral control, and paternal psychological control was not correlated with paternal behavioral control. Therefore, results partially supported that psychological and behavioral control are distinct dimensions rather than opposite ends of a continuum (Barber, 1996).

Parental support was negatively correlated with almost all of the psychological control dimensions. However, these correlations varied among the dimensions of psychological control. The highest correlation was between support and the blaming and love withdrawal, and the lowest correlation was between support and overprotection. It seems that parents who perform blaming and love withdrawal on their children are less likely to exert supportive behaviors. However, correlational analysis yielded that exerting guilt induction and especially overprotection does not exactly mean the absence of supportive behaviors.

Parental overprotection was modestly correlated with guilt induction and blaming and love withdrawal, whereas the correlation between blaming and love withdrawal and guilt induction was very high. This high correlation is somewhat problematic considering that both concept tap the similar behaviors and there is no evidence supporting the discriminate validity of these constructs. However, guilt induction and blaming and love withdrawal including specific parenting behaviors seemed to have distinct effects on regulatory focuses.

4.2 Comparison of the Measures and the Dominancy

The correlational analysis also yielded a number of unexpected relationships. First, prevention focus measured with the PPS was positively correlated with prevention focus and negatively correlated with promotion focus measured with the PVQ, in expected direction. However, promotion focus measured with the PPS was positively correlated with both promotion and prevention focus measured with the PVQ unexpectedly. Moreover, whereas the correlation between promotion and

prevention focus measured with the PPS was significant and positive, the correlation between promotion and prevention focus measured with the PVQ was insignificant. While promotion focus measured with the PVQ was not significantly correlated with parenting behaviors, prevention focus measured with the PVQ was positively correlated with maternal and paternal overprotection, and paternal behavioral control only.

The relationship between promotion and prevention focus was explained by two competing approaches. One of them assumes that relationship between them should be orthogonal (Higgins, 1996) and the other one assumes that promotion and prevention focuses can occur at the opposite poles of a dimension with negative correlations (Kluger et al., 2001). Correlations between subscales of the PVQ supported the proposition of the RFT that assumes orthogonal dimensions. Moreover, positive modest correlation occurred among the subscales of the PPS, congruently, similar modest correlation was found between the subscales of Event Reaction Questionnaire developed by Higgins and his colleagues to measure chronic promotion and prevention focus (Higgins et al., 2001).

The relationship between promotion and prevention focus is suggested to depend on distinct antecedents. The RFT assumes that promotion focus is associated with self-actualization needs, and prevention focus is associated with security needs (Higgins, 1997). Moreover, these focuses are suggested to develop among the certain parent-child interaction modes (Higgins, 1989). Accordingly, relationship between the promotion and prevention focuses can be better understood by investigating the underlying constructs such as value domains. Besides, indirect measures of regulatory focus such as the PVQ can be validated by exploring the relationships between them and other relevant measures. Although the PVQ have been used to measure self-regulatory focuses in previous studies, it was not compared with other measures of regulatory focus before. In order to explain insignificant and unexpected correlations, relationship between promotion and prevention focus, and value domains of the PVQ constituting regulatory focuses was tested.

Correlational analysis revealed that within the dimensions constituting promotion focus, only hedonism was positively correlated with maternal and paternal

support, and negatively correlated with maternal overprotection. Stimulation and self-direction value domains were not correlated with any of the parenting behaviors. Moreover, tradition, one of the value domains composing prevention focus, was positively correlated with maternal overprotection, and another domain composing prevention focus, conformity, was positively correlated with maternal support and paternal behavioral control. Finally, security was positively correlated with both maternal and paternal overprotection, maternal and paternal support, and maternal and paternal behavioral control. Briefly, values based promotion focus had significant correlations with the promotion focus in expected direction. However, they were weakly correlated with parenting behaviors unexpectedly. Prevention focus related values were found to be correlated with promotion and prevention focus and with various parenting behaviors. Cultural differences on value hierarchy may be one of the explanations of these conflicting findings. Schwartz (1992) yielded that values are universal but cultural differences occur in terms of particular emphasis on certain values. İmamoğlu and Karakitapoğlu-Aygün (1999) confirmed Schwartz' proposition on Turkish culture. Turkish parents were found to be paying more attention to other-related values, such as conformity and tradition. Thus, message conveyed via parenting behaviors performed by Turkish parents may include other-related values dominantly rather than individual values, such as hedonism and stimulation.

Tradition, conformity and security were found to be correlated with positive parenting behaviors such as support and behavioral control, and overprotection as well. Specifically, tradition was positively correlated with maternal and paternal overprotection, and conformity was positively correlated with maternal support and paternal behavioral control. Finally, security was positively correlated with all of the parenting behaviors except psychological control and its dimensions including blaming and love withdrawal and guilt induction. These results can be explained considering cultural patterns and beliefs in parenting. In other words, parents' emphasis on culturally pervasive values such as conformity and security may partly determine their overarching parenting behaviors (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Therefore, parenting behaviors such as overprotection, behavioral control and support may serve function for the children's internalization of the idealized and

emphasized values. Accordingly, in line with the previous research (İmamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 1999), these behaviors may help to internalize other-related values. However, it should be noted that these relations were only correlational and should be investigated deeply.

Regression analysis yielded that hedonism, self-direction, and security predicted prevention focus. Specifically, lower levels of hedonism and self-direction were associated with higher levels of prevention focus unexpectedly. However, in this sample, higher levels of security were related to higher levels of prevention focus inconsistent with what would be expected by RFT. Direction of the relationship between hedonism, self-direction, and prevention focus was in expected direction, and partially supported the assumption referring to the opposite ends of a dimension (Kluger et al., 2001). Although relationship between these values and prevention focus challenged the orthogonality assumption between prevention and promotion focuses proposed by RFT (Higgins, 1996). Furthermore, why the relationship between hedonism, stimulation, and promotion focus was insignificant remained unanswered. Similarly, according to the regression results, tradition and conformity was found to be unrelated to prevention focus. Although value domains related to promotion focus are placed in the same higher-order category and value domains related to prevention focus are placed in the same higher-order category such as other-related values, specific relationship patterns between value domains and regulatory focuses may occur. For instance, there may be dominating values comprising promotion and prevention focus such as self-direction and security. These issues should be explored in future studies.

The most interesting relationship was observed between the security domains of values and regulatory focuses. Security values predicted both prevention and promotion focus in parallel with the correlational analysis, and unexpectedly, the relationship between security and promotion focus was stronger than the relationship between security and prevention focus and the difference between the correlations was significant, suggesting that security is strongly associated with promotion rather than prevention focus in Turkish sample. First of all, it seems that there is a theoretical confusion on the conceptualization of security needs. Schwartz (1992)

73

defined eleven motivational domains and assumed that they are universal and tap biological and survival needs. According to value survey research, three main value domain groups were defined. One of them was named individual values that include hedonism and self-direction which were also referring promotion related values. The second one was named collective values that include tradition and conformity which were also related to prevention focus and finally he defined the third factor as including both interests. This third grouped composed by security and spirituality domains. Therefore, it was found that security needs include both interests and accordingly both promotion and prevention focuses. Although, results of this study did not support the premises of the RFT, results were in accordance with the findings of Schwartz's value theory. As a result, it seems that more empirical research investigating these relationships is needed when using the PVQ as a measure of self-regulatory focus.

Although value theory assumes that values are placed on the opposite ends such as security on one end and self-direction on the opposite of security, and simultaneous pursuit of them leads to the psychological tension, interestingly security and self-direction predicted promotion focus in the same direction. Conceptualization of the RFT on regulatory focus may be one of the explanations of these findings. According to the RFT, promotion focus refers to a motivation for approaching ideals. Thus, when security placed as a higher order value on the value hierarchy, it may motivate individuals to achieve security and satisfaction in life. In other words, security needs may become an ideal for individuals and may serve as a fundamental basis promotion motivation. Consistent with this proposition, Turkish cultural context was found to be emphasizing both familial and national security (İmamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 1999). Therefore, in cultural contexts which are idealizing security needs by setting those needs to higher order on value hierarchy, there may be a positive relationship between higher levels of security needs and promotion focus.

In addition to above explanations, individuals may want to feel secure either familial or national in order to approach ideals, achievements, and accomplishments. If so, this process is similar to attachment theory's secure base that is children can

explore environment only under secure environments (Bell & Ainsworth, 1972). Thus, individuals may seek security, namely want to be sure about the absence of negative outcomes or threats (prevention focus), to achieve positive outcomes (promotion focus). Accordingly, promotion and prevention focuses may not operate distinctively rather they may operate hand in hand. That is to say, security values may be functioning as a "secure base" for promotion motivation.

This explanation also sheds some light to the significant positive correlations between promotion and prevention focuses. Moreover, conceptualization of cooperating promotion and prevention focus explains why these focuses occurred at moderate to high levels at individual level. That is, presence of one focus does not mean the absence of other. Furthermore, higher levels of promotion focus relative to prevention focus may be the result of simultaneous occurrence of them. Accordingly, feeling secure may divert individuals' attention directly to the promotion focused motivation rather than prevention focus. Finally, it should be noted that cognitive processes behind these relationships should also be investigated. For instance, seeking security before promotion-focused motivation or behavior may occur at conscious or unconscious level. However, these speculations do not have adequate empirical support. Further invstigation is needed to beter understand the nature of these relationships.

4.3 Psychological Control and Regulatory Focuses

One of the major concerns of the study was to investigate the relationship between psychological control considering its specific dimensions and self-regulatory focuses. Past research investigating this relationship did not find significant relationships between controlling parenting and regulatory focuses. However, this study took a new insight to the relationships by including different aspects of parental control, especially psychological control. First, psychological control was found to be related to prevention focus in expected direction and was not related to promotion focus. Specifically, both maternal and paternal psychological control were related to higher levels of prevention focus in line with the assumptions of attachment theory and previous research (Manian et al., 1998). That is, in previous studies it was showed that both prevention focus and psychological control were

associated with externalizing problems such as cynical hostility and aggression (e.g., Barber et al., 1994; Keller et al., 2008). Therefore, results confirmed the expectation that psychological control predicts higher levels of prevention focus. Moreover, these results supported the assumption that psychological control has detrimental effects on individual's self, motivate them to prevent negative outcomes to fulfill duties, and obligations set by parents. For instance, individuals can obtain regard in conditions which he/she fulfill ought standards. Although the results revealed that psychological control are associated with prevention focus, it is not exactly a clear support for the attachment theory's assumption (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). Since it is still unclear if prevention focus is a fragile self-concept resulting from the negative parenting behaviors or it is an accomodation strategy for the negative parenting behaviors aiming to avoid pain. According to attachment theory, this kind of unresponsive and insensitive parenting behaviors prevent the development of secure attachment and promotion focus. However, according to the RFT, promotion focus can be developed in either positive or negative parenting experiences. Besides, previous studies revealed competing findings on the working principles and outcomes of the prevention focus such as goal pursuit and motivation. Thus, to better understand the antecedents and implications of the regulatory focuses, underlying processes of the prevention focus needs further exploration with.

Although, the effects of psychological control on self-regulatory focuses explored, dimensions composing psychological control were investigated to better explore its effects on regulatory focuses. Although, previous research on psychological control has shown that it includes various dimensions (e.g., Olsen et al., 2002), the unique effects of these dimensions on regulatory focus or on outcome behaviors was not examined in previous studies. Furthermore, effects of psychological control were found to vary among cultures (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007; Wu et al., 2002), especially some culture-relevant dimensions of psychological control such as overprotection, may have specific effects.

In this study, it was found that maternal blaming and love withdrawal, maternal and paternal overprotection predicted higher levels of prevention focus. Though, guilt induction did not contribute to the prevention focus, there was a trend on the

relationship between maternal guilt induction and prevention focus. Moreover, maternal overprotection and paternal guilt induction were also found to predict promotion focus. In general, different aspects of psychological control were related to different outcomes in terms of regulatory focuses. Moreover, effects of psychological control dimensions were complex and varied.

Blaming and love withdrawal with its strong effect on the prevention focus, seems to be the most detrimental result of psychological control. Effects of the blaming and love withdrawal dimension including constraining verbal expressions, invalidating feeling, personal attack, erratic emotional behaviors and love withdrawal on various child outcomes have been shown in numerous studies (see, Barber, 2002). For instance, like prevention focus orientation, these behaviors were found to be related to externalizing problems. However, the RFT assumes that love withdrawing behaviors are related with promotion focus. While interpreting these contradictions, it should be noted that there are some differences on the conceptualization of love withdrawal. According to the RFT, parents withdraw their love when the child does not accomplish their ideals and bolster their child when expected behaviors exist. That is, the RFT defines parent-child interaction mode including both positive and negative types of parenting behaviors. However, in this study love withdrawal with the other psychologically controlling behaviors was used as a single dimension and defined as an intrusion to the child's psychological situation. Thus, blaming and love withdrawal that includes combination of criticizing, yelling, and punishing behaviors were expectedly predicted prevention focus in congruence with the RFT.

Previous work on psychological control did not investigate the specific effects of guilt induction on child or adolescent outcomes. Thus, results contributed to the knowledge of both predictors of self-regulatory focus and the effects of the guilt induction. Although, blaming and love withdrawal predicted prevention focus, findings on guilt induction revealed a different pattern of relationships. Accordingly, guilt induction was not perceived as a negative parenting dimension, even paternal guilt induction played a promotive role by predicting promotion focus. It seems that experiences of guilt induction are not perceived as an intrusion to individual's psychological world. In other words, guilt induction may not convey a message to

individual about the duties and obligations, but to some extent guilt induction may convey a message about the wishes and aspirations. For instance, parents' telling their children that they make too much effort for them may lead children to focus on their parents' wishes and expectations to overcome the induced guilt. Moreover, this kind of interaction may become more important in cultural contexts emphasizing emotional interdependence. When parents get embarrassed and disappointed due to child misbehaviors, children may perceive these behaviors as involvement and parents' attention to them. Thus, guilt induction may not be perceived as rejecting parenting, rather it may be perceived as involvement and turns child attentions for meeting the expectations of his/her parents.

Parental overprotection yielded one of the most interesting findings within the psychological control dimensions. On the one hand, in parallel with the past research depending on the Western conceptualization (Britton & Fuendeling, 2005; Chorpita & Barlow, 1998), parental overprotection predicted prevention focus. Specifically, higher levels of both maternal and paternal overprotection were found to be related to higher levels of prevention focus. On the other hand, in parallel with the cultural perspective (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007; Wu et al., 2002) parental overprotection predicted the promotion focus. Specifically higher levels of maternal overprotection predicted the higher levels of promotion focus. One possible explanation may be parental overprotection has different aspects. For instance, Levy (1966) proposed that indulgent overprotective parents differ from the controlling overprotective parents (as cited in Thomasgaard & Metz, 1993). Accordingly, while controlling overprotective parents use love withdrawal and punishment, indulgent overprotective parents does not use this kind of parenting behaviors. Therefore, since the measure used in this study was not sensitive to the different aspects of parental overprotection, findings should be interpreted cautiously. Another plausible explanation is that parental overprotection should be related to both regulatory focuses. As discussed above, if promotion and prevention focuses operate similarly in terms of their bases on satisfying security needs, they may have similar antecedents. That is, overprotective parents' emphasis on obedience and dependency makes these salient and children may focus on oughts and presence of negative outcomes. However, because fulfilling those expectations are parents' ideals in some

cultural contexts, children's attention on them also may lead to focus on ideals, achievements, and accomplishments.

4.4 Positive Parenting Behaviors and Regulatory Focuses

It was hypothesized that parental support would be related to promotion focus and behavioral control would be associated with prevention focus. The findings provided partial support for the hypotheses. Maternal support was found to be related with promotion focus. Consistent with these results, Manian and his colleagues (1998) found that maternal warmth was associated with ought self-regulatory orientation (prevention focus).

Attachment theory proposed that responsive and sensitive parenting behaviors lead focusing on achievements and accomplishments (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2005). In line with the attachment theory's propositions, parental support including responsive and sensitive parenting behaviors (Barber et al., 2005) predicted the promotion focus. However, results on the comparison of measures seem to challenge the attachment theory's assumption. If regulatory focuses occur at similar levels and depend on the similar processes, promotion and prevention focuses can not be related to attachment security and insecurity respectively. Thus, it seems that there are still gaps that need further exploration on the nature of the promotion and prevention focuses.

Although, current study revealed robust findings on the positive effects of the parental support in line with the previous research, some unexpected findings were also obtained. When analyses were run separately for both genders, it was found that maternal support was found to be related to prevention focus for females but not males. Although the relationship occurred only among the mother-daughter dyad level, it is hard to give a plausible answer even considering the specific relationship patterns.

Consistent with the hypothesis, behavioral control was found to be associated with prevention focus. Similar relationship was found in previous research. For instance, behaviorally controlling parenting was consistently found to be associated with lower levels of externalizing problem behaviors (e.g., Barber et al., 2005). Since

monitoring and limit setting behaviors of parents and knowledge of child's whereabouts leads to development of high self-regulation, behaviorally controlled children can inhibit their externalizing behaviors such as aggression and hostility. Moreover, in a recent study it was found that prevention focus predicted externalizing problems such as aggression and cynical hostility (Keller et al., 2008). Thus, higher levels of behavioral control leads lower levels of prevention focus. Furthermore, results on the relationship between behavioral control and prevention focus supported the premises of the RFT. Hence, highly permissive and inattentive parenting behaviors are assumed to be related to weaker self-other contingency knowledge and lead to focus on ought self-guides to provide the parents' attention.

It should be noted that behavioral control has various aspects (Kerr & Stattin, 2000). Although, some aspects of the behavioral control, such as child's self-disclosure, are not directly related to parenting behaviors and parents' messages about the world in terms of regulatory focuses, behavioral control predicted prevention focus. Thus, effects of the controlling behaviors relevant to prevention focus such as parental monitoring and limit setting, seem to be clear. Effects of different aspects of the behavioral control should be investigated in future studies to explore possible culture-specific effects.

Finally, some differences between males and females in terms of the relationship between parenting behaviors and regulatory focuses were found. While maternal overprotection predicted females' prevention focus, paternal overprotection predicted males' prevention focus. Moreover, maternal overprotection was related to males' promotion focus. Besides, maternal and paternal behavioral control predicted only females' prevention focus and paternal guilt induction predicted females' promotion focus. Although, the RFT has no assumptions on the gender differences, to better explicate the relationship pattern, gender difference were investigated to better explicate the patterns of relationships in this study. Research on psychological control also ignored the specific effects of gender differences or parents' gender (Barber, 2002). Although, it is difficult to explain observed gender differences maternal and paternal parenting behaviors seem to have different implication for girls and boys depending on cultural expectations and gender-based socialization. Barber,

Bean and Erickson (2002) reported that only eleven studies investigated the effects of parental gender differences. Nine of them yielded that mothers exert higher levels of psychological control than fathers. Results of the study revealed the same pattern with the previous studies and this also may explain why maternal psychological control is more influential than paternal psychological control. One of the explanations for the relationship between maternal and paternal behavioral control and females' prevention focus may be the gender typed socialization. That is, parents may exert higher levels of controlling behaviors to their girls than their boys, and these behaviors are more influential on females' self-guides, because of the gender roles. Parents may provide more autonomy to their boys and accordingly they may exert less behavioral control. However, parents may want to ensure the dependency of their girls and may perform behavioral control dominantly (Kındap et al., 2008). In parallel with this explanation, maternal overprotection may help to internalization of the values on gender.

Overprotective behaviors may serve function for the maintenance of the dependency to the parents for females. On the contrary, both maternal and paternal overprotection helps to the development of promotion focus for males. It seems that both males and females perceive overprotective behaviors as protection but they have different goals in terms of parents' beliefs. Only a few studies investigated the gender effects on the relationship between psychological control and various outcomes and these studies yielded mixed findings (Barber et al., 2002).

4.5 Contributions of the Study

This study contributed to the current literature on the development of chronic self-regulatory focus in several ways. First of all, effects of specific parenting behaviors on promotion and prevention focuses were empirically tested.

In Turkish cultural context and supporting evidence was obtained for the systematic link between parenting behaviors and self-regulatory focuses. Specifically, it was found that psychological control as a general construct is linked with prevention focus. Behavioral control was also the significant predictor of

prevention focus. Moreover, parental support was found to predict promotion focus consistently and also predict prevention focus in certain conditions.

Third, effects of psychological control were investigated in detail by employing measures tapping different aspects of psychological control on self-regulatory focus. While blaming and love withdrawal significantly predicted prevention focus, guilt induction predicted promotion focus only in some conditions. Moreover, parental overprotection was found to be related to both promotion and prevention focus. Results suggested that psychological control includes a combination of various parenting behaviors that contribute to the self-regulation in several ways. Consideration of these findings with the positive correlations between promotion and prevention focus provide a new insight into the relationship between the types of regulatory focuses.

Fourth, relationship between self-regulatory focus and parenting behaviors was first tested in a non-Western sample. Results yielded some challenging findings for the assumptions of the RFT. Certain culturally relevant parenting behaviors seem to have different effects on the self-regulatory focus. For instance, parental overprotection predicted both promotion and prevention, and guilt induction predicted promotion focus. That is, promotion and prevention focus may operate similarly in all cultures but it may have different antecedents according to culture-specific attitudes and goals.

Fifth contribution of the study was the inclusion of father. Effects of paternal parenting behaviors were not tested before in previous studies. Although, the RFT does not have a specific assumption on gender differences, to better explicate the effects mothering and fathering, gender differences were tested in dyad level such as mother-son, father-daughter. The current study showed that unlike materenal parenting, paternal support and blaming and love withdrawal did not predict self-regulatory focuses. While paternal guilt induction predicted girls' promotion focus, paternal psychological, behavioral control and overprotection predicted prevention focus. Overall, although fathers have effects on specific parenting behaviors, it appears that mothers have relatively more influence than fathers on self-regulatory focuses of children.

82

Finally, this study provided evidence for the challenging assumptions on regulatory focus and dominancy of regulatory focuses by compaing direct and indirect measures. Although some indirect measures have been used to tap regulatory focuses, validity of the measures was not assessed before. Current study compared the PPS and the PVQ to explore these relationships. Specifically, security needs predicted both promotion and prevention focus, and promotion-related values predicted prevention focus negatively. These results showed that specific value domains have functions in self-regulatory focuses but their effects on parenting behaviors are still unclear.

4.6 Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for the Future

One of the limitations of the study was that retrospective method was used in assesing parenting behaviors. As the development of self-regulatory focus spreads in the first sixteen years of life, sample was selected almost from university freshmen in order to assess fully developed self-regulatory focus. Thus, parenting experiences of the first sixteen years were asked. Because of memory limitation and a number of bias motivations, some distortions may be possible in recalling past parenting behaviors. However, Brewin, Andrews, and Gotlib (1993) reported that caveats on the retrospective studies are exaggerated, future studies should also measure actual rather than perceived parenting behaviors.

Second limitation of the study was that some of critical parental behaviors were not included in the study. Although parental overprotection was added to the study in order to better explore the effects of psychological control, specific forms of behavioral control such as monitoring and child's self-disclosure should have also been assessed. According to the results, aspects of psychological control had different effects on the development of self-regulatory focus. Especially, it was found that psychological control behaviors had important culture-specific implications. Thus, some specific aspects of parental support and behavioral control may help to explain the relationship between these parenting behaviors and self-regulatory focuses.

The third limitation of the study was that socialization of self-regulatory focuses was investigated only in terms of parenting behaviors. Parenting behaviors helped to explain only the specific interaction patterns that contribute to the development of self-regulatory focus. However, parents' promotion and prevention goals, attitudes, and beliefs, by contributing to the regulatory focuses in various levels, may help to explore the whole picture as a model. Moreover, different types of child temperament may also influence the development of self-regulatory focus.

Finally, the correlational nature of the study and selection of sample only among university students can be seen critical limitations that preclude readers to make causal explanations.

Limitations of this study should be considered for future research. To prevent the limitations of the retrospective measures, development of self-regulatory focuses can be investigated by using longitudinal research design. Moreover, longitudinal designs may better explicate the regulatory focus' trajectories in terms of parent-child interactions. Besides, investigating regulatory focus as a process requires age-appropriate measures of self-regulatory focus in congruence with the parent-child interaction modes proposed by the RFT.

Considering the expected and unexpected findings of the study, cross-cultural patterns should be investigated to better illuminate the antecedents of regulatory focus in future research. Moreover, according to culture-specific antecedents of promotion and prevention focuses; specific motivational, emotional and behavioral implications of the regulatory focuses should also be investigated. Values and needs related to regulatory focuses were not investigated in previous studies.In future studies, it should be clarified that under which cultural and familial contexts and how parenting behaviors, attitudes, beliefs and values create tendencies for promotion and/or prevention focus or inclinations to approach pleasure and to avoid pain.

REFERENCES

Bell, S.M., & Ainswoth, M. D. S. (1972). Infant crying and maternal responsiveness. *Child Development, 43*, 1171-1190.

Anuola, K., & Nurmi, J. (2004). Maternal affection moderates the impact of psychological control on achild's mathematical performance. *Developmental Psychology, 6*, 965-978.

Anuola, K., & Nurmi, J. (2005). The role parenting styles in Children's problem behaviors. *Child Development, 6*, 1144-1159.

Assor, A., Roth, G, & Deci, E. L. (2004). The emotional costs of parents' conditional regard: A self-determination theory analysis. *Journal of Personality, 72*, 47-88.

Barber, B. K. (1992). Family, personality, and problem behaviors. *Journal of the Marriage and the Family, 54*, 69-79.

Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*, 3296-3319.

Barber, B. K. (2002). Reintroducing parental psychological control. In (Eds.), B. K. Barber, *Intrusive Parenting*, (pp. 3-15).Washington: American Psychological Association.

Barber, B. K., Bean, R. L., & Erickson, L. D. (2002). Expanding the study and understanding of psychological control. In (Eds.),B. K. Barber, *Intrusive Parenting*, (pp. 263-291).Washington: American Psychological Association.

Barber, B. K., Chadwick, B. A., & Oerter, R. (1992). Parental behaviors and adolescent self-esteem in the United States and the Germany. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54*, 128-141.

Barber, B. K., Maughan, S. L., & Olsen, J. A. (2005). Patterns of parenting across adolescence. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 108*, 1-13.

Barber, B. K., Olsen, J. E., & Shagle, S: C. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioral control and youth internalized and externalized behaviors. *Child Development, 65*, 1120-1136.

Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., & Olsen, J. A. (2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: Assessing relevance across time, culture, and method. In W. F. Overton (Eds.). *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, serial no. 282, 70, 4, (pp. 21-26). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Bargh, J. A., Higgins, E. T., & Lombardi, W. (1988). Automaticity of chronically accessible constructs in person x situation effects on person perception: It's just a matter of time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*, 599-605.

Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development, 38*, 291-327.

Bean, R. A., Barber B. K., & Crane, D. R. (2006). Parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control among African American youth. *Journal of Family Issues, 10*, 1335-1355.

Bean, R. A., Bush, K. R., McKenry, P. C., & Wilson, S. M. (2003). The impact of parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control on the academic achievement and self-esteem of African American and European American adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 5*, 523-541.

Bögels, S. M., & van Melick, M. (2004). The relationship between child-report, parent self report, and partner report of perceived parental rearing behaviors and anxiety in children and parents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 1583–1596.

Boldero, J., & Francis, J. (1999). Ideals, oughts, and self-regulation: Are there qualitatively distinct self-guides. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2*, 343-355.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment: Vol. 1. Attachment and Loss.* New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and Loss: Separation, anxiety and anger.* New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and Loss: Sadness and Depression.* New York: Basic Books.

Brazy, P. C., & Shah, J. Y. (2006). Strength and safety in numbers: Considering the social implications of regulatory focus. *Journal of Personality, 74*, 1647-1672.

Brewin, C. R., Andrews, B., & Gotlib, I. H. (1993). Psychopathology and early experience: A reappraisal of retrospective reports. *Psychological Bulletin, 1*, 82-98.

Britton, P. C., & Fuendeling, J. M. (2005). The Relations Among Varieties of Adult Attachment and the Components of Empathy. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 5*, 519–530.

Buss, D. (1996). The evolutionary psychology of human social strategies. In E. T. Higgins, & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 3-38). New York: Guilford Press.

Canetti, L., & Bachar, E. (1997). Parental bonding and mental health in adolescence. *Adolescence, 32*, 382-394.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1990).Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view. *Psychological Review, 1*, 19-35.

Carver. C. S., & White, T. L: (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*, 319-333.

Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D. (2000). Parental warmth, control, and indulgence and their relations to adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology, 3*, 401-419.

Chorpita, B. F., & Barlow, D. H. (1998). The development of anxiety: The role of control I early environment. *Psychological Bulletin, 1*, 3-21.

Chorpita, B. F., Brown, T. A., & Barlow, D. H. (1998). Perceived control as a mediator of family environment in etiological models of childhood anxiety. *Behavior Therapy, 29*, 457-476.

Collins, W. A. (1992). Parents' cognitions and developmental changes in relationships during adolescence. In I. Sigeli A. McGillicuddy-deLisa, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.). *Parental belief systems* (2nd ed., pp, 175-199). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Collins, N. L., Guichard, A. C., Ford, M. B., & Feeney, B. C. (2004). Working models of attachment: New developments and emerging themes. In W. S. Rholes, & J. A. Simpson (Eds.), *Adult attachment: Theory, research and clinical implications* (pp. 196-239). New York: Guilford Press.

Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision-making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 69*, 117-132.

Delaney, M. E. (1996). Across the transition to adolescence: Qualities of parent/adolescent relationship and adjustment. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 16*, 174-300.

Demirutku, K. (2007). *Parenting styles, internalization of values, and the self-concept*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Dickson, J. (2006). Perceived consequences underlying approach goals and avoidance goals in relation to anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*, 1527-1538.

Elliot, A. J., & Sheldon, K. M. (1997). Avoidance achievement motivation: A personal goal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1, 171-185.

Elliot, A. J., & Reis, H. T. (2003). Attachment and exploration in adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 317-331.

Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2003). Motivations for caregiving in adult intimate relationships: Influences on caregiving behavior and relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8*, 950-968.

Förster, J. Higgins E. T., & Idson, L. C. (1998). Approach and avoidance strength during goal attainment: Regulatory focus and the "goal looms larger" effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 115-1131.

Förster, J., Grant, H., Idson, L. C., & Higgins, E. T. (2001). Success/Failure feedback, expectancies, and approach/avoidance motivation: How regulatory focus moderates classic relations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 253-260.

Frank, E., & Brandstatter, V. (2002). Approach versus avoidance: Different types of commitment in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*, 208-222.

Freitas, A. L., & Higgins, E. T. (2002). Enjoying goal-directed action: The role of regulatory fit. *Psychological Science, 13*, 1-6.

Freitas, A. L., Liberman, N., & Higgins, E. T. (2002). Regulatory fit resisting temptation during goal pursuit. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 291-298.

Freitas, A. L., Liberman, N., Salovey, P., & Higgins, E. T. (2002). When to begin?: Regulatory focus and initiating goal pursuit. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 121-130.

Friedman, R. S., & Förster, J. (2001). The effects of promotion and prevention cues on creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 1001-1013.

Gable, S. (2006). Approach and avoidance social motives and goals. *Journal of Personality, 74*, 176-222.

Galambos, N. L., Barker, E. T., & Almeida, D. M. (2003). Parents do matter: Trajectories of change in externalizing and internalizing problems in early adolescence. *Child Development, 2*, 578-594.

Gerlsma, C. (2000). Recollections of parental care and quality of intimate relationships: The role of re-evaluating past attachment experiences. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 7*, 289-295.

Gerlsma, C., Emmelkamp, P. M. G., & Arrindell, W. A. (1990). Anxiety, depression, and perception of early parenting: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 10*, 251-277.

Goldstein, S. E., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Eccles, J. S. (2005). Parents, peers, and problem behavior: A longitudinal investigation of the impact of the relationship perception and characterictics on the development of adolescent problem behavior. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 401-413.

Gonzales, N. A., Pitts, S. C., Hill, N. E., & Roosa, M. W. (2000). A meditational model of the impact of interparental conflict on child adjustment in a multiethnic, low-income sample. *Journal of Family Psychology, 3*, 365-379.

Gray, J. A. (1982). *The neuropsychology of anxiety: an enquiry into the functions of the septo-hippocampal system.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenfeld, P. M., Keller, H., Fuligni, A., & Maynard, A. (2003). Cultural pathways through universal development. *Annual Reviews of Psychology, 54*, 461-490.

Grey, M. R., & Steinberg, L. (1999). Unpacking authoritative parenting: Reassessing a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 61*, 584-577.

Harter, S. (1999). *The construction of self: A developmental perspective.* New York: Guilford Press.

Hasebe, Y., Nucci, L., & Nucci, M. S. (2004). Parental control of the personal domain and adolescent symptoms of psychopathology: A cross-national study in Unites States and Japan. *Child Development, 3*, 815-828.

Herz, L., & Gullone, E. (1999). The Relationship between Self-Esteem and Parenting Style: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Australian and Vietnamese Australian Adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*, 742-761.

Higgins, E. T., & Silberman, I. (1998). Development of regulatory focus: Promotion and prevention as ways of living. In J. Heckhausen, & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Motivation and Self-regulation Across the Life Span*, (pp.78-113), New York: Cambridge University Press.

Higgins, E. T., & Spiegel, S. (2004). Promotion and prevention strategies for self-regulation: Amotivated cognition perspective. In R. F. Baumeister, & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-regulation: Research, theory and Applications*, (pp. 171-187). New York: Guilford Press.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 3*, 319-340.

Higgins, E. T. (1996a). Knowledge activation: Accessibility, applicability, and salience. In E. T. Higgins, & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles*. New York: Guilford Press.

Higgins, E. T. (1996b). The "Self Digest": Self-knowledge serving self-regulatory functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 1062-1083.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American psychologist, 52*, 1280-1300.

Higgins, E. T. (1999a). When do self-discrepancies have specific relations to emotions? The second-generation question of Tangney, Niendenthal, Covert, and Barlow (1998). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*, 1313-1317.

Higgins, E. T. (1999b). Promotion and prevention as a motivational duality. In S. Chaiken, & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology*, (pp. 503-529). New York: Guilford Press.

Higgins, E. T. (2000). Making a good decision: Value from fit. *American Psychologist, 55*, 1217-1230.

Higgins, E. T. (2001). Promotion and prevention experiences: Relating emotions to nonemotional motivational states. In J. P. Forgas (Eds.), *Handbook Affect and Social Cognition*, (pp. 186-211). New Jersey: Lawrance Earlbaum.

Higgins, E. T., Bargh, J. A., & Lombardi, W. (1985). Nature of priming effects on categorization. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 11*, 59-69.

Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R.S, Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achivement orientations from subjective histories of success: promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 3-23.

Higgins, E. T., Roney, C. J. R., Crowe, E., & Hymes, C. (1994). Ideal versus ought predilections for approach and avoidance: Distinct self-regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 276-286.

Higgins, E. T., Shah, J., & Friedman, R. (1997). Emotional responses to goal attainment: Strength of regulatory focus as moderator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 515-525.

Higgins, E.T. (1989). Continuities and discontinuities in self-regulatory and self-evaluative processes: A developmental theory relating self and affect. *Journal of Personality, 2*, 407-444.

İmamoğlu, E. O., & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (1999). 1970'lerden 1990'lara değerler: Üniversite düzeyinde gözlenen zaman, kuşak ve cinsiyet farklılıkları. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 14*, 1-18.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2007). *Family, Self, and Human Development across Cultures.* New York: Lawrance Earlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Keller J., Hurst, M., & Uskul, A. (2008, in press). Prevention-focused self-regulation and aggressiveness. *Journal of Research in Personality.*

Keller, J. (2007). When negative stereotypic expectancies turn into challenge or threat: The moderating role of regulatory focus. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 3*, 163-168.

Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, How they know it, and several forms of adolesceent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology, 3*, 366-380.

Kındap, Y., & Sayıl, M. (2008). *Direct and indirect effects of parenting on adolescents' psychosocial adaptation: The role of self-disclousure and perceived parental knowledge among Turkish adolescents.* Paper presented at the International Congress of Psychology. Berlin, Germany, 20-25 July, 2008.

Kındap, Y., Sayıl, M., & Kumru, A. (2008). Anneden algılanan kontrolün niteliği ile ergenin psikososyal uyumu ve arkadaşları arasındaki ilişkiler: Benlik Değerinin Aracı Rolü. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 23*, 92-107.

Kisbu, Y. (2006). *Influences of regulatory focus, core self evaluations and age on biases in perception and choice.* Unpublished master thesis, Koç University, İstanbul.

Kluger, A. N., Yaniv, I., & Kühberger, A. (2001, February). *Needs, self-regulation, and risk preference.* Paper presented at the 2nd Annual meeting of the Society of Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio, Texas.

Kochanska, G. (1993). Toward a synthesis of parental socialization and child temperament in early development of conscience. *Child Development, 64*, 325-347.

Krishnakumar, A., Buehler, C., & Barber, B. K. (2003). Youth perceptions of interparental conflict, ineffective parenting, and youth problem behaviors in European-American and African-American families. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2*, 239-260.

Kurdek, L. A., & Fine, M. A. (1994). Family acceptance and family control as predictors of adjustment in young adolescence: Linear, curvilinear, or interactive effects? *Child Development, 65*, 1137-1146.

Laird, R. D., Pettit, G. S., Dodge, K. A., & Bates, J. E. (2003). *Change in parents' monitoring knowledge: Links with parenting relationship quality, adolescent beliefs, and antisocial behaviors.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Levine, J. M., Higgins, E. T., & Choi, H. S. (2000). Development of strategic norms in groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 82*, 88-101.

Liberman, N., Idson, L. C., Camacho, C. J., & Higgins, E. T. (1999). Promotion and prevention choices between stability and change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*, 1135-1145.

Liberman, N., Molden, D. C., Idson, L. C., & Higgins, E. T. (2001). Promotion and prevention focus on alternative hypothesis: Implications for attributional functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1*, 5-18.

Lockwood, P., Jordan, J. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*, 854-864.

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of family: Parent-child interaction. In (Eds.), P. H. Mussen, & M. E. Hetherington, *Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 4, Socialization, Personality, and Social Development*, (pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.

Manian, N., Papadakis, A. A., Strauman, T. J., & Essex, M. J. (2006). The development of children's ideal and ought self-guides: Parenting, temperament, and individual differences in guide strength. *Journal of Personality, 57*, 1619-1646.

Maslow, A. H., (1965). *Eupsychian management*. Homewood: The Dorsy Press.

Mason, C. A., Cauce, A. M., Gonzales, N., & Hiraga, Y. (1996). Neither too sweet nor too sour: Problem peers, maternal control, and problem behavior on African American adolescents. *Child Development, 67*, 2115-2130.

Mikulincer, M., & Arad, D. (1999). Attachment working models and cognitive openness in close relationships: A test of chronic and temporary accessibility effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 710-725.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. (2005). *Mental representations of attachment security: Theoretical foundation for a positive social psychology.* In M. W. Baldwin (Eds.), (pp. 233-266). New York: Guilford Press.

Mikulincer, M., & Sheffi, E. (2000). Adult attachment style and cognitive reaction to positive affect: A test of mental categorization and creative problem solving. *Motivation and Emotion, 24*, 149-174.

Mikulincer, M. (1995). Attachment style and the mental representations of the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 1203-1215.

Mikulincer, M. (1997). Adult attachment style and information processing: Individual differences in curiosity and cognitive openness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 1217-1230.

Mikulincer, M., Gillath O., & Shaver, P. R. (2002). Activation of the attachment system in adulthood: Threat-related primes increase the accessibility of mental representations of attachment figures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 881-895.

Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., Gillath O., & Nitzberg, R. A. (2005). Attachment, caregiving, and altruism: Boosting attachment security increases compassion and helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 817-839.

Mills, R. S. H., & Rubin, K. L. (1998). Are psychological and behavioral control both differentially associated with childhood aggression and social withdrawal? *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 2*, 132-136.

Moretti, M. M., & Higgins, E. T. (1990) Relating self-discrepancy to self-esteem. The contribution of discrepancy beyond actual-self ratings. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26*, 108-123.

Muris, P., Meesters, C., & van Brakel, A. (2003). Assessment of Anxious Rearing Behaviors with a Modified Version of "Egna Minnen Betr¨affande Uppfostran" Questionnaire for Children. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 4*, 229-237.

Nelson, D. A., & Crick, N. R. (2002). Parental psychological control: Childhood physical and relational aggression. In (Eds.),B. K. Barber, *Intrusive Parenting*, (pp. 161-191).Washington: American Psychological Association.

Oldehinkel,A. J., Veenstra, R., Ormel, J. A., de Winter, F., & Verhulst, F. C. (2006). Temperament, parenting, and depressive symptoms in a population sample of preadolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 7*, 684–695.

Olsen, S. F., Yang, C., Hart, C. H., Robinson, C. C., Wu, P., Nelson, D. A., Nelson, L. J., Jin, S., & Wo, J. (2002). Maternal psychological control and preschool children's behavioral outcomes in China, Russia, and the United States. In B. K. Barber (Eds.), *Intrusive Parenting* (pp. 235-262).Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Perris, C., & Anderson, P. (2000). Experiences of parental rearing and patterns of attachment in adulthood. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 7*, 279-288.

Pettit, G. S., & Laird, R. D. (2002). Psychological control and monitoring in early adolescence: The role of parental involvement and earlier child adjustment. In (Eds.),B. K. Barber, *Intrusive Parenting*, (pp. 97-125).Washington: American Psychological Association.

Pettit, G. S., Keiley, M. K., Laird, R. D., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (2007). Predicting the developmental course mother-reported monitoring across childhood and adolescence from early proactive parenting, child temperament, and parents' worries. *Journal of Family Psychology, 2*, 206-217.

Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K A., Bates, J. E., & Criss, M. M. (2001). Antecedents and behavior-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child Development, 2*, 583-598.

Rogers, K. N., Buchanan, C. M., & Winchell, M. E. (2003). Psychological control during early adolescence: Links to adjustment in differing parent/adolescent dyads. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 4*, 349-383.

Ruchkin, V. V., Eisemann, M., & Haglöff, B. (1998). Aggression in delinquent adolescents versus controls: the role of parental rearing. *Children & Society Volume, 12*, 275-282.

Rudy, D., & Grusec, J. E. (2006). Authoritarian parenting in individualist and collectivist groups: Association with maternal emotion and cognition and children's self-esteem. *Journal of Family Psychology, 1*, 68-78.

Schaefer, E. S. (1965a). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. *Child Development, 36*, 413-424.

Schaefer, E. S. (1965b). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29*, 552-557.

Schlette, P., Brandstrom, S., Eisemann, M., Sigvardsson, S., Nylander, P., Adolfsson R., & Perris, C. (1998). Perceived parental rearing behaviors and temperament and character in healthy adults. *Personality and Individual Differences, 5*, 661-668.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). *Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries.* In M. P. Zanna (Eds.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, vol. 25, (pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M., & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*, 519-542.

Seibel, F. L. (1997). *Experience with father, satisfaction with life and trait anxiety in college students.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, George Fox University, Oregon, United States.

Shah, J. Y., Brazy, P. C., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Promoting us or preventing them: Regulatory focus and manifestations of intergroup bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 433-446.

Shah, J., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Expectancy x value effects: Regulatory focus as a determinant of magnitude and direction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 447-458.

Shah, J., Higgins, E. T., & Friedman, R. S. (1998). Performance incentives and means: How regulatory focus influences goal attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*, 285-293.

Shek, D. T. L. (2006). Assessment of perceived parental psychological control in Chinese adolescence in Hong Kong. *Research on Social Work Practice, 4*, 383-391.

Silk, J. S., Morris, A. S., Kanaya, T., & Steinberg, L. (2003). Psychological control and autonomy granting: Opposites of a continuum or distinct constructs? *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13*, 113-128.

Smith, E. T. (1983). Adolescent reactions to attempted parental control and influence techniques. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 533-542.

Soenens, B., Elliot, A. J., Goossens, L., Vansteenkiste, M., Luyten,, P. & Duriez, B. (2005). The intergenerational transmission of perfectionism: Parents' psychological control as intervening variables. *Journal of Family Psychology, 3*, 358-366.

Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Luyckx, K., & Goossens, L. (2006). Parenting and adolescent problem behavior: An integrated model with adolescent self-disclosure and perceived parental knowledge as intervening variables. *Developmental Psychology, 2*, 305-318.

Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Luyten, P., Duriez, B., & Goossens, L. (2004). Maladaptive perfectionist self-representations: The meditational link between psychological control and adjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 487-498.

Stattin, H., & Kerr, M (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development, 71*, 1072-1085.

Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychological maturity, and academic success among adolescence. *Child Development, 60*, 1424-1436.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*, 1266-1281.

Stewart, S. M., & Bond, M. H. (2002). A critical look at the parenting research from the mainstream: Problems uncovered while adapting Western to non-Wesrern cultures. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20*, 379-392.

Stolz, H. E., Barber, B. K., & Olsen, J. A. (2005). Toward disentangling fathering and mothering: An assessment of relative importance. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 1076-1092.

Strage, A. A. (1998). Family context variables and the development of self-regulation in college students. *Adolescence, 33*, 16-31.

Strauman, T. (1996). Stability within the self: A longitudinal study of the structural implications of self-discrepancy theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*, 1142-1153.

Strauman, T. J., & Higgins, E. T. (1987). Automatic activation of self-discrepancies and emotional syndromes: When cognitive structures influence affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6*, 1004-1014.

Strauman, T. J. (1990). Self-guides and emotionally significant childhood memories: A study of retrieval efficiency and incidental negative emotional content. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 869-880.

Strauman, T. J. (1992). Self-guides, autobiographical memory, and anxiety and dysphoria: Toward cognitive model of vulnerability to emotional stress. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101*, 87-95.

Sullivan, H., Worth, K. A., Baldwin, A. S., & Rothman, A. (2006). The effects of approach and avoidance referents on academic outcomes: A test of competing predictions. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*, 157-164.

Sumer, N. (2006). *Parental warmth, rejection, and attachment security among Turkish high school students.* Paper presented at the invited symposia at the European Association for Research on Adolescence Conference. Antalya, Turkey, 2-6 May, 2006.

Supple, A. J., Peterson, G. W., & Bush, K. R. (2004). Assessing the validity of parenting measures in a sample of Chinese adolescents. *Journal of Family Psychology, 3*, 539-544.

Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). Using Multivariate Statistics. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Thomasgaard, M., & Metz, W. P (1993). Parental overprotection revisited. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 2*, 67-80.

Trivers, R. L. (1974). Parent-Offspring Conflict. *American Zoologist, 1*, 249-264.

Van Hook, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1988). Self-related problems beyond the self-concept: motivational consequences of discrepant self-guides. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*, 625-633.

Van Leeuwen, K. G., Mervielde, I., Braet, C., & Bosmans, G. (2004). Child personality and parental behavior as moderators of problem behavior: Variable- and person-centered approach. *Developmental Psychology, 6*, 1028-1046.

Vazonyi, A. T., Hibbert, J. R., & Snider, J. B. (2003). Exotic enterprise no more? Adolescent reports of famiky and parenting processes from youth in four countries. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13*, 129-160.

Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., De Winter, A. F., & Ormel, J. (2006). Temperament, environment, and antisocial behavior in a population sample of preadolescent boys and girls. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 5*, 422–432.

Wickrama, K. A. S., Lorenz, F. O., & Conger, R. D. (1997). Parental support and adolescent physical mental health status: A latent growth-curve analysis. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 38*, 149-163.

Wills, T. A., & Cleary, S. D. (1996). How are social support effects mediated? A test with parental support and adolescent substance use. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 937-952.

Wu; P., Robinson, C. C., Yang, C., Hart, C. H., Olsen, S. F., Porter, C. L., Jin, S., Wo, J., & Wu, X. (2002). Similarities and differences in mother's parenting of preschoolers in China and United States. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 6*, 481-491.

Xia, G., & Qian, M. (2001). The relationship of parenting style to self-reported mental health among two subcultures of Chinese. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*, 251–260.

Yeo, J., & Park, J. (2006). Effects of parent-extension similarity and self-regulatory focus on evaluations of brand extensions. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 3*, 272-282.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A1 Confirmatory Factor Analyses Results of PCS

To verify the factor structure of Psychological Control Scale (Olsen et al., 2002) 25-item psychological control scale obtained from the exploratory analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis using the covariance matrix obtained from the sample was conducted. It was hypothesized that psychological control has two latent variables. Maximum likelihood solutions were obtained by using LISREL 8.51 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989) to verify the relationships between observable items and latent factors.

Confirmatory factor analysis for perceived maternal blaming and love withdrawal yielded acceptable fit of the confirmatory model in the data [χ^2 (90, N = 320) = 431.97, p < .001, RMSEA = .11, GFI = .85, AGFI = .80, CFI = .88, NNFI = .86]. All items had loadings above than .30, minimum loading was .44 and the maximum loading was .78. Analysis also yielded acceptable fit of the confirmatory model in the data for perceived paternal blaming and love withdrawal [χ^2 (90, N = 320) = 397.59, p < .001, RMSEA = .10, GFI = .86, AGFI = .81, CFI = .86, NNFI = .84]. All items had loadings above than .30, minimum loading was .62 and the maximum loading was .91.

Confirmatory factor analysis for perceived maternal guilt induction yielded acceptable fit of the confirmatory model in the data [χ^2 (35, N = 320) = 316.09, p < .001, RMSEA = .16, GFI = .84, AGFI = .74, CFI = .85, NNFI = .81]. Item loadings were ranged from .50 to .76. Analysis also yielded acceptable fit of the confirmatory model in the data for perceived paternal blaming and love withdrawal [χ^2 (34, N = 320) = 274.78, p < .001, RMSEA = .15, GFI = .85, AGFI = .76, CFI = .87, NNFI = .83]. Item loadings were ranged from .47 to .80.

Appendix A2 Confirmatory Factor Analyses Results of PCS-YSR

To verify the factor structure of PCS-YSR (Barber, 1996) eight-item psychological control scale obtained from the exploratory analysis, a confirmatory

factor analysis using the covariance matrix obtained from the sample was conducted. It was hypothesized that psychological control has one latent variable. Maximum likelihood solutions were obtained by using LISREL 8.51 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989) to verify the relationships between observable items and latent factor.

Confirmatory factor analysis for perceived maternal psychological control yielded good fit of the confirmatory model in the data [χ^2 (19, N = 320) = 83.88, $p <$ .001, RMSEA = .10, GFI = .94, AGFI = .88, CFI = .92, NNFI = .88]. Minimum loading was .53 and the maximum loading was .73. Analysis also yielded acceptable fit of the confirmatory model in the data for perceived paternal psychological control [χ^2 (19, N = 320) = 100.33, $p <$ .001, RMSEA = .12, GFI = .93, AGFI = .86, CFI = .92, NNFI = .88]. Minimum loading was .47 and the maximum loading was .75.

Appendix A3 Confirmatory Factor Analyses Results of PSS

To verify the factor structure of Parental Support Scale obtained from the exploratory analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis using the covariance matrix obtained from the sample was conducted. It was hypothesized that parental support has one latent variable. Maximum likelihood solutions were obtained by using LISREL 8.51 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989) to verify the relationships between observable items and latent factor.

Confirmatory factor analysis for perceived maternal support yielded acceptable fit of the confirmatory model in the data [χ^2 (35, N = 320) = 322.69, $p <$ .001, RMSEA = .16, GFI = .83, AGFI = .74, CFI = .88, NNFI = .85]. All items had loadings above than .30, minimum loading was .50 and the maximum loading was .86. Analysis also yielded acceptable fit of the confirmatory model in the data for perceived paternal support [χ^2 (35, N = 320) = 212.06, $p <$ .001, RMSEA = .13, GFI = .88, AGFI = .82, CFI = .94, NNFI = .92]. All items had loadings above than .30, minimum loading was .62 and the maximum loading was .91.

Appendix A4 Confirmatory Factor Analyses Results of POS

To verify the factor structure of Parental Overprotection Scale obtained from the exploratory analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis using the covariance matrix obtained from the sample was conducted. It was hypothesized that parental

overprotection has one latent variable. Maximum likelihood solutions were obtained by using LISREL 8.51 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989) to verify the relationships between observable items and latent factor.

Confirmatory factor analysis for perceived maternal overprotection yielded good fit of the confirmatory model in the data [χ^2 (14, N = 320) = 49.52, p < .001, RMSEA = .09, GFI = .96, AGFI = .92, CFI = .95, NNFI = .93]. All items had loadings above than .30, minimum loading was .59 and the maximum loading was .76. Analysis also yielded good fit of the confirmatory model in the data for perceived paternal support [χ^2 (14, N = 320) = 75.94, p < .001, RMSEA = .12, GFI = .94, AGFI = .87, CFI = .92, NNFI = .89]. All items had loadings above than .30, minimum loading was .55 and the maximum loading was .77.

Appendix A5 Confirmatory Factor Analyses Results of BCS

To verify the factor structure of Behavioral Control Scale, twenty-item behavioral control scale obtained from the exploratory analysis, a confirmatory factor analysis using the covariance matrix obtained from the sample was conducted. It was hypothesized that behavioral control has one latent variable. Maximum likelihood solutions were obtained by using LISREL 8.51 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989) to verify the relationships between observable items and latent factor.

Confirmatory factor analysis for perceived paternal behavioral control yielded acceptable fit of the confirmatory model in the data [χ^2 (163, N = 320) = 977.37, p < .001, RMSEA = .13, GFI = .77, AGFI = .70, CFI = .84, NNFI = .82]. Minimum loading was .41 and the maximum loading was .83. However, analysis yielded poor fit of the confirmatory model in the data for perceived paternal behavioral control compared to perceived maternal behavioral control [χ^2 (163, N = 320) = 1036.15, p < .001, RMSEA = .13, GFI = .76, AGFI = .68, CFI = .84, NNFI = .81]. Minimum loading was .40 and the maximum loading was .84.

APPENDIX B Consent Form

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Psikoloji Bölümü   Tel: 90 (312) 210 31 82

Department of Psychology   Faks:90 (312) 210 79 75

Sayın Katılımcı,

Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü'nde aile içi ilişkiler konusunda bir çalışma yürütmekteyiz. Katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz takdirde size verilen anketi yaklaşık kırk dakika süresince dolduracaksınız. Çalışmada madde sayısı çok olmakla birlikte bazı sorular hem anne hem baba için doldurulacağından dolayı anket çabuk ve kolay bir biçimde tamamlanabilmektedir. Soruların doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur, size en uygun şıkkı işaretlemeniz yeterli olacaktır. Dolduracağınız anketlerde cevaplarınız kesinlikle gizli tutulacak ve bu cevaplar sadece bilimsel araştırma amacıyla kullanılacaktır. Çalışmada sizi rahatsız eden sorular olursa istediğiniz aşamasında katılımcılıktan ayrılma hakkına sahipsiniz.

Araştırmayla ilgili sorularınızı aşağıdaki e-posta adresini veya telefon numarasını kullanarak bize yöneltebilirsiniz.

Saygılarımızla,

Prof. Dr. Nebi SÜMER; Burak DOĞRUYOL

Psikoloji Bölümü

Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara

Tel: (0312) 210 5966

e-posta: nsumer@metu.edu.tr, dburak@metu.edu.tr

Appendix C1 Psychological Control Scale (Mother Form)

Aşağıda, çocukluğunuzun **ilk 16 yılında** **annenizle** olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Her bir cümlede anlatılan durumu **çocukluğunuzda** ne sıklıkla yaşadığınızı 6 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmanızdır. Annenizi kaybetmişseniz anneniz yerine koyduğunuz kişiyle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak soruları cevaplayınız.

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Ara sıra	Sık sık	Her zaman
1. Annem, ben birşey söylerken konuyu değiştirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Annem ben konuşurken sözümü keserdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Annem ben konuşurken bitirmemi beklemeden cümlemi tamamlardı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Annem bazı konulardaki hislerimi ve düşüncelerimi değiştirmeye çalışırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Annem ne hissettiğimi ya da düşündüğümü biliyormuş gibi davranırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Annem çoğu konuda ne düşüneceğimi, nasıl hissetmem gerektiğini söylemekten hoşlanırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Annem beni eleştirirken geçmişte yaptığım hataları hatırlatıp dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Annem yaptığım bazı davranışların "aptalca, ahmakça" olduğunu söylerdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Annem ailedeki diğer kişilerin sorunları için beni suçlardı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Annem bana karşı sabırsız davranırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Ben etraftayken, annem birden parlar, duygusal davranışlar gösterirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6

12. Annem bana karşı bazen sıcak davranırken bazen de şikayet edip dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Annem sorular sorup, onu rahatsız etmemden hoşlanmazdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Annem benimle birlikteyken huysuzlaşır, ruh hali değişirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Annem benimleyken kolaylıkla sabrı taşardı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Annemi hayal kırıklığına uğrattığımda, beni görmezden gelmeye çalışırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Annemin dikkatini çekmeye çalışırken beni görmezden gelirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Annemi üzdüğümde onu memnun edene kadar benimle konuşmazdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Annem aynı fikirde olmadığımda bana karşı soğuk ve daha az samimi davranırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Annemin ben konuşurken bana pek dikkatini vermediğini düşünürdüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Annemi hayal kırıklığına uğrattığımda bunu bana hissettirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Annem benim onun çocukluğunda olduğu kadar iyi olmadığımı söyleyip dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Annem bana kızdığı zaman bunu bana hissettirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Annem, benim için ne kadar çok çalışıp yorulduğunu söyler dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Annem "benim ne hissettiğime önem verseydin beni üzecek bu şeyleri yapmazdın" vb. derdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Annem yaptığı herşeyi benim için yaptığını hatırlatıp dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. Annem ben yanlış davrandığımda hayal kırıklığını gösterirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Annem, kötü davranışlarımdan, yaramazlıklarımdan utanmam gerektiğini söyler dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. Beklentilerini yerine getirmediğimde annem kendisini utandırdığımı söylerdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Annem yanlış davrandığım her zaman cezalandırılacağımı söylerdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Ben yanlış davrandığım zaman annem hayal kırıklığına uğradığını söylerdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Annem diğer çocuklar kadar iyi olmadığımı söyler dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C2 Behavioral Control Scale (Mother Form)

Aşağıda, çocukluğunuzun **ilk 16 yılında** **annenizle** olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Her bir cümlede anlatılan durumu **çocukluğunuzda** ne sıklıkla yaşadığınızı 6 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmanızdır. Annenizi kaybetmişseniz anneniz yerine koyduğunuz kişiyle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak soruları cevaplayınız.

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Ara sıra	Sık sık	Her zaman
1. Annen kiminle zaman geçirdiğini bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Annen boş zamanlarını nasıl geçirdiğini bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Annen paranı nelere, nasıl harcadığını bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Annen okuldan sonra nereye gittiğini bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Annen haftasonu ne yaptığını bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Annen okulda yaşadığın sorunları bilir miydi?-	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Bir yere gitmek için ayrıldığında annene ya da başka bir büyüğüne nereye gittiğini söyler miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Arkadaşlarınla dışarıya çıktığında annene kaçta evde olacağını söyler miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Dışarı çıkmak istediğinde annen evde yoksa nereye gittiğini söylemek için ona not bırakır ya da telefon eder miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Annen evde olmadığında ona nasıl ulaşacağını bilir miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Annen hangi derslerden ödevin olduğunu bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Annen derslerin hakkında öğretmenlerin ile görüşür müydü?	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Annen sınav sonuçlarını, önemli ödevlerini bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Annen senin farklı derslerdeki durumunu ve başarını bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Annene okulda derslerinin nasıl gittiğini söyler miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6

16.　　Annene okulda gününün nasıl geçtiğini anlatır mıydın? (örneğin, sınavlarının nasıl geçtiğini, öğretmenlerinle aranın nasıl olduğunu vb.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
17.　　Annenle boş zamanlarında yaptıkların hakkında konuşur muydun?	1	2	3	4	5	6
18.　　Arkadaşlarınla oynayıp eve geldiğinde neler yaptığını annene anlatır mıydın?	1	2	3	4	5	6
19.　　Annenle arkadaşların hakkında konuşur muydun?	1	2	3	4	5	6
20.　　Arkadaşların size geldiğinde annen onlarla konuşur muydu?	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C3 Parental Overprotection Scale (Mother Form)

Aşağıda, çocukluğunuzun **ilk 16 yılında** **annenizle** olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Her bir cümlede anlatılan durumu **çocukluğunuzda** ne sıklıkla yaşadığınızı 6 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmanızdır. Annenizi kaybetmişseniz anneniz yerine koyduğunuz kişiyle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak soruları cevaplayınız.

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Ara sıra	Sık sık	Her zaman
1. Annem başıma bir şey gelecek korkusuyla başka çocukların yaptığı bazı şeyleri yapmama izin vermezdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Annemin ne yapıp ettiğim konusunda daha az endişelenmesini isterdim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Oynarken tehlikeler konusunda en çok benim annem uyarırdı (Ağaca, duvara tırmanmamamı söylemek gibi)	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Sokakta oynarken annesi tarafından en çok çağırılan çocuk ben olurdum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Annem üşüyeceğim endişesiyle beni çok kalın giydirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Annemin başıma bir şey gelebileceği yolundaki endişeleri çok abartılıydı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Annem, oynarken evin yakınından ayrılmama hiç izin vermezdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C4 Psychological Support Scale (Mother Form)

Aşağıda, çocukluğunuzun **ilk 16 yılında** **annenizle** olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Her bir cümlede anlatılan durumu **çocukluğunuzda** ne sıklıkla yaşadığınızı 6 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmanızdır. Annenizi kaybetmişseniz anneniz yerine koyduğunuz kişiyle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak soruları cevaplayınız.

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Ara sıra	Sık sık	Her zaman
1. Annemle endişe ve korkularımı konuştuktan sonra, kendimi çok daha iyi hissederdim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Annem bana oldukça sık gülümserdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Mutsuz yada moralim bozuk olduğu zamanlar annem bana kendimi daha iyi hissettirebilirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Annem benimle birlikte bir şeyler yapmaktan zevk alırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Üzgün olduğumda annem beni neşelendirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Annem bana hep özen gösterir, dikkatini üzerimden eksik etmezdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Annem bana, hayatındaki en önemli insanmışım gibi hissettirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Annem bana sevgisini içtenlikle gösterirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Annem beni oldukça sık överdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Annemle her istediğimi rahatça konuşurdum.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C5 Promotion/Prevention Scale

Aşağıdaki Sorular Hayatınızdaki Belli Olayların Geçmişte Ya Da Şimdi **NE SIKLIKLA** Meydana Geldiğini Öğrenmek İçin Hazırlanmıştır. Lütfen Cevaplarınızı Sizi En İyi Açıklayan Seçeneği İşaretleyerek Veriniz.

```
1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6----------7----------8----------9
Bana Hiç                                                              Bana Çok
Uygun Değil                                                           Uygun
```

1. Genellikle, hayatımdaki olumsuz olayları engellemeye odaklıyımdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. Sorumluluk ve yükümlülüklerimi yeterince yerine getiremeyeceğim diye kaygı duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. Sık sık umutlarıma ve hedeflerime nasıl ulaşacağımı hayal ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Gelecekte olmaktan korktuğum kişi hakkında sıkça düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. Gelecekte idealimde olmak istediğim kişi hakkında sıkça düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Genellikle, gelecekte elde etmeyi umduğum başarılara odaklanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Akademik hedeflerimi başaramayacağımdan dolayı sıklıkla endişelenirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. Sıklıkla derslerimde nasıl başarıya ulaşacağımı düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. Sıklıkla kendimi başıma gelmesinden korktuğum kötü şeyleri yaşarken hayal ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. Sıklıkla, yaşamımdaki olası başarısızlıkları nasıl önleyebileceğimi düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. Yaşamımda genellikle, kazançlara ulaşmaktan ziyade kayıpları önleme eğilimi gösteririm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. Okuldaki şu anki temel amacım derslerim konusundaki isteklerimi gerçekleştirmektir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13. Okuldaki şu anki temel amacım derslerim konusunda olası bir başarısızlıktan kaçınmaktır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. Kendimi temel olarak, "idealimdeki ben"e ulaşmaya çalışan; yani umutlarını, arzularını ve hayallerini gerçekleştirmeye çalışan biri olarak görüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

15. Kendimi temel olarak, "olmam beklenen" kişi olmaya çalışan; yani görevlerini, sorumluluklarını ve yükümlülüklerini yerine getirmeye çalışan biri olarak görüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16. Genellikle, yaşamımda olumlu sonuçlar elde etmeye odaklanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17. Sık sık kendimi, başıma gelmesini umut ettiğim güzel şeyleri yaşarken hayal ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18. Genel olarak, başarısızlığı önlemekten ziyade başarıya ulaşmaya çaba gösteririm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Appendix C6 Portrait Values Questionnaire

Aşağıda bazı kişiler kısaca tanımlanmaktadır. Lütfen her tanımı okuyun ve bu kişilerin size ne derece benzediğini ya da benzemediğini düşünün. Tanımda verilen kişinin size ne kadar benzediğini göstermek için sağdaki kutucuklardan uygun olan birini **[X]** ile işaretleyin.

	BU KİŞİ SİZE NE KADAR BENZİYOR?					
	Bana **hiç** benze-miyor	Bana benze-miyor	Bana çok az benzi-yor	Bana az benzi-yor	Bana benzi-yor	Bana **çok** benzi-yor
1. Yeni fikirler bulmak ve yaratıcı olmak onun için önemlidir. İşleri kendine özgü yollarla yapmaktan hoşlanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Onun için zengin olmak önemlidir. Çok parası ve pahalı şeyleri olsun ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Dünyada herkesin eşit muamele görmesinin önemli olduğunu düşünür. Hayatta herkesin eşit fırsatlara sahip olması gerektiğine inanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Onun için yeteneklerini göstermek çok önemlidir. İnsanların onun yaptıklarına hayran olmasını ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Onun için güvenli bir çevrede yaşamak önemlidir. Güvenliğini tehlikeye sokabilecek her şeyden kaçınır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Hayatta pek çok farklı şey yapmanın önemli olduğunu düşünür. Her zaman deneyecek yeni şeyler arar.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. İnsanların kendilerine söylenenleri yapmaları gerektiğine inanır. İnsanların her zaman, hatta başkaları izlemiyorken bile, kurallara uymaları gerektiğini düşünür.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Kendisinden farklı olan insanları dinlemek onun için önemlidir. Onlarla aynı fikirde olmadığında bile onları anlamak ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

114

9. Sahip olduğundan daha fazlasını **istememenin** önemli olduğunu düşünür. İnsanların sahip olduklarıyla tatmin olmaları gerektiğine inanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Eğlenmek için her fırsatı kollar. Zevk veren şeyleri yapmak onun için önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Yaptığı işler hakkında kendi başına karar vermek onun için önemlidir. Faaliyetlerini seçip planlarken özgür olmaktan hoşlanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Çevresindeki insanlara yardım etmek onun için çok önemlidir. Onların refaha kavuşmasını ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Çok başarılı olmak onun için önemlidir. İnsanlar üzerinde iyi izlenim bırakmaktan hoşlanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Ülkesinin güvende olması onun için çok önemlidir. Devletin içeriden ve dışarıdan gelebilecek tehditlere karşı uyanık olması gerektiğini düşünür.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Risk almaktan hoşlanır. Her zaman macera peşinde koşar.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Her zaman uygun şekilde davranmak onun için önemlidir. İnsanların yanlış diyeceği şeyleri yapmaktan kaçınmak ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. İşin başında olmak ve başkalarına ne yapacaklarını söylemek onun için önemlidir. İnsanların onun söylediklerini yapmalarını ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Arkadaşlarına sadık olmak onun için önemlidir. Kendisini ona yakın olan insanlara adamak ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. İnsanların doğayı korumaları gerektiğine gönülden inanır. Çevreyi korumak onun için önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Dini inanç onun için önemlidir. Dininin gereklerini yerine getirmek için çok çaba harcar.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Eşyaların düzenli ve temiz olması onun için önemlidir. Her şeyin pislik içinde olmasından hiç hoşlanmaz.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

22. Her şeyle ilgili olmanın önemli olduğunu düşünür. Meraklı olmaktan ve her türlü şeyi anlamaya çalışmaktan hoşlanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Dünyadaki bütün insanların uyum içinde yaşaması gerektiğine inanır. Dünyadaki bütün gruplar arasında barışın güçlenmesi onun için önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Hırslı olmanın önemli olduğunu düşünür. Ne kadar kabiliyetli olduğunu göstermek ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. İşleri geleneksel yollarla yapmanın en iyisi olduğunu düşünür. Öğrendiği gelenek ve göreneklerin devam ettirmek onun için önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Hayattan zevk almak onun için önemlidir. Kendisini "şımartmaktan" hoşlanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Başkalarının ihtiyaçlarına cevap vermek onun için önemlidir. Tanıdıklarına destek olmaya çalışır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Ana-babasına ve yaşlı insanlara her zaman saygı göstermesi gerektiğine inanır. Onun için itaatkar olmak önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. Herkese, hatta hiç tanımadığı insanlara bile adil muamele yapılmasını ister. Toplumdaki zayıfları korumak onun için önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. Sürprizlerden hoşlanır. Heyecan verici bir yaşamının olması onun için önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. Hastalanmaktan kaçınmak için çok çaba gösterir. Sağlıklı kalmak onun için çok önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. Hayatta öne geçmek onun için önemlidir. Başkalarından daha iyi olmaya çalışır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. Kendisini inciten insanları bağışlamak onun için önemlidir. İçlerindeki iyi yanları görmeye ve kin gütmemeye çalışır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34. Bağımsız olmak onun için önemlidir. Kendi ayakları üzerinde durmak ister.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

35. İstikrarlı bir hükümetin olması onun için önemlidir. Sosyal düzenin korunması konusunda endişelenir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36. Başkalarına karşı her zaman kibar olmak onun için önemlidir. Başkalarını hiçbir zaman rahatsız veya huzursuz etmemeye çalışır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37. Hayattan zevk almayı çok ister. İyi zaman geçirmek onun için önemlidir.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38. Alçakgönüllü ve kibirsiz olmak onun için önemlidir. Dikkatleri üzerine **çekmemeye** çalışır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39. Her zaman kararları veren kişi olmak ister. Lider olmaktan hoşlanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40. Doğaya uyum sağlamak ve onun uyumlu bir parçası olmak onun için önemlidir. İnsanların doğayı değiştirmemesi gerektiğine inanır.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix C7 Psychological Control Scale (Father Form)

Aşağıda, çocukluğunuzun **ilk 16 yılında** **babanızla** olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Her bir cümlede anlatılan durumu **çocukluğunuzda** ne sıklıkla yaşadığınızı 6 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmanızdır. Babanızı kaybetmişseniz babanız yerine koyduğunuz kişiyle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak soruları cevaplayınız.

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Ara sıra	Sık sık	Her zaman
1. Babam, ben birşey söylerken konuyu değiştirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Babam ben konuşurken sözümü keserdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Babam ben konuşurken bitirmemi beklemeden cümlemi tamamlardı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Babam bazı konulardaki hislerimi ve düşüncelerimi değiştirmeye çalışırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Babam ne hissettiğimi ya da düşündüğümü biliyormuş gibi davranırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Babam çoğu konuda ne düşüneceğimi, nasıl hissetmem gerektiğini söylemekten hoşlanırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Babam beni eleştirirken geçmişte yaptığım hataları hatırlatıp dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Babam yaptığım bazı davranışların "aptalca, ahmakça" olduğunu söylerdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Babam ailedeki diğer kişilerin sorunları için beni suçlardı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Babam bana karşı sabırsız davranırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6

11. Ben etraftayken, babam birden parlar, duygusal davranışlar gösterirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Babam bana karşı bazen sıcak davranırken bazen de şikayet edip dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Babam sorular sorup, onu rahatsız etmemden hoşlanmazdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Babam benimle birlikteyken huysuzlaşır, ruh hali değişirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Babam benimleyken kolaylıkla sabrı taşardı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Babamı hayal kırıklığına uğrattığımda, beni görmezden gelmeye çalışırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Babamın dikkatini çekmeye çalışırken beni görmezden gelirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Babamı üzdüğümde onu memnun edene kadar benimle konuşmazdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Babam aynı fikirde olmadığımda bana karşı soğuk ve daha az samimi davranırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Babamın ben konuşurken bana pek dikkatini vermediğini düşünürdüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Babamı hayal kırıklığına uğrattığımda bunu bana hissettirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Babam benim onun çocukluğunda olduğu kadar iyi olmadığımı söyleyip dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Babam bana kızdığı zaman bunu bana hissettirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Babam, benim için ne kadar çok çalışıp yorulduğunu söyler dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Babam "benim ne hissettiğime önem verseydin beni üzecek bu şeyleri yapmazdın"vb. derdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Babam yaptığı herşeyi benim için yaptığını hatırlatıp dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6

27. Babam ben yanlış davrandığımda hayal kırıklığını gösterirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Babam, kötü davranışlarımdan, yaramazlıklarımdan utanmam gerektiğini söyler dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. Beklentilerini yerine getirmediğimde babam kendisini utandırdığımı söylerdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Babam yanlış davrandığım her zaman cezalandırılacağımı söylerdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Ben yanlış davrandığım zaman babam hayal kırıklığına uğradığını söylerdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Babam diğer çocuklar kadar iyi olmadığımı söyler dururdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C8 Behavioral Control Scale (Father Form)

Aşağıda, çocukluğunuzun **ilk 16 yılında** **babanızla** olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Her bir cümlede anlatılan durumu **çocukluğunuzda** ne sıklıkla yaşadığınızı 6 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmanızdır. Babanızı kaybetmişseniz babanız yerine koyduğunuz kişiyle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak soruları cevaplayınız.

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Ara sıra	Sık sık	Her zaman
1. Baban kiminle zaman geçirdiğini bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Baban boş zamanlarını nasıl geçirdiğini bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Baban paranı nelere, nasıl harcadığını bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Baban okuldan sonra nereye gittiğini bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Baban haftasonu ve tatillerde ne yaptığını bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Baban okulda yaşadığın sorunları bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Bir yere gitmek için ayrıldığında babana ya da başka bir büyüğüne nereye gittiğini söyler miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Arkadaşlarınla dışarıya çıktığında babana kaçta evde olacağını söyler miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Baban evde olmadığında ve senin evden çıkman gerekiyorsa nereye gittiğini söylemek için ona not bırakır ya da telefon eder miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Baban evde olmadığında ona nasıl ulaşacağını bilir miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6

121

11. Baban hangi derslerden ödevin olduğunu bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Baban derslerin hakkında öğretmenlerin ile görüşür müydü?	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Baban sınav sonuçlarını, önemli ödevlerini bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Baban senin farklı derslerdeki durumunu ve başarını bilir miydi?	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Babana okulda derslerinin nasıl gittiğini söyler miydin?	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Babana okulda gününün nasıl geçtiğini anlatır mıydın? (örneğin, sınavlarının nasıl geçtiğini, öğretmenlerinle aranın nasıl olduğunu vb.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Babanla boş zamanlarında yaptıkların hakkında konuşur muydun?	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Arkadaşlarınla oynayıp eve geldiğinde neler yaptığını babana anlatır mıydın?	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Babanla arkadaşların hakkında konuşur muydun?	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Arkadaşların size geldiğinde baban onlarla konuşur muydu?	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C9 Parental Overprotection Scale (Father Form)

Aşağıda, çocukluğunuzun **ilk 16 yılında** **annenizle** olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Her bir cümlede anlatılan durumu **çocukluğunuzda** ne sıklıkla yaşadığınızı 6 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmanızdır. Annenizi kaybetmişseniz anneniz yerine koyduğunuz kişiyle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak soruları cevaplayınız.

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Ara sıra	Sık sık	Her zaman
1. Babam başıma bir şey gelecek korkusuyla başka çocukların yaptığı bazı şeyleri yapmama izin vermezdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Babamın ne yapıp ettiğim konusunda daha az endişelenmesini isterdim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Oynarken tehlikeler konusunda en çok benim babam uyarırdı (Ağaca, duvara tırmanmamamı söylemek gibi)	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Sokakta oynarken babası tarafından en çok çağırılan çocuk ben olurdum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Babam üşüyeceğim endişesiyle beni çok kalın giydirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Babamın başıma bir şey gelebileceği yolundaki endişeleri çok abartılıydı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Babam, oynarken evin yakınından ayrılmama hiç izin vermezdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C10 Parental Support Scale (Father Form)

Aşağıda, çocukluğunuzun **ilk 16 yılında** **annenizle** olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Her bir cümlede anlatılan durumu **çocukluğunuzda** ne sıklıkla yaşadığınızı 6 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak gösteriniz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmanızdır. Annenizi kaybetmişseniz anneniz yerine koyduğunuz kişiyle ilişkinizi göz önüne alarak soruları cevaplayınız.

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Ara sıra	Sık sık	Her zaman
1. Babamla endişe ve korkularımı konuştuktan sonra, kendimi çok daha iyi hissederdim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Babam bana oldukça sık gülümserdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Mutsuz yada moralim bozuk olduğu zamanlar babam bana kendimi daha iyi hissettirebilirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Babam benimle birlikte bir şeyler yapmaktan zevk alırdı.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Üzgün olduğumda babam beni neşelendirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Babam bana hep özen gösterir, dikkatini üzerimden eksik etmezdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Babam bana, hayatındaki en önemli insanmışım gibi hissettirirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Babam bana sevgisini içtenlikle gösterirdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Babam beni oldukça sık överdi.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Babamla her istediğimi rahatça konuşurdum.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C11 Demographic Questions

Yaşınız: _____

Cinsiyetiniz: O K   O E

3a. Bölümünüz: _____

3b. Kaçıncı seneniz: _____

3c. Genel Not Ortalamanız: _____/4

4.a. Annenizin eğitim durumu nedir?

    O Okuma-yazma bilmiyor   O İlkokul mezunu   O Ortaokul mezunu

    O Lise mezunu   O Üniversite mezunu

    4. b. Babanızın eğitim durumu nedir?

    O Okuma-yazma bilmiyor   O İlkokul mezunu   O Ortaokul mezunu

    O Lise mezunu   O Üniversite mezunu

5-1. Ailenizle beraber mi yaşıyorsunuz? O Evet   O Hayır

5-2. Eğer yanıtınız hayır ise ne kadar süredir ailenizden ayrı yaşıyorsunuz?

           _____ **yıl** _____ **ay**

5-3. Çevrenizdeki diğer insanlarla karşılaştırdığınızda ailenizin gelir durumunu belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5
Çok düşük	Düşük	Orta	Yüksek	Çok Yüksek

5-4. Hayatınızın en uzun dönemini aşağıdakilerden hangisinde geçirdiniz?
O Köy-Kasaba   O İlçe   O İl (Şehir)   O Büyük Şehir   O Metropol

Appendix D1 Results of Factor Analyses on Parental Psychological Control Scale

ITEMS	Perceived Mother N=320		Perceived Father N=320	
	Blaming and Love Withdrawal	Guilt Induction	Blaming and Love Withdrawal	Guilt Induction
20.Annemin ben konuşurken bana pek dikkatini vermediğini düşünürdüm.	**0.85**		**0.76**	
1.Annem, ben birşey söylerken konuyu değiştirirdi.	**0.85**		**0.54**	
14.Annem benimle birlikteyken huysuzlaşır, ruh hali değişirdi.	**0.83**		**0.88**	
2.Annem ben konuşurken sözümü keserdi.	**0.79**		**0.72**	
17.Annemin dikkatini çekmeye çalışırken beni görmezden gelirdi.	**0.77**		**0.89**	
15.Annem benimleyken kolaylıkla sabrı taşardı.	**0.75**		**0.63**	
13.Annem sorular sorup, onu rahatsız etmemden hoşlanmazdı.	**0.73**		**0.73**	
10.Annem bana karşı sabırsız davranırdı.	**0.71**		**0.57**	
9.Annem ailedeki diğer kişilerin sorunları için beni suçlardı.	**0.70**		**0.63**	
11.Ben etraftayken, annem birden parlar, duygusal davranışlar gösterirdi.	**0.66**		**0.70**	
12.Annem bana karşı bazen sıcak davranırken bazen de şikayet edip dururdu.	**0.63**		**0.41**	0.36
32.Annem diğer çocuklar kadar iyi olmadığımı söyler dururdu.	0.54			0.48
8.Annem yaptığım bazı davranışların "aptalca, ahmakça" olduğunu söylerdi.	**0.47**		**0.53**	0.31
22.Annem benim onun çocukluğunda olduğu kadar iyi olmadığımı söyleyip dururdu.	0.44			0.42
16.Annemi hayal kırıklığına uğrattığımda, beni görmezden gelmeye çalışırdı.	**0.38**	0.33	**0.55**	
7.Annem beni eleştirirken geçmişte yaptığım hataları hatırlatıp dururdu.	0.38	0.33		0.61

3.Annem ben konuşurken bitirmemi beklemeden cümlemi tamamlardı.	**0.36**		**0.50**	
4.Annem bazı konulardaki hislerimi ve düşüncelerimi değiştirmeye çalışırdı.	0.36			0.51
27.Annem ben yanlış davrandığımda hayal kırıklığını gösterirdi.		**0.96**		**0.87**
31.Ben yanlış davrandığım zaman annem hayal kırıklığına uğradığını söylerdi.		**0.87**		**0.86**
23.Annem bana kızdığı zaman bunu bana hissettirirdi.		**0.79**		**0.61**
21.Annemi hayal kırıklığına uğrattığımda bunu bana hissettirirdi.		**0.78**		**0.75**
25.Annem"benim ne hissettiğime önem verseydin beni üzecek bu şeyleri yapmazdın " vb. derdi.		**0.72**		**0.63**
26.Annem yaptığı herşeyi benim için yaptığını hatırlatıp dururdu.		**0.67**		**0.65**
24.Annem, benim için ne kadar çok çalışıp yorulduğunu söyler dururdu.		**0.63**		**0.72**
29.Beklentilerini yerine getirmediğimde annem kendisini utandırdığını söylerdi.		**0.62**		**0.65**
18.Annemi üzdüğümde onu memnun edine kadar benimle konuşmazdı.		0.58		0.41
28.Annem, kötü davranışlarımdan, yaramazlıklarımdan utanmam gerektiğini söyler dururdu.	0.30	**0.52**		**0.64**
19.Annem aynı fikirde olmadığımda bana karşı soğuk ve daha az samimi davranırdı.	**0.38**	0.41	**0.60**	
30.Annem yanlış davrandığım her zaman cezalandırılacağımı söylerdi.	0.44	**0.33**		**0.34**
6.Annem çoğu konuda ne düşüneceğimi, nasıl hissetmem gerektiğini söylemekten hoşlanırdı.	0.30	0.32		0.61
5.Annem ne hissettiğimi ya da düşündüğümü biliyormuş gibi davranırdı.				0.50
Eigenvalues:	13.33	2.23	12.11	2.32
Explained Variance %:	41.67	6.98	37.84	7.24

127

Appendix D2 Results of Factor Analyses on Promotion/Prevention Scale

ITEMS	Promotion Focus	Prevention Focus
6. Genellikle, gelecekte elde etmeyi umduğum başarılara odaklanırım.	**0.80**	
3. Sık sık umutlarıma ve hedeflerime nasıl ulaşacağımı hayal ederim.	**0.77**	
14. Kendimi temel olarak, "idealimdeki ben"e ulaşmaya çalışan; yani umutlarını, arzularını ve hayallerini gerçekleştirmeye çalışan biri olarak görüyorum.	**0.74**	
18. Genel olarak, başarısızlığı önlemekten ziyade başarıya ulaşmaya çaba gösteririm.	**0.72**	
16. Genellikle, yaşamımda olumlu sonuçlar elde etmeye odaklanırım.	**0.69**	
17. Sık sık kendimi, başıma gelmesini umut ettiğim güzel şeyleri yaşarken hayal ederim.	**0.66**	
5. Gelecekte idealimde olmak istediğim kişi hakkında sıkça düşünürüm.	**0.63**	
1. Genellikle, hayatımdaki olumsuz olayları engellemeye odaklıyımdır.	**0.37**	
7. Akademik hedeflerimi başaramayacağımdan dolayı sıklıkla endişelenirim.		**0.67**
8. Sıklıkla derslerimde nasıl başarıya ulaşacağımı düşünürüm.		**0.66**
13. Okuldaki şu anki temel amacım derslerim konusunda olası bir başarısızlıktan kaçınmaktır.		**0.63**
10. Sıklıkla, yaşamımdaki olası başarısızlıkları nasıl önleyebileceğimi düşünürüm.		**0.61**
9. Sıklıkla kendimi başıma gelmesinden korktuğum kötü şeyleri yaşarken hayal ederim.		**0.61**
11. Yaşamımda genellikle, kazançlara ulaşmaktan ziyade kayıpları önleme eğilimi gösteririm.	-0.32	**0.59**
2. Sorumluluk ve yükümlülüklerimi yeterince yerine getiremeyeceğim diye kaygı duyarım.		**0.51**

15. Kendimi temel olarak, "olmam beklenen" kişi olmaya çalışan; yani görevlerini, sorumluluklarını ve yükümlülüklerini yerine getirmeye çalışan biri olarak görüyorum.		**0.50**
4. Gelecekte olmaktan korktuğum kişi hakkında sıkça düşünürüm.		**0.47**
12. Okuldaki şu anki temel amacım derslerim konusundaki isteklerimi gerçekleştirmektir.	0.36	**0.43**
Eigenvalues:	4.59	2.96
Explained Variance %:	25.51	16.47
Cronbach Alpha:	.83	.77

Appendix D3 Results of Factor Analyses on Portrait Values Questionnaire

ITEMS	Prevention Focus	Promotion Focus
28.Ana-babasına ve yaşlı insanlara her zaman saygı göstermesi gerektiğine inanır. Onun için itaatkar olmak önemlidir.	0.70	
16.Her zaman uygun şekilde davranmak onun için önemlidir. İnsanların yanlış diyeceği şeyleri yapmaktan kaçınmak ister.	0.68	
7.İnsanların kendilerine söylenenleri yapmaları gerektiğine inanır. İnsanların her zaman, hatta başkaları izlemiyorken bile, kurallara uymaları gerektiğini düşünür.	0.65	
20.Dini inanç onun için önemlidir. Dininin gereklerini yerine getirmek için çok çaba harcar.	0.61	
21.Eşyaların düzenli ve temiz olması onun için önemlidir. Her şeyin pislik içinde olmasından hiç hoşlanmaz.	0.61	
14.Ülkesinin güvende olması onun için çok önemlidir. Devletin içeriden ve dışarıdan gelebilecek tehditlere karşı uyanık olması gerektiğini düşünür.	0.61	
5.Onun için güvenli bir çevrede yaşamak önemlidir. Güvenliğini tehlikeye sokabilecek her şeyden kaçınır.	0.54	
36.Başkalarına karşı her zaman kibar olmak onun için önemlidir. Başkalarını hiçbir zaman rahatsız veya huzursuz etmemeye çalışır.	0.54	
35.İstikrarlı bir hükümetin olması onun için önemlidir. Sosyal düzenin korunması konusunda endişelenir.	0.51	
25.İşleri geleneksel yollarla yapmanın en iyisi olduğunu düşünür. Öğrendiği gelenek ve göreneklerin devam ettirmek onun için önemlidir.	0.51	-0.31
31.Hastalanmaktan kaçınmak için çok çaba gösterir. Sağlıklı kalmak onun için çok önemlidir.	0.43	

38.Alçakgönüllü ve kibirsiz olmak onun için önemlidir. Dikkatleri üzerine **çekmemeye** çalışır.	0.39	
9.Sahip olduğundan daha fazlasını **istememenin** önemli olduğunu düşünür. İnsanların sahip olduklarıyla tatmin olmaları gerektiğine inanır.	0.34	
30.Sürprizlerden hoşlanır. Heyecan verici bir yaşamının olması onun için önemlidir.		0.75
10.Eğlenmek için her fırsatı kollar. Zevk veren şeyleri yapmak onun için önemlidir.		0.71
37.Hayattan zevk almayı çok ister. İyi zaman geçirmek onun için önemlidir.		0.69
6.Hayatta pek çok farklı şey yapmanın önemli olduğunu düşünür. Her zaman deneyecek yeni şeyler arar.		0.64
26.Hayattan zevk almak onun için önemlidir. Kendisini "şımartmaktan" hoşlanır.		0.60
15.Risk almaktan hoşlanır. Her zaman macera peşinde koşar.		0.56
11.Yaptığı işler hakkında kendi başına karar vermek onun için önemlidir. Faaliyetlerini seçip planlarken özgür olmaktan hoşlanır.		0.52
22.Her şeyle ilgili olmanın önemli olduğunu düşünür. Meraklı olmaktan ve her türlü şeyi anlamaya çalışmaktan hoşlanır.		0.48
1.Yeni fikirler bulmak ve yaratıcı olmak onun için önemlidir. İşleri kendine özgü yollarla yapmaktan hoşlanır.		0.46
Eigenvalues:	4.17	3.93
Explained Variance %:	18.14	17.09
Cronbach Alpha:	.81	.81