

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VERTICAL and HORIZONTAL
INDIVIDUALISM-COLLECTIVISM, RELIGIOSITY, and PARENTING STYLES
FROM PERSPECTIVE of PARENTS and THEIR CHILDREN

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

BY

NAGİHAN TAŞDEMİR

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

MARCH 2006

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: Taşdemir Nagihan

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VERTICAL and HORIZONTAL INDIVIDUALISM-COLLECTIVISM, RELIGIOSITY, and PARENTING STYLES FROM PERSPECTIVE of PARENTS and THEIR CHILDREN

Taşdemir, Nagihan

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı Uğurlu

March 2006, 98 pages

The main purpose of the present study was to explore the relationships between vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, religiosity and parenting styles from perspective of parents and their children. It was also aimed to examine SES related differences and the differences between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of the study variables. In addition, the differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families in terms of vertical individualism (VI), horizontal individualism (HI), vertical collectivism (VC), horizontal collectivism (HC), and religiosity were investigated. For these purposes data were collected from 230 families including mother, father, and their young adult child –in the age range of 17-25-. Three participants from each family responded to similar measurement of the study variables, namely Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism Scale, the Measurement of the Child Rearing Styles Scale, Religiosity Scale, and Demographic Information Form. According to the results, age, family income, VI, and VC for mothers and age, VI, and religiosity for fathers were significant predictors of parental control whereas education level, HI, HC, and VC for mothers and only VC for fathers were significant predictors of parental acceptance. The regression analyses for the child sample of the study indicated that the predictors of VI are education level and perceived parental control; the predictor of HC is perceived parental acceptance; the predictors of VC are perceived parental control and acceptance; the predictor of HI is gender; and the predictors of religiosity are family income

and perceived parental control. Results also showed that there were significant differences as well as similarities between all considered groups. The findings of the study were discussed in the light of the related literature.

Keywords: Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism, Religiosity, Parenting Styles, Maternal and Paternal Control and Acceptance, Perceived Parental Control and Acceptance, Generation Differences, SES Differences, Gender Differences

ÖZ

ANNE-BABA VE ÇOCUKLARIN PERSPEKTİFİNDEN YATAY ve DİKEY BİREYCİLİK-TOPLULUKÇULUK, DİNDARLIK ve ANABABALIK STİLLERİ ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİLER

Taşdemir, Nagihan

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu

Mart 2006, 98 sayfa

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı dikey ve yatay bireycilik-toplulukçuluk, dindarlık ve anababalık stilleri arasındaki ilişkileri anne-baba ve çocukların perspektifinden incelemektir. Bu çalışmada ayrıca ele alınan değişkenler bakımından sosyoekonomik düzey farklılıkları ve anne, baba ve çocuklar arasındaki farklılıkların incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Ek olarak, dikey ve yatay bireycilik-toplulukçuluk ve dindarlık bakımından otoriter, demokratik, şımartıcı ve ihmalkâr aileler arasındaki farklılıkların incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Örneklem grubunu anne, baba ve 17–25 yaş arasındaki çocuktan oluşan 230 aile oluşturmuştur. Katılımcılar yatay ve dikey bireycilik-toplulukçuluk ölçeği, anababalık stilleri ölçeği, dindarlık ölçeği ve demografik bilgi formundan oluşan anket setini cevaplandırmışlardır. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulara göre, yaş, aile geliri, dikey bireycilik ve toplulukçuluk anneler için; yaş, dikey bireycilik ve dindarlık babalar için kontrolcü anababalığın yordayıcı değişkenleri iken; eğitim düzeyi, yatay bireycilik ve toplulukçuluk ve dikey toplulukçuluk anneler için; sadece dikey toplulukçuluk babalar için kabul edici anababalığın yordayıcı değişkenleridir. Çalışmanın çocuk örneklemini üzerinde yürütülen regresyon analizleri sonuçlarına göre, eğitim düzeyi ve algılanan kontrolcü anababalık dikey bireycilik için; algılanan kabul edici anababalık yatay toplulukçuluk için; algılanan kontrolcü ve kabul edici anababalık dikey toplulukçuluk için; cinsiyet yatay bireycilik için; aile geliri ve algılanan kontrol edici anababalık dindarlık için yordayıcı değişkenler olarak bulunmuştur. Bulgular ayrıca

ele alınan gruplar arasında anlamlı farklılıklar ve benzerlikler olduğunu göstermiştir. Araştırma bulguları ilgili literatür dikkate alınarak tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dikey ve Yatay Bireycilik-Toplulukçuluk, Dindarlık, Anababalık Stilleri, Anne ve Babadan Öğrenilen Kontrolcü ve Kabul Edici Anababalık, Algılanan Kontrolcü ve Kabul Edici Anababalık, Kuşak Farklılıkları, Sosyoekonomik Düzey Farklılıkları, Cinsiyet Farklılıkları

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express my initial thanks to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu for her useful and helpful academic guidance and general support all through my thesis process.

Secondly, I like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. E. Olcay İmamoğlu who demonstrated interest in this work, provided me with useful feedbacks, and made valuable contributions for completing this thesis.

Thirdly, I would like to express my thanks to Prof. Dr. Ali Dönmez who was very warm, understanding and encouraging during all our meetings for this thesis.

Fourthly, I owe my thanks to all my colleagues for answering my every query and giving me general support and encouragement during my thesis process.

Finally, I must acknowledge the special contributions of my family and express my deep appreciation to my mother, father, and brother for their general encouragement, support, and assistance at every stage of this thesis process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Parenting Styles	2
1.2. Individualism-Collectivism	7
1.2.1. Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism	9
1.3. Individualism-Collectivism and Parenting Styles	14
1.3.1. Family Change Model	16
1.3.2. Balanced Integration Differentiation Model	19
1.4. Cross-and Within-Cultural Analyses of I-C	21
1.4.1. Socioeconomic Status (SES), Individualism-Collectivism, and Parenting Styles	24
1.5. Religiosity	26
1.5.1. Religiosity and Parenting Styles	29
1.6. Aims of the Study and Related Expectations	31
2. METHOD	38
2.1. Participants	38
2.2. Measures	38
2.2.1. The Measure of Child Rearing Styles	39
2.2.2. Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism Scale .	40
2.2.3. Religiosity Scale	41
2.2.4. Demographic Information Form	42
2.3. Procedure	42

3. RESULTS	44
3.1. Are there significant differences between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance? And, are there significant differences between low and high SES families in terms of the study variables?	44
3.1.1. Are there significant differences between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance?	44
3.1.1.1. ANOVA results for VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity .	44
3.1.1.2. ANOVA results for parental control and acceptance ..	45
3.1.2. Are there significant differences between low and high SES families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance?	47
3.2. How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental control?	48
3.2.1. The predictors of mother parental control	48
3.2.2. The predictors of father parental control	49
3.3. How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental acceptance?	50
3.3.1. The predictors of mother parental acceptance	50
3.3.2. The predictors of father parental acceptance	51
3.4. How do education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance predict children's VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity?	52
3.4.1. The predictors of children's VI	53
3.4.2. The predictors of children's VC	54
3.4.3. The predictors of children's HI	54
3.4.4. The predictors of children's HC	55
3.4.5. The predictors of children's religiosity	56

3.5. Are there significant differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity?	57
4. DISCUSSION	60
4.1. Are there significant differences between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance?	60
4.2. Are there significant differences between low and high SES families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance?	64
4.3. How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental control?	66
4.4. How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental acceptance?	70
4.5 How do education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance predict children's VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity?	73
4.6 Are there significant differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity?	76
4.7 General Discussion	78
REFERENCES	83
APPENDICES	
A. Correlation Tables	90
B. The Measure of Child Rearing Styles for Parents	92
C. The Measure of Child Searing Styles for Children	93
D. Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism Scale.....	95
E. Religiosity Scale	97
F. Demographic Information Form	98

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

1.	Means, Standard Deviation Scores, and one-way ANOVA for the comparison of mothers, fathers, and their children on VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity.....	45
2.	Means, Standard Deviation Scores, and one-way ANOVAs for the comparison of mothers, fathers, and their children on parental control and acceptance.....	46
3.	Hierarchal regression on mother parental control.....	49
4.	Hierarchal regression on father parental control.....	50
5.	Hierarchal regression on mother parental acceptance	51
6.	Hierarchal regression on father parental acceptance	52
7.	Hierarchal regression on children's VI	53
8.	Hierarchal regression on children's VC	54
9.	Hierarchal regression on children's HI	55
10.	Hierarchal regression on children's HC	56
11.	Hierarchal regression on children's religiosity	57
12.	Means, Standard Deviation Scores, and one-way ANOVA for the Comparison of Authoritative, Indulgent-Permissive, Neglectful, and Authoritarian Families on HI, HC, VC, VI, and religiosity	59

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES

1.	Parenting Styles	4
2.	Family models, parenting and the self	17
3.	BID Model and Family Contexts	20

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Family life, in particular the relationships between family members, affect and are affected by each family members' individual characteristics. Especially the relationships between parents and their children deserve special attention. Parents play important role in the socialization and enculturation of their children, although it is true that children have also impact on their parents' life. According to Baumrind (1980) while introducing social reality to their children, parents exhibit their self-conceptions and their worldviews, which also influence their behavior and attitudes towards their children. These parental behavior and attitudes, in turn, do influence life of the children (e.g., Darling & Steinberg, 1993). This line of consideration implies that different parental behavior and attitudes are related with the parents as well as children's different individual characteristics. Accepting parents as initial socialization agents in a family life, it is worthy to question how parents' individual characteristics are relevant to their parental behavior and attitudes. Regarding the children, it seems also worthy to question how evaluations of parental behavior and attitudes are relevant to their individual characteristics. Accordingly, the examination of the relationships between individual characteristics and parental behavior and attitudes from the perspective of both parents and their children may help researchers to better understand the nature of these relationships, which constitutes the main purpose of the present study.

As individual characteristics of parents and their children, this study considers vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, religiosity, and some socio-demographical variables, namely, education level, family income, age, and gender. Parental behavior and attitudes, in this study, are conceptualized as parenting styles and dealt with as two dimensions - control and acceptance- and four categories – authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful-. Accordingly, from perspective of the parents, the present study questions how vertical and horizontal

individualism-collectivism, religiosity, and socio demographical variables are relevant to the maternal and paternal control and acceptance. From perspective of the children, this study also questions how perceived parental control and acceptance and socio demographical variables are relevant to the vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism and religiosity. In addition, the present study deals with the differences between mothers, fathers, and their children and the differences between low and high SES families in terms of the study variables. Regarding four categories of the parenting styles, this study also examines the differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families on vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism and religiosity.

In the following sections of this chapter, initially information about the parenting styles will be given. The next section will be about individualism-collectivism followed by the vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism. Later section will include explanations about the relationships between individualism-collectivism and parenting styles. Then, brief information about cross-and within-cultural studies of individualism-collectivism and information about the relationships between SES, individualism-collectivism, and parenting styles will be presented. In the remaining sections religiosity and the relationships between religiosity and parenting styles will be covered, respectively. Finally, the aims of the study and related expectations will be explained.

1.1 Parenting Styles

Within psychological investigation parenting is conceptualized in different ways by researchers. Reviewing some parenting related literature Hoff, Laursen, and Tardif (2002) concluded that it is conceptualized as parenting beliefs, parenting goals, parenting practices and parenting styles, each of four constituting different component of parenting. According to these researchers parenting beliefs include “what parents expect the course of development to look like and what parents see as their own role in their children’s development” (p.235); parenting goals are “the outcomes toward which parents direct their efforts” (p.235); and parenting practices include “behaviors parents produce in interactions with their children, the kinds of

home environments parents create for children, and the connections to the world outside the home that parents both enable and permit” (p.235). On the other hand, parenting styles consist of “the attitudes about children that parents communicate to their own children and the emotional climate in which these attitudes are expressed” (p.235).

Since the subject of the study is parenting styles, I focus on the issues relevant to the parenting styles. According to Grolnick, Deci and Ryan (1997) parenting styles describe parents’ general approach to motivating and interacting with their children. Coplan, Hastings, Seguin, and Moulton (2002) defined parenting styles as a macro level construct, which reflects the parents’ responses across different childrearing situations. According to Darling and Steinberg (1993) regardless of the characteristics of the children, parenting style is the characteristic of the parent and is related with his/her general attitudes and belief systems. Darling and Steinberg (1993) argued that parenting styles are expressed partly thorough parental practices and determine emotional climate from which children infer their parents’ emotional attitudes.

Parenting styles are classified based on some central dimensions of parental behavior and attitudes, which are considered as closely related with children’s development (Amato & Fowler, 2002). The literature in this area defines two broad dimensions of parenting styles as parental control and parental acceptance, although different terms are used by different researchers in similar meanings (Barber, 2001). For example, Maccoby and Martin (1983) defined two fundamental aspects of parenting as responsiveness and demandingness, Amato and Fowler (2002) as parental support and monitoring, Barber (2001) as parental support and control. In this study two main dimensions of parenting styles are termed as the “parental control” and “parental acceptance”.

Parental control refers to the parents’ willingness to act as a socializing agent (Darling and Steinberg, 1993) and so aiming to integrate the child into society (Durbin, Darling, Steinberg & Brown, 1993). According to Baumrind (1991) parental control refers to “the extent to which parents attempt to integrate the child

into whole family life through their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys” (p. 750). Similarly, according to Amato and Fowler (2002) parental control (monitoring) involves “supervising children’s activities, keeping track of children’s school work and peer relationships, and requiring conformity to family and community norms” (p.703). On the other hand, parental acceptance refers to the parents’ recognition of the child’s individuality (Darling and Steinberg, 1993). According to Baumrind (1991) parental acceptance refers to “the actions, which intentionally foster individuality, self regulation and self assertion, by being attuned, supportive and acquiescent to the child’s special needs and demands,” (p.750). Parental acceptance corresponds with the terms such as, nurturance, warmth, acceptance, supportiveness, and attachment (Barber, 2001).

Based on two dimensions of parenting as control and acceptance Maccoby and Martin (1983) created a four-fold typology of parenting styles as authoritative, indulgent-permissive, indifferent-uninvolved (neglectful), and authoritarian. As seen in Figure 1, authoritative parents are high in both control and acceptance, indulgent-permissive parents are high in acceptance but low in control, indifferent-uninvolved parents are low in both control and acceptance, and authoritarian parents are high in control but low in acceptance.

		<i>Parental Acceptance</i>	
		High	Low
<i>Parental Control</i>	High	Authoritative	Authoritarian
	Low	Indulgent-Permissive	Indifferent-Uninvolved

Figure 1: Parenting Styles (exemplified from Maccoby and Martin, 1983)

Parents with authoritative style are responsive to their children’s needs and at the same time are likely to make demands on them. These parents communicate their

own perspective, but also recognize the individual interests of their children and affirm their personal qualities (Baumrind, 1968). In this sense, in authoritative families the rights of both parents and children are recognized in a reciprocal way (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Therefore, children from authoritative families are likely to consider both individual and societal needs in a balanced way (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Studies investigating the relationships between authoritative parenting and children's characteristics generally dealt with perceived parenting styles of the children and reported that children with authoritative families are likely to be personally and socially competent (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991); to have high levels of self-concept clarity and self esteem (Sümer & Güngör, 1999); academic competence and global self worth (Yılmaz, 2001). Regarding the developmental characteristics of children, researchers suggest that authoritative parenting constitutes the most desired pattern among others (e.g., Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Parents with indulgent-permissive style are highly responsive to children's needs and make few demands on them. They are accepting, tolerant, and affirmative towards the children's desires, impulses and actions and do not force them to obey external standards (Baumrind, 1968). Studies investigating the relationships between indulgent-permissive parenting and children's characteristics reported that children with indulgent-permissive parents are likely to have high self esteem and self concept clarity (Sümer & Güngör, 1999); high self-confidence, but also to show substance abuse and school misconduct (Lamborn et al., 1991). Thus, indulgent-permissive parenting might be related to some desirable characteristics, such as high self-esteem and self-confidence but also some undesirable characteristics, such as substance use and school misconduct in children.

On the other hand, parents with authoritarian style make demands on their children instead of accepting the demands of them. Authoritarian parents evaluate the behavior and attitudes of their children in accordance with social conventions (Baumrind, 1968) and teach them that conformity to others, preservation of tradition, and respect for authority is important (Durbin et al., 1993). Therefore, not encouraging the children's independency and individuality, authoritarian parents try

to maintain their authority (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Baldwin (1949) in one of the earliest studies reported that children with authoritarian parents tend to be obedient and lack of curiosity and spontaneity (cited in Maccoby and Martin, 1983). In another early study, Loeb (1975) found that authoritarian parents' directive teaching style is related with external locus of control and the avoidance for undertaking activities independently in children. In the supporting way, Lamborn et al. (1991) reported that adolescents who described their parents as authoritarian scored highest on measures of obedience and conformity to the standards of adults.

Regarding indifferent-uninvolved (neglectful) parents, they are neither demanding nor responsive with their children. Accepting that parental involvement ranges from complete involvement to little involvement, indifferent-uninvolved parents are motivated to minimize the efforts for interaction with the children and are likely to consume most of their time in other activities. Accordingly, these parents tend to avoid the experience of difficulty with their children and so keep them at a distance (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Studies investigating the relationships between neglectful parenting and the characteristics of the children reported that children with neglectful parents are likely to be heavy drinker, moody, aggressive and lack long-term goals (Pulkkinen, 1982); and to have psychological and behavioral dysfunction (Lamborn et al., 1991).

Above-mentioned studies (e.g., Lamborn et al., 1991, Sümer & Güngör, 1999) demonstrate that the different characteristics of children are related with different perceived parenting styles. These studies present that in terms of well-being and adjustment, children with authoritative parents constitute the best functioning group, whereas children with uninvolved-indifferent parents do the worst functioning group. Thus, the mentioned studies deal with the relationships between parenting styles and children's personality characteristics and their positive and/or negative behaviors. Different from the earlier studies, the present study plans to focus on the relationships between parenting styles and socio-cultural variables, namely vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism and religiosity. Regarding two main dimensions of parenting styles –control and acceptance-, the present study tries to explore how perceived parental control and acceptance of children correlate with

their vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism and religiosity and how parents' vertical and horizontal individualism –collectivism and religiosity correlate with their parental control and acceptance. Thus, the study not only considers the perceived parenting styles of the children but also deals with both mother- and father-reported parenting styles. In addition, using scores taken from mothers, fathers, and their children, the present study aims to explore how authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful, and indulgent-permissive families differ in terms of their vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism and religiosity scores. In the following sections, initially I present brief information about individualism-collectivism, and then focus on vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism.

1.2 Individualism and Collectivism

Individualism-collectivism (I-C) is one of the most popular concepts in the explanations of human behavior and the relationships among individuals. Especially, classifying the cultures as individualistic or collectivist (Hofstede, 1980) and assuming that I-C is the most important dimension of cultural differences in social behavior; cross-cultural psychologists frequently use this concept in their explanations (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Researchers generally label Asian, African, and Latin American cultures as collectivist and Western European and North American cultures as individualistic; and such classification shows Turkey as a collectivist culture (Hofstede, 1980).

According to Triandis (1995) individualism and collectivism are cultural syndromes, which involve shared beliefs, attitudes, norms, and values in a given region during particular time. Triandis (1995) defined I-C in four ways: 1. The definition of the self is independent in individualism but interdependent in collectivism. 2. In-group and personal goals are compatible in collectivism but incompatible in individualism. In collectivism subordination of the personal goals to the goals of the collective – family- is important, whereas in individualism giving priority to the personal goals over the goals of the collective is important. 3. Social behavior is guided by social norms, obligations and duties in collectivism but by attitudes, personal needs, and rights in individualism. 4. Relationship maintenance is emphasized regardless of

costs for personal benefit in collectivism but as long as personal benefit exists relationships are maintained in individualism.

According to Kağıtçıbaşı (1996a) individualism and collectivism are actually “ideological concepts” and affect the socio-cultural values of people, in addition to the independency-dependency level of them. I-C as cultural values represents normative I-C whereas I-C as the level of independency-dependency of people (self-construal) represents relational I-C (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997, 2005). In general, studies of I-C either deal with normative I-C or relational I-C (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005). In terms of normative I-C, collectivism is seen as related with traditional and conservative ideology (Kağıtçıbaşı 1996a, 1997) and it is argued that collectivist cultures and so people from these cultures idealize values related with closely- knit family relations, family security, family integrity, conformity, obedience, power distance, and religiosity. Individualism is seen as related with modernity and modern values and it is argued that individualist cultures and so people from these cultures idealize values related with distance from in-groups (e.g., family), primacy of personal goals, self reliance, autonomy, hedonism, and individual freedom (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990; Triandis, 1989). In terms of relational I-C, researchers claim that people from collectivist cultures are connected to others, they define themselves in relation with others, and have interdependent or collectivist self-construal. However, people from individualistic cultures define themselves independent from others and have independent or individualistic self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Up to now several researchers offered various models and conceptualizations about self development and cultural differences, such as Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) independent vs. interdependent self-construal approach, Kağıtçıbaşı’s (1990, 1996a, b, 2005) family change model, İmamoğlu’s (1998, 2003) balanced integration-differentiation approach, and Triandis’ (1995) conceptualization of I-C as vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism.

As mentioned previously, according to Markus and Kitayama (1991) people develop either independent self or interdependent self as a result of their cultural background. Thus, people who live in individualistic cultures should have independent self

whereas people living in collectivist cultures should have interdependent self-construal. In this way, Markus and Kitayama (1991) described self-development process as one-dimensional, one pole reflecting total independency, and the other reflecting total interdependency.

Different from this viewpoint Kağıtçıbaşı (1996a, b, 2005) proposed two dimensions of self-construal development and argued that individuals have both individualism and collectivism related tendencies, the degree of which may change as a result of different societal and familial factors. İmamoğlu (1987, 1995) also claimed that people naturally have a need for both agency (individualism related) and integration (collectivism related). İmamoğlu (1998, 2003) provided evidence for her balanced integration differentiation model defining two dimensions of self construal development as intrapersonal differentiation and interpersonal integration. Different from Kağıtçıbaşı and İmamoğlu's two-dimensional models, Triandis (1995) suggested four separate dimensions of I-C as vertical collectivism, vertical individualism, horizontal collectivism, and horizontal individualism. With this model Triandis distinguished between some kinds of I-C and refined it. Since the present study deals with the model of Triandis, information about vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism is presented in a separate section, below.

1.2.1 Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism

According to Triandis (1995, 1996) cultures differ in terms of their emphasis on either hierarchy or egalitarianism. Some cultures, in which in-group (e.g., family) authorities determine most social behavior, value hierarchy and some others, in which social behavior is more egalitarian, value egalitarianism. Hierarchy oriented cultures involve vertical relationships; on the other hand, egalitarianism oriented cultures involve horizontal relationships. Considering I-C, some individualistic cultures, in which hierarchy is important, are labeled as vertical individualistic (e.g., USA and France); some others, in which egalitarianism is important, are labeled as horizontal individualistic cultures (e.g., Sweden and Australia). On the other hand, some collectivist cultures, in which hierarchy is important, are defined as vertical collectivist (e.g., India and traditional Greece); some others, in which egalitarianism

is important, are defined as horizontal collectivist (e.g., the Israeli kibbutz). Regarding the prevalence of vertical and horizontal collectivist and individualistic cultures, however, Triandis (1995) argued that vertical collectivism and horizontal individualism are the “typical” patterns around the world because of Hofstede’s (1980) finding that collectivism is highly correlated with power distance.

Considering the individual differences, individuals who are high on the horizontal dimension emphasize equality and believe that everyone should have equal rights and status whereas individuals who are high on vertical dimension emphasize hierarchy and accept social order and inequality in their relationships. According to Triandis (1995) vertical dimension represents the self as different from others; horizontal dimension represents the self as similar or equal with others. As a result, individuals differ in terms of horizontal individualism (HI), horizontal collectivism (HC), vertical individualism (VI), and vertical collectivism (VC) (Triandis, 1995, 1996). According to Chirkov, Lynch and Niwa, (2005) these orientations in people are long lasting and affect the social life of people in different domains such as family, job relations, political structure, etc.

VC orientation emphasizes the subordination of personal goals to the goals of collective (e.g., family), the sacrifice of individual interests for the benefit of in-group, and status differences between in-group members and related with valuing tradition, respect for family and doing one’s duty. Different from VC, HC emphasizes the relationships between in-group members instead of concerning the in-group as a whole. HC orientation gives importance to the concepts such as social cohesion, oneness with in-group members, communal sharing, trust, and mutual respect. VI orientation emphasizes the hierarchy and status differences in a competitive way. Accordingly, VI is related with striving for the higher position in hierarchy and a desire to be the best among others, so comparing oneself with others. On the other hand, HI orientation does not emphasize the distinctiveness but gives importance to the individual development, autonomy, and privacy while respecting other individuals (Chiou, 2001; Chirkov et al., 2005; Kemmelmeier et al., 2003; Triandis, 1995).

In the words of Kağıtçıbaşı (1997)

Vertical collectivism involves the self-merged with a hierarchical in-group; horizontal collectivism implies the same interdependent self as a member of an equalitarian in-group. Vertical individualism refers to an autonomous self in a group of unequal individuals, whereas horizontal individualism involves the independent self in an equalitarian in-group (p. 21).

In order to demonstrate the generalizability of these four cultural dimensions, Triandis (1996) used Schwartz's (1992, 1994) findings suggesting that in most countries (people from 56 countries participated in the study) the cultural values represent two main dimensions; one dimension is individualism (openness to change including self direction, stimulation, and hedonism) versus collectivism (conservation including security, conformity, and tradition), the other dimension is vertical (power and achievement) versus horizontal (benevolence and universalism). Considering these explanations, one is likely to interpret that Triandis corresponds VC orientation with conservation and power related cultural values; VI orientation with openness to change, power and achievement related values; HC orientation with conservation, benevolence and universalism related values; and HI orientation with openness to change, benevolence and universalism related values. However, as explained below, later empirical studies do not totally confirm these arguments.

Using a USA sample Oishi, Schimmack, Diener, and Suh (1998) tested these arguments and found that VI is related with power (i.e., social status, dominance over people and resources) and achievement (i.e., personal success according to social standards); HI is related with self-direction (independence of thought and action); VC is related with conformity (i.e., restraint of actions that may violate social expectations) and security (i.e., safety and stability of society, relationships, and self); and HC is related with benevolence (preserving and enhancing the welfare of close others).

In another study examining the relationships between Schwartz's values, personality types and vertical and horizontal I-C using Singapore and USA samples, Soh and Leong (2002) reported that in both cultures VI is more related to power and desire to influence and dominate others than achievement. They also reported positive

correlation between VC and tradition (i.e., respect and commitment to cultural or religious customs and ideas), security, and conformity, which reached highest significance in both cultures. In this way, they argued that power is more related to VI than VC. In terms of HI and HC, similar to the findings of Oishi et al. (1998), Soh and Leong (2002) also reported positive relation between HI-self direction and between HC-benevolence. However, different from Oishi et al. (1998), Soh and Leong (2002) also found positive relation between benevolence, universalism (i.e., understanding, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and nature) and VC.

On the other hand, in another cross-cultural study including participants from Turkey, USA, and Philippines, Çukur, Guzman and Carlo (2004) reported negative relationship between VC and self-direction and stimulation related values in all three countries. Interestingly, Çukur et al. (2004) also noted negative correlation between VI and self-direction for Turkish participants. Regarding other relationships for Turkish culture, they found that VI is positively related with power, achievement, hedonism, and negatively associated with universalism, benevolence, tradition and security; VC is positively associated with tradition, conformity, security, and benevolence, and negatively associated with achievement, universalism, hedonism, stimulation, and self direction; HC is positively related with benevolence and conformity, negatively related with power, achievement, and self direction; HI is positively related with hedonism, stimulation, and self direction, negatively related with tradition, conformity, security, and benevolence.

Regarding other empirical studies dealing with vertical and horizontal I-C, they generally reported supportive evidence for above-mentioned arguments. For example, in one study Kemmelmeier et al. (2003) claimed that because authoritarianism including variables of “conformity” and “submission to authority” refers to power differences, it should be related with vertical dimension (both VI, VC). Especially, seeing authoritarianism related with valuing “traditional authority family structure” they expected higher positive correlation between authoritarianism and VC. On the other hand, distinguishing between to be identifying with in-group (characteristic of VC) and connectedness to in-group members, and accepting HC

associated with interpersonal connectedness, they expected HC unrelated with authoritarianism. As a result, they confirmed their hypotheses in their study in which data were collected from seven countries. In another study examining the relationships between HC, VC and reward allocation in China, Chen, Meindl, and Hunt (1997) found differential reward allocation (not based on distributive justice) positively related with VC (because of in group emphasis). As a conclusion, based on two research findings, one correlating collectivism with conformity and the other correlating it with power distance, Chen et al. (1997) questioned that “could it be that power distance and conformity have more to do with vertical than with horizontal collectivism?” (p. 65).

In another study, Strunk and Chang (1999) hypothesized that equality based sociopolitical attitudes, such as humanitarianism-egalitarianism, would be positively related with collectivism, especially with HC, but negatively related with individualism, especially with VI; on the other hand, inequality based attitudes, such as social dominance orientation, would be positively related with individualism, especially VI, but negatively associated with collectivism, especially with HC. They found humanitarianism-egalitarianism positively related with HI, HC, and VC (the strongest association with HC); social dominance orientation negatively related with HC, positively related with VI; and anti-black attitudes positively related with VI and VC. As a conclusion, they argued that HC is more positively and consistently associated with equality based sociopolitical attitudes than VC, and VI is more positively and consistently related with inequality-based attitudes than HI.

In order to test the convergent validity of vertical and horizontal I-C constructs Triandis and Gelfand (1998) distinguished between the components of individualism as self-reliance, emotional distance from in-groups, competition, and hedonism; and the components of collectivism as interdependence, family integrity and sociability. As a result, they found that VI is related with hedonism and competition; HI is related with self-reliance; VC is related with family integrity and sociability; HC related with interdependence (relatedness) and sociability. In this study, Triandis and Gelfand (1998) also aimed to clarify the overlap between HC and VC and argued that because both emphasize on sociability, HC and VC are related; however in terms

of family integrity and interdependence they are distinct -HC includes interdependence (relatedness with others), VC includes family integrity-.

In general above-mentioned studies (e.g., Çukur et al., 2004; Strunk & Chang, 1999; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) demonstrate that VC, VI, HI, and HC orientations in people are associated with different characteristics of them, although there are overlaps between these constructs. To summarize, it seems that people high in HC attribute importance to the close relationships and interrelatedness between people; on the other hand, people high in HI emphasize on the self-reliance and the independency from others. With regard to VI and VC, it seems that people high in VC consider family integrity and traditional family structure as important; on the other hand, people high in VI mostly emphasize on being different and more powerful than others.

1.3 Individualism-Collectivism and Parenting Styles

In the socialization process of the children individualistic and collectivist cultures differ in the desired level of independency and dependency in children (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997). Cultures sharing individualistic ideology value independence in childrearing whereas cultures sharing collectivist ideology value dependence. For example, in a study comparing Anglo (Individualistic) and Puerto Rican (collectivist) mothers in terms of the parental beliefs and goals, Harwood, Schoelmerich, Ventura-Cook, Schulze, and Wilson (1996) argued that individualistic and collectivist cultures mostly differ in their emphasis on either “self maximization” (independence and the development of personal skills) or “proper demeanor” (respectfulness, obedience, and attentiveness) in childrearing. Accordingly, they found that Puerto Rican mothers evaluate their child’s behavior and set socialization goals in terms of “proper demeanor” whereas Anglo mothers do so in terms of “self maximization. As a result, they suggested that parents’ attitudes and values about childrearing are influenced by “broad-level cultural constructs” which are salient in a given culture.

Since in individualistic cultures “individuation-separation” is regarded as necessary for healthy human development (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996b), the primary concern of parents

in such cultures is to raise children who are self reliant, independent and creative (e.g., Triandis, 1989). On the other hand, since in collectivist cultures interdependence is valued (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996b); the primary concern of parents in such cultures is to raise children who are obedient, reliable and properly behave (Triandis, 1989).

Based on Adamopoulos and Bontempo's (1984) suggestion that childrearing patterns have two main dimensions -acceptance-rejection and independence-dependence- around the world, Triandis (1995) argued that individualists tend to use acceptance/independence, which lead to high self confidence, while collectivists tend to use acceptance/dependence, which lead to conformity. Therefore, parenting styles, particularly parental control and acceptance, are relevant to the individualism and collectivism related tendencies in people. According to Triandis (1995) collectivists control their children by providing high rates of interaction, guidance, and consultation. In this way, dependence of the child on the parents is often encouraged. Triandis (1995) attracted attention to the importance of realizing that parental control tends to have a different meaning in collectivist and individualistic cultures. In collectivist cultures it is often perceived as "love" because it is part of the effort of the parents to make the child a useful member of the in-group or the society; in individualistic cultures, on the other hand, it is often perceived as "over control" and leads to negative affect. Similarly, based on some research findings about parental control and children's perception of parental acceptance, Kağıtçıbaşı (1997) argued that children in North America and Germany perceive parental control as parental hostility and rejection, whereas the same behavior of parental control is perceived as parental warmth and acceptance in Japan and Korea. As an explanation she proposed that because in collectivist cultures parental control is the social norm, e.g., it is "normal" and perceived as "good". On the other hand, in individualistic contexts parental control is exception, e.g., "not normal", controlling parents are perceived as hostile or rejecting. In the supporting way, Trommsdorff (1985) noted "Japanese adolescents even feel rejected by their parents when they experience only little parental control and a broader range of autonomy" (cited in Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997).

In one of the early studies comparing American and Turkish adolescents Kağıtçıbaşı (1970) indicated that Turkish adolescents perceive more parental control than American adolescents while in terms of parental affection they do not differ. Accordingly, this study showed that parental control rather than parental acceptance is likely to vary on the basis of social-normative context. Actually, Kağıtçıbaşı (1997) proposed that because parental affection functions in the protection and care of the offspring, it shows universality; on the other hand, parental control is related with socialization values and goals, so it shows variation across socio-cultural contexts. Similar to the results of Kağıtçıbaşı's early study, in more recent study comparing American and Turkish university students, Karakitapoğlu-Aygün (2002) also found that Turkish students perceive more parental control than American students do, although they did not differ in terms of their perceived parental acceptance.

Regarding the parental correlates of individualism and collectivism related tendencies in people, Kağıtçıbaşı and İmamoğlu offered models, which are Family Change Model, and Balanced Integration Differentiation Model, respectively. These models explain parental control and acceptance related correlates of individualism and collectivism related tendencies in people, as presented below.

1.3.1 Family Change Model (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990, 1996a, b, 2005)

Influenced by cross-cultural perspective about family and socialization, Kağıtçıbaşı (1990, 1996a, b, 2005) developed a “family change model” that offers the ideal-typical family patterns of different socio-cultural contexts. In addition to explaining the ideal-typical family patterns of individualistic and collectivist cultures, this model also proposes a family model for the collectivist cultures, which are undergoing socioeconomic change. Moreover, this model provides “some explanations for the contrasting childrearing orientations among the middle-class/urban/educated groups and the low SES/rural/marginal immigrant groups” (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996a, p.72). Based on the dimension of dependency-independency, the family change model focuses on the intergenerational family interactions. Accordingly four general patterns of intergenerational interactions are claimed in four different family types, namely the

model of interdependence, the model of independence, the model of emotional interdependence, and the model of hierarchical neglecting family (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005).

Kağıtçıbaşı conceptualizes individualism and collectivism related tendencies in people in the way that is termed as interpersonal distance (separateness vs. relatedness) and agency (autonomy vs. heteronomy). Interpersonal relatedness vs. separateness shows the extent to which individuals live in close physical and social proximity to each other whereas autonomy vs. heteronomy shows the degree to which individuals have control over their own circumstances. Based on these two dimensions, each family model includes the definitions of related parenting styles, childrearing orientations, and self-construal, as seen in Figure 2.

	Parenting Style	Childrearing Or.	Self Construal
Interdependence	Authoritarian	Control/obedience	Relational
Independence	Permissive	Autonomy/self reliance	Separated
Emotional Interdependence	Authoritative	Control/autonomy	Autonomous- relational
Hierarchical Neglecting	Neglecting/indifferent	Rejection/obedience	Heteronomous- separate

Figure 2: Family models, parenting and the self (exemplified from Kağıtçıbaşı 1996b)

Model of interdependence reflects the ideal-typical family pattern of traditional collectivist cultures with closely-knit family and kin relations and patrilineal family structures. Members of this family pattern are both materially and emotionally dependent on each other. In order to ensure “child’s full integration in the family”, dependence/obedience is emphasized in childrearing and so parenting style of such context is defined as authoritarian. Regarding self-construal development, such context is related with the relational self that involves relatedness (close relationships) and heteronomy poles (to behave in accordance with normative expectations) of interpersonal distance and agency dimensions, respectively (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996b, 2005).

Model of independence reflects the ideal-typical family pattern of individualistic cultures (industrial, urban, middle-class societies) with the independence of families from other families and the members of the families from each other. In childrearing autonomy is valued, and so parenting style of such contexts is defined as permissive. This family pattern is related with the separated self that involves separateness (physical and social distance from others) and autonomy poles (to be autonomous in decision making) of interpersonal distance and agency dimensions, respectively (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996b, 2005).

Model of emotional interdependence reflects the ideal-typical family pattern of collectivist cultures undergoing socioeconomic change. In urban, high SES settings of such collectivist cultures, emotional interdependencies between family members remain to exist, however, material interdependencies between them tend to decrease. Thus, in such settings both “family/group loyalties” and “individual loyalties” emerge. Because both autonomy and relatedness are emphasized in childrearing, the parenting style of such contexts is defined as authoritative. The self-construal of the model of emotional interdependence is autonomous-related self that involves relatedness and autonomy poles of interpersonal distance and agency dimensions, respectively (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996b, 2005).

According to Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) hierarchical-neglecting family corresponds with the separated-heteronomous self, which reflects the non-satisfaction of both relatedness and autonomy. In such families neglectful, indifferent and rejecting parenting is related with being separated and heteronomous at the same time.

To summarize, in the model of Kağıtçıbaşı individualism related tendencies correspond with separateness and autonomy together and is related with permissive parenting style, whereas collectivism related tendencies correspond with relatedness and heteronomy and are related with authoritarian parenting style. In addition, the togetherness of both individualism and collectivism related tendencies correspond with autonomy and relatedness, respectively and is related with authoritative parenting style. On the other hand, the non-satisfaction of both collectivism and

individualism related tendencies correspond with the togetherness of heteronomy and separateness and is related with neglectful parenting style.

1.3.2 Balanced Integration Differentiation Model (BID model) (İmamoğlu, 1995, 1998, 2003)

In the BID model, İmamoğlu (1998, 2003) conceptualizes individualism and collectivism related tendencies in people in a way that is termed as interpersonal integration and intrapersonal differentiation. The BID model requires the development of both intrapersonal differentiation and interpersonal integration in a balanced way for “optimal psychological functioning”. In order to explain the parental correlates of intrapersonal differentiation and interpersonal integration orientations in people, İmamoğlu (2003) defined family contexts, namely, differentiative family context, integrative family context, balanced family context, and unbalanced family context, which emphasize the relationships between parents and their children, as seen in Figure 3.

According to İmamoğlu (2003) differentiative family contexts, in which low control and low nurturance exist in childrearing, is related with the separated-individuated self that shows the satisfaction of intrapersonal differentiation but non satisfaction of interpersonal integration orientations.

On the other hand, integrative family contexts, in which “nurturance, sacrifice, as well as, strict, intrusive, overprotective control” exist, is related with the related patterning self that shows the non-satisfaction of intrapersonal differentiation but satisfaction of interpersonal integration orientations. In such contexts individualist tendencies are seen as a threat to family harmony/integrity, so children are taught to behave in accordance with parents’ obligations and to be grateful to them. Therefore, if children meet the expectations of their parents, positive affectivity and attachment can be sustained between parents and their children.

		<i>Intrapersonal differentiation</i>	
		High	Low
<i>Interpersonal Integration</i>	High	Related-individuated self	Related-patterned self
		Balanced family context	Integrative family context
		High acceptance, low control	High acceptance and control
	Low	Separated-individuated self	Separated-patterned self
		Differentiative family context	Unbalanced family context
		Low in control and acceptance	High control, low acceptance

Figure 3: BID Model and Family Contexts

Balanced family contexts, in which low restrictive control and high acceptance exist, is related with the related individuated self that shows the satisfaction of both intrapersonal differentiation and interpersonal integration orientations. People with such self-construal concern both their individuality and the relatedness with parents and close others in a balanced way.

The last defined context, which is high in restrictive control but low in acceptance, is unbalanced family contexts. Such contexts are related with the separated patterning self that shows the non-satisfaction of both interpersonal integration and intrapersonal differentiation orientations, as seen in Figure 3.

To summarize, it may be argued that in the model of İmamoğlu (2003) collectivism related tendencies correspond with the togetherness of relatedness (close relationships with parents and others) and normative patterning (to behave in accordance with normative expectations) and are related with the high accepting and controlling parenting style; individualism related tendencies correspond with the togetherness of separateness (being in physical and social distance from others) and individuation (to behave in accordance with personal inclinations) and are related with the low accepting and controlling parenting. On the other hand, the development of both individualism and collectivism related tendencies correspond with the togetherness of individuation and relatedness, respectively and are related with the high accepting and low controlling parenting style. The non-satisfaction of

both collectivism and individualism related tendencies correspond with the togetherness of normative patterning and separateness and are related with the high controlling and low accepting parenting style.

In one cross-cultural study using İmamoğlu's conceptualization of self-construal development, Karakitapoğlu-Aygün (2002) investigated the relationships between perceived parenting styles and self-construal among American and Turkish university students. She reported that interpersonal integration orientation correlates positively with perceived parental acceptance whereas intrapersonal differentiation orientation correlates negatively with perceived parental control for both Turkish and American participants.

Considering the studies of I-C, one of the issues is whether I-C shows only variation between cultures or it differs also between individuals within given culture. In actual, the concept of I-C, as an area of psychological investigation, emerged within cross-cultural psychology (Hofstede, 1980) and was used for a long time for the explanations of cultural differences. On the other hand, this study is not a cross-cultural study of I-C but considers individual differences in a context of Turkish culture. Accordingly, the information about the cross- and within- cultural analyses of I-C is presented as separate section, below.

1.4 Cross-and Within-Cultural Analyses of I-C

While conducting cultural level of analyses (the comparison between cultures), cross-cultural psychologists generally argue that individuals from individualistic cultures tend to have individualistic tendencies and independent self, whereas individuals from collectivist cultures tend to have collectivist tendencies and interdependent self (e.g., Markus & Kitayama). However, this may not be the case all the time. Initially, it seems important to note that cross-cultural studies of I-C are generally conducted in extremely different cultural contexts (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996a). Moreover, while searching for cross cultural differences in social behavior and explaining these in the context of I-C, cross cultural psychologists generally do not directly measure the individualism or collectivism level of people; it is just

assumed on the basis of their cultural background (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997). Actually, in studies using cultural level of analyses, culture –individualistic or collectivistic- is regarded enough as independent variable, instead of dealing with mediating variables between culture and social behavior. However, it is true that the absence of mediating variables remains questionable “what” in culture “causes” behavior (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1994). In the supporting way, Neff (2003) argued that focusing on the culture in the attempt to explore underlying processes of human behavior is problematic, even in the case of totally individualistic or collectivist cultures, because it leads to “overgeneralizations”, “interpretive bias”, and a “misrepresentation” of the complex interaction of independency and interdependency tendencies.

Recently, Singelis, Bond, Sharkey, and Lai (1999) investigated independent and interdependent self-construal in different cultural contexts. In contrast with cross-cultural approach, they reported that average scores on both independent and interdependent self-construal are over the midpoint for both individualistic (Euro-Americans) and collectivist (Hong Kong Chinese) cultures. This study showed that participants from both cultures were likely to describe themselves in terms of both individualism and collectivism related tendencies. As a conclusion, finding that between-group differences are smaller than the within group differences, this study indicated that there is more variation in I-C within cultures than between cultures (Neff, 2003).

Similarly, in terms of vertical and horizontal I-C, Triandis (1995) suggested that in every culture there are some horizontal and some vertical individualistic and some horizontal and some vertical collectivists, although in each culture there may be an overall pattern with a characteristic distribution of individuals among the four types. For example, in one study Triandis and Gelfand (1998) tested the existence of VI, VC, HI, and HC constructs in the collectivist cultures (Korea) and reported empirical evidence for the validity of these constructs for collectivist cultures. Thus, I-C can be used in explaining individual differences in social behavior in a given culture (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1994; Triandis, 1995).

As a result, above explanations suggest that studying I-C in a specific culture is possible and important. Accepting both independency and interdependency as basic human needs, Neff (2003) suggested that rather than focusing on these two orientations in different cultures, it might be more useful and informative determining different conditions in which these needs are met or unmet within given cultural contexts. In terms of I-C and parenting, Neff (2003) proposed that the examination of parental behavior and attitudes could help researchers to determine the ways in which the need for both independence and interdependence are met or in which they are in conflict.

Similarly, both Kağıtçıbaşı and İmamoğlu in Turkey made proposals about familial and parental correlates of individualism and collectivism related tendencies in people. However, it is noteworthy that both Kağıtçıbaşı and İmamoğlu used their own conceptualization on the issue of I-C while relating it to parenting styles, as explained before. As mentioned previously, Triandis made another conceptualization of I-C, although he did not provide parenting related information while talking about the constructs of VC, VI, HC, and HI. In this sense, the present study aims to explore the relationships between Triandis' VC, VI, HC, HI constructs, religiosity and parenting styles as two dimensions –control and acceptance- and four categories – authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful and indulgent-permissive- within the context of Turkish culture. Using data from mothers, fathers, and their children this study examines the relationships between VC, VI, HC, HI, religiosity, and parenting styles from the perspective of parents and their children. Accordingly, the present study tries to explore how VC, VI, HC, HI, religiosity correlate with maternal and paternal control and acceptance in parents and how perceived parental control and acceptance correlate with VC, VI, HC, HI, and religiosity in children. In addition, using scores taken from mothers, fathers, and their children, this study examines how authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful, and indulgent-permissive families differ in terms of their VC, VI, HC, HI, and religiosity.

Considering the within culture variations in terms of I-C and also parenting styles, Kağıtçıbaşı (1994, 1997) also attract attention to the importance of determining some confounding variables -in the relationship between cultural orientations and social

behavior- and controlling for the effects of them in research designs. As some of these confounding variables Kağıtçıbaşı (1997) suggested SES related variables, such as education level, income, urban-rural standing, and type of employment. Actually, socioeconomic status is treated as crucial variable affecting within culture variations in terms of both I-C and parenting by also other researchers (e.g., Freeman, 1997; Hoff, Laursen, & Tardif, 2002), as explained in the following section.

1.4.1 Socioeconomic Status (SES), Individualism-Collectivism, and Parenting Styles

As mentioned above SES is one important variable that is regarded as affecting within culture variations in terms of I-C, and also parenting. Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) noted that not only the culturally shared ideology of I-C affects the dependency or independency oriented family relations but also the affluence level (affluent or nonaffluent lifestyles) of living contexts has an impact on family relations. She added that although the family model of interdependence is characteristic of collectivist cultures, it is also seen in urban low-SES contexts because of the contribution of the children to the family economy. In a similar way, Triandis (1989) argued that in all cultures upper social classes are more likely to be individualistic than the lower social classes. In a study investigating the demographic correlates of I-C, it was indicated that SES correlates negatively with collectivist tendencies but positively with individualistic tendencies (Freeman, 1997).

With respect to parenting, Hoff, Laursen, and Tardif (2002) argued that SES constituting educational, occupational and financial factors affects the patterns of parenting, although they noted that among them especially educational level of parents (especially mothers) is the strongest predictor of parental behavior and attitudes. Reviewing some research evidence, Hoff et al. (2002) concluded that in different cultures parents from lower socioeconomic status tend to value conformity in their children whereas parents from higher SES tend to encourage their children to be self-directed. Similarly, in Turkey İmamoğlu (1987) found that urban upper SES

mothers value independence and self-reliance, whereas middle and lower SES mothers emphasize the obedience and loyalty to parents in their children.

However, these explanations should not be interpreted as SES is the only factor explaining variations in childrearing orientations. For example, in one study examining both between and within cultural differences in childrearing and aiming to unravel the effects of “broad-level cultural constructs” and social class, Harwood et al. (1996) reported that although social class is one factor explaining within cultural differences, cultural values alone continue to be influential in different childrearing orientations. Equaling for social class Harwood et al. (1996) found that Puerto Rican mothers are more oriented toward “proper demeanor” in childrearing whereas Anglo mothers are more oriented toward “self maximization”, as mentioned previously.

In the light of above explanations, using scores taken from mothers, fathers, and their children, the present study investigates the differences between low and high SES families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity (another subject of the study), and parental control and acceptance. In addition, the effects of SES related variables, namely education level and family income on maternal and paternal control and acceptance in the parent sample and on VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity in the child sample are examined. Regarding Kağıtçıbaşı’s (2005) explanation that intergenerational differences are possible in terms of the childrearing orientations, the effects of the age of parents on maternal and paternal control and acceptance is also examined.

When culture related differences are considered religiosity becomes an important factor to consider since culture-related orientations are relevant to religion (e.g., Tarakeshwar, Stanton, & Pargament, 2003). As one of the important socio-cultural variables, religiosity has also an impact on people’s family life and particularly on their parental experiences (e.g., Shor, 1998). Because of such reasons religiosity is included in the study and is explained in the following section.

1.5 Religiosity

Simply, the term “religiosity” or “religiousness” refers to the importance of religion in the life of people. Religious people “who believe in a sacred power view the world thorough the lens of mythic or scriptural vocabularies and regulate their lives according to the models and injunctions set forth in their religious traditions” (Tarakeshwar et al., 2003, p.377). However, according to Verbit (1970) this definition of religiosity does not simply imply the relation between an individual and sacred power but rather it refers to the relation between individual and a certain worldview (cited in Çukur et al., 2004).

Based on research about the psychology of religion Tarakeshwar et al. (2003) defined five dimensions of religiosity as ideological, ritualistic, experiential, intellectual, and social. Ideological dimension refers to the religious beliefs about “the nature of the divine”, “the ultimate destination or purpose of life” and “the pathways people should follow to fulfill this divine purpose” and “the importance of these beliefs in the life of people”. Other dimensions represent, in general, religion related behaviors, spiritual life, knowledge, and relationships with others, respectively. With regard to different dimensions of religiosity Saroglou, Delpierre, and Dernelle (2004) argued that although psychosocial functioning of religion may be better understood when distinguishing between different dimensions, results based on general religiosity measures (akin to ideological dimension) are valid and similar to those taken from multidimensional religiosity scales. Moreover, Schaefer and Gorsuch (1991) demonstrated that the measurement of general religiosity has more predictive power than the measurement of separate religiosity categories. Regarding general or ideological religiosity, Tarakeshwar et al. (2003) argued that religious ideology has an important impact on people’s lives and as an example; they suggested that because of their belief in Judaism, Israeli Jewish people give priority to the preservation of social conventions.

In general, studies in the area of the psychology of religion either deal with religiosity as having psychosocial functions (e.g., coping strategy) or as influencing the worldview of people (e.g., value system) (Mahoney, Pargament, Tarakeshwar, &

Swank, 2001). As an example of the influence of religion in the worldviews of people, Mahoney et al. (2001) suggested that conservative Christian ideology encourages its members to teach their children to be obedient and to believe the correctness of corporal punishment in order to obtain child compliance.

In the literature of sociology, religion as a belief system or worldview (ideological dimension) is regarded as an important factor determining value systems of people in general (Mutlu, 1996). According to Hinde (1999) religion functions in a way that integrates “values”, “moral codes”, “beliefs”, “rituals”, “emotions” and “community” into a unifying whole (cited in Saroglou et al., 2004). According to Tarakeshwar et al. (2003) across cultures religion has the grateful impact on the relationships between individuals including within family relations. Assuming powerful links between religion, culture and human behavior, Tarakeshwar et al. (2003) argued that the role religion plays in the relationship between culture and social behavior is far from the limited one. After reviewing some research findings and concluding that religiosity shows strong positive relation with traditional values and negative relations with hedonism, Tarakeshwar et al. (2003) claimed that religion serves as a distinctive predictor of culture related dimensions. Accordingly, because of seeing religiosity as a possible confounding variable in the relationship between cultural variables (e.g., individualism-collectivism) and outcome variables (e.g., parental attitudes), they noted that culture and religion should be examined together for a better understanding of culture-related similarities and differences.

In a meta-analytic study Saroglou et al. (2004) reviewed studies (totally 21 samples from 15 countries) investigating the relationship between Schwartz’s model of values and religiosity. As mentioned previously, Schwartz’s values are organized into two axes, one representing two poles of self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence related values) and self-enhancement (achievement and power related values). The other axis represents two poles of conservation (conformity, tradition, and security related values) and openness to change (self direction and stimulation related values) (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Considering the relationships between conservation and openness to change values and religiosity, Saroglou et al. (2004) concluded that religious people are likely to attribute more importance to the

tradition and conformity related values, but lower importance to the self direction and hedonism related values across different religions (Christians, Jews, and Muslims) and cultures. Considering the relationships between self-transcendence and self-enhancement values and religiosity they concluded that in more developed countries the relationship between religiosity and benevolence is more positive, and the correlation between power and religiosity is more negative than less developed countries. With respect to socioeconomic development, they summarized that “overall, the more a society tended to be developed, the less religion implied conservation values (CO, TR, SE) and discomfort with autonomy (SD) and achievement, and the more it reflected self-transcendence values (BE, UN) and neglect of power” (p.731). As an explanation of this, they noted that

in more developed societies, religion follows the general cultural change of autonomization and democratization of values and way of life, and then becomes less traditional and in-group focused, more individualized, and perhaps even less anti-hedonistic and more intrinsic (p.731).

With regard to Turkey in which present study was conducted, and which is characterized as developing country (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997), Çukur et al. (2004) reported a negative significant correlation between universalism and religiosity for Turkish people. Regarding the other relationships between other value types and religiosity for Turkish culture, Çukur et al. (2004) found religiosity positively correlated with tradition, conformity, security, and benevolence related values and negatively correlated with self-direction, stimulation, and hedonism related values. In a similar way, Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000) found that more religious Turkish teachers give more importance to the conservatism related values and less importance to the openness to change values than less religious teachers. In addition, similar to Çukur et al (2004), Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000) reported negative relationship between religiosity and universalism related values among Turkish teachers. In terms of religiosity and vertical and horizontal I-C, Çukur et al. (2004) also examined the relationships between these constructs in Turkey, USA, and Philippines. As a result they found that religiosity was positively correlated with VC and HC in all countries. Contrary to their expectations they also found positive relationship between religiosity and VI for only Turkish university students.

1.5.1 Religiosity and Parenting Styles

Despite the prevalence of ideologies such as “secularization”, “postmodernism”, “global capitalism”, and “the rhetoric of multiculturalism” religion has powerful influence in the life of people, particularly in their family life (Frosh, 2004; Halman, Pettersson, & Verweij, 1999). With regard to the family related values and attitudes in domains, such as marital quality, family size, and attitudes towards gender roles, Halman et al. (1999) emphasized the powerful impact of religion in these domains in contemporary societies. In their study Halman et al. (1999) conceptualized private sphere as “traditional family pattern”, “traditional parent-child relationships”, and “conformity”, and reported the stronger impact of religiosity on private sphere than on public sphere, such as political orientation.

Specifically, in terms of the parental behavior and attitudes, Shor (1998) proposed that religion has a major influence on attitudes, values, and behaviors of parents about childrearing. Especially, seeing religiosity in relation with collectivist norms, Shor (1998) argued that the combination of religiosity and collectivism orients parents towards childrearing in which the integration of the child to community is primary socialization goal. Discussing the relationship between parenting and religiosity Frosh (2004) attracted attention to parents in whose life religion is central and argued that for these parents religion is “bedrock” determining the core parental attitudes and behaviors towards their children. Accordingly, these parents give priority to the demands of certain religion instead of individual demands of their children and try to maintain the “traditional authority structures”, because for these parents the social conventions are more important than the “freedom”, “autonomy”, and “independence” of the child (Frosh, 2004).

In terms of religiosity and parenting, researchers generally focused on Catholic-Protestant differences in global parental values -obedience vs. autonomy in children- (Ellison & Sherkat, 1993). For example, in an early study Lenski (1958) defined two main childrearing values in parents as “autonomy” and “conformity” and demonstrated that Catholics value conformity in their children more than Protestant people, after controlling for SES variables (cited in Alwin, 1986). In another study

comparing Conservative Protestants and Catholics with other Americans Ellison and Sherkat (1993) found that Conservative protestants more than Catholics and Catholics more than other Americans value obedience in their children, after controlling for SES variables. They also reported that for Conservative Protestants, three theological orientations, “the doctrine of biblical literalism”, “beliefs in original sin”, and “punitive attitudes toward sinners” mediate the relationship between religiosity and obedience based childrearing orientation. Interestingly, in terms of autonomy Ellison and Sherkat (1993) noted that in addition to obedience Conservative Protestants also value autonomy in childrearing different from Catholics do.

In their meta analytic study Mahoney et al. (2001) examined religiosity-parenting relationship in the domains of “attitudes about child conformity”, “belief in corporal punishment”, “use of physical discipline”, “disciplinary attitudes or behaviors”, “warmth and positivity”, “parental coping”, and “child psychopathology”. Although they saw psychological inquiry in terms of religiosity and parenting as insufficient to make firm conclusions, Mahoney et al. (2001) reported positive effect of religiosity in domains of “warmth and positivity”, “parental coping”, and “child psychopathology”. However, regarding other domains, Mahoney et al. (2001) found Christian conservatism positively related with the valuing of obedience in childrearing, belief in corporal punishment, use of physical discipline, and giving importance to the discipline of children.

Research about parenting and religiosity generally concerns the question of whether religiosity affects parenting negatively or positively (Frosh, 2004; Mahoney et al. 2001). Actually, in the light of above explanations, it is arguable that religious parents are more likely to want their children to be obedient to and respectful for parents and so to be integrated into their family life than nonreligious parents do, although it may be possible to observe differences among different religions. This implies that religiosity in family life functions to keep the family members together and not encourage them to be separate and independent from close others. In a supporting way, for example, Serageldin (1989) argued that Islamic principles encourage closely-knit family relations among Muslim people (cited in İmamoğlu,

1999). Regarding Turkish Muslim people, İmamoğlu (1999) also claimed that in line with Islamic and cultural conventions, Turkish Muslim people value respectfulness, obedience, conformity, and responsibility of the children in their relationships with parents. In a similar vein, using a sample from another religion and society - Protestant Christian Americans-, Lee and Early (2000) investigated the relationship between family values and religious behavior and demonstrated that religious behavior is positively correlated with the family traditionalism values and negatively correlated with the family progressivism values.

Considering the above explanations, it seems that being religious or nonreligious alone is an important factor influencing people's lives, particularly family lives, regardless of being a member of a given religion, such as Christianity, Islam, or Jewish. However, again regarding the above explanations, this does not mean that it is unnecessary to search for people from different religions in terms of their individual characteristics, particularly their parent-child relationships. Actually, Mahoney et al. (2001) in their meta-analytic study saw a literature gap in empirical studies of parenting and religiosity because of the absence of studies dealing with other religions, such as Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism instead of the major religions of Western societies. In this sense, the present study may be useful because one of the aims of the study is to explore how parenting styles of Turkish people who are Muslim vary in accordance with their religiosity level.

1.6 Aims of the Study and Related Expectations

Before specifying the aims of the study and related expectations, it seems important to mention the aspects of Turkish culture, and particularly the aspects of Turkish family. Traditional Turkish family is generally characterized as a patriarchal system in which material and emotional interdependencies exist between family members. So, childrearing is oriented to maintain the dominance of men and to make child dependent to each family member. Actually, traditional Turkish family serves as the most salient in-group for its members that lead the definition of Turkey as collectivist country (Sunar, 2002). In this way, the benefit of the family as a whole is emphasized over the benefit of each individual. In other words, for the maintenance

of the closely-knit family relations and family loyalty, subordination of the personal needs to the family as a group is encouraged. So, the parents, especially fathers, represent authority figures in traditional family and encourage their children to be obedient to and responsible for them (Sunar, 2000). Accordingly, traditional attitudes about childrearing include “unconditional obedience”, “strict parental control”, “protection”, and “concern and parental sacrifice for the good of the child” (İmamoğlu, 1987). Thus, regarding the emphasis on dependency with in-group (family) and hierarchical social relations in this culture (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000) and the argument that traditional collectivist cultures are mostly vertically collectivist (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis, 1995), in a broad meaning it seems that traditional Turkish culture is VC. However, accepting the existence of emotional interdependencies and benevolence related attitudes such as concern for the welfare of close others (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; Karakitapoğlu-Aygün & İmamoğlu, 2002); it is also arguable that traditional Turkish culture also reflects the aspects of HC.

On the other hand, considering contemporary Turkish culture, researchers argue that in a parallel way with the movement from rural, agricultural, patriarchal society to urbanized, industrialized and egalitarian one, contemporary Turkish culture developed individualism related tendencies besides its existing collectivist tendencies (İmamoğlu, 1987, 1998, 2003; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990, 1996a, b, 2005). Especially, regarding the more developed urban settings of Turkey, researchers demonstrated Turkish culture to adopt both individualism and collectivism related tendencies together (e.g., Göregenli, 1995, 1997; İmamoğlu, 1998). In terms of collectivism, Turkish family continues to be important for its members and so “family harmony”, “preservation of the family’s reputation”, and “general discouragement of autonomy” are still particularly valued by Turkish people from lower socioeconomic status (Sunar, 2002). In addition, emotional interdependencies between family members and interpersonal relatedness with close others are still emphasized by Turkish people (İmamoğlu, 1987, 1998, 2003; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990, 1996a, b, 2005). In terms of individualism, however, people from Turkey, especially educated ones living in big cities, also give importance to the individualistic tendencies, such as independency from others, self-reliance, and individual development (e.g., Göregenli, 1995, 1997; İmamoğlu, 1998). For example, in a study examining value orientations of Turkish

teachers Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000) reported that Turkish teachers attribute importance to both conservatism and openness to change related values similarly. Thus, especially regarding the more developed urban settings of Turkey, both to preserve close emotional ties between family members and to encourage family members to express their own personal interests are important in childrearing (İmamoğlu, 1987, 2003; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990, 1996, a, b). Accordingly, it seems that in a contemporary context of Turkish culture socioeconomic development parallels with the decreases in material interdependencies between family members while emotional interdependencies continue to remain (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Thus, if one generalizes, it is arguable that with higher levels of socioeconomic development people in Turkey tend to become more individualism oriented and with lower levels of socioeconomic development they tend to become more collectivism oriented in their attitudes, behaviors, and values (see also Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005).

Within such a context of Turkish culture the present study tries to explore the relationships between VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, some socio demographical variables and parenting styles from perspective of mothers, fathers, and their children. Specifically, from perspective of the parents, the present study examines how socio demographical variables, namely education level, family income, age, and VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict the maternal and paternal control and acceptance. From perspective of the children, this study also examines how socio demographical variables, namely, education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance predict VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity. As mentioned previously, researchers also distinguished between four categories of parenting styles as authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful and indulgent-permissive and related them with different characteristics of the children (e.g., Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Accordingly, using scores taken from mothers, fathers, and their children, the present study also tries to explore how authoritative, authoritarian, neglectful and indulgent-permissive families differ in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity. Besides, in the light of above explanations, it seems also important to explore whether there are significant differences between mothers, fathers and their children in terms of the study variables. Finally, regarding that socioeconomic status

is an important factor affecting within cultural variations in terms of I-C and parenting, using scores taken from mothers, fathers, and their children, this study also aims to explore how low and high SES families differ in terms of the study variables.

Therefore, considering all of the above-mentioned explanations, the aims of the study are specified and presented with the related expectations, below.

- 1) Are there significant differences between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance? And, are there significant differences between low and high SES families in terms of the study variables?

Expectation: Considering the socio-cultural change in Turkey (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005), it was expected that there would be generation difference in terms of I-C, as parents being more collectivist (especially VC) whereas children as being more individualistic (especially HI) oriented. Regarding that parents may be more traditional oriented, it was also expected that parents would score higher on parental control than their children would. In terms of parental acceptance, on the other hand, rather than generation difference, gender difference was expected as mothers being more accepting than fathers. Regarding the SES differences, consistent with the related studies (e.g., Freeman, 1997; İmamoğlu, 1987), it was predicted that low SES people would score higher on collectivism (especially VC) and parental control than high SES people whereas high SES people would score higher on individualism (especially HI) than low SES people would. In terms of religiosity, as this study is the first to investigate the generational and SES differences among Turkish Muslim people, no expectation was specified.

- 2) How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental control?

Expectation: In terms of socio demographical variables, accepting that parental control is likely to increase with lower socioeconomic status (e.g., Hoff et al., 2002)

it was expected that education level and family income would be negative correlates rather than positive correlates of parental control. Regarding that intergenerational differences are possible in terms of the childrearing orientations (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005), it was also expected that age of parents would be positive correlate of parental control rather than parental acceptance. In terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, consistent with the related studies (e.g., Çukur et al., 2004; Soh & Leong, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), it was predicted that rather than HI and HC, VI and/or VC would be positive correlate of parental control. Regarding the related explanations (e.g. Frosh, 2004; Shor, 1998), religiosity was also expected to be positive correlate of parental control rather than parental acceptance. However, considering the differences between mothers and fathers in terms of the predictors of parental control, no expectation was specified as this study is the first to investigate the gender differences in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity related correlates of parental control.

- 3) How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental acceptance?

Expectation: In terms of socio demographical variables, considering that educated parents (especially mothers) are likely to value self-direction in childrearing (e.g., Hoff et al., 2002), it was expected that education level would be a positive correlate of parental acceptance. It was also predicted that family income would not be a negative correlate of parental acceptance since material interdependencies between family members are likely to decrease with increasing affluent level (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005). In terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, consistent with related studies (e.g., Çukur et al., 2004; Soh & Leong, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), it was expected that HI and HC would be positive correlates of parental acceptance since both are related with the emphasizing equal relationships between in-group members. However, considering the differences between mothers and fathers in terms of the predictors of parental acceptance, no expectation was specified as this study is the first to investigate the gender differences in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity related correlates of parental acceptance.

- 4) How do education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance predict the children's VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity?

Expectation: In terms of socio demographical variables, considering that high socioeconomic status is related with individualism related tendencies whereas low socioeconomic status is related with collectivism related tendencies (e.g., Triandis, 1989), it was expected that education level and family income would not be positive correlates of VC and HC and they would not be also negative correlate of HI and HC. In terms of perceived parental control and acceptance, considering the related studies (e.g., Çukur et al., 2004; Soh & Leong, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), it was expected that perceived parental control would be positive correlate of VI, VC, and also religiosity (e.g., Frosh, 2004; Shor, 1998). On the other hand, perceived parental acceptance would be positive correlate of HC since İmamoğlu (2003) demonstrated that interpersonal integration orientation is positively correlated with the perceived parental acceptance.

- 5) Are there significant differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC and religiosity?

Expectation: Consistent with the related studies, authoritarian families were expected to score higher than others on religiosity (e.g., Frosh, 2004; Shor, 1998) and VI (e.g., Çukur et al., 2004; Soh & Leong, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Considering that HI is related with the emphasis on self-direction (e.g., Çukur et al., 2004), indulgent-permissive families were expected to score higher than others on HI. In terms of VC, regarding that family integrity necessitates both parental control and acceptance (İmamoğlu, 2003), it was expected that authoritative families score higher than others on VC. However, accepting that in authoritative families the rights of both parents and children are recognized in a reciprocal way (e.g., Maccoby and Martin, 1983), it was also predicted that authoritative families might score higher than others on HI. In terms of HC, it was expected that both authoritative and indulgent-permissive families would score higher on HC than others since HC is

relevant to the emphasis on interpersonal relatedness between close others (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

230 families -mother, father, and their child- living in Ankara participated in the present study. However, after checking the data for outliers, 5 of them (two with univariate, 3 with multivariate outliers) were excluded, and 225 triads of mother, father, and child constituted the sample of the study. Child sample of the study included 102 boys and 123 girls. The age ranges of participants were 35-60, 38-72, and 17-25 for mothers, fathers, and their children, respectively. The education levels of mothers were literate (N = 6), primary school (N = 57), secondary school (N = 22), high school (N = 59), university (N = 72), and postgraduate (N = 9). Most of the mothers were housewives (N = 130), some others were currently employed (N = 82) and few others were retired (N = 9). The education levels of fathers were literate (N = 1), primary school (N = 31), secondary school (N = 14), high school (N = 56), university (N = 94), and postgraduate (N = 29). Most of the fathers were currently employed (N = 200) and the others were retired (N = 25). The most of the child sample were university students (N = 162), some were university graduates (N = 25), and the others were high school graduates (N = 38). The marriage duration of couples ranged between 19 and 41, and majority of them lived with their nuclear family (father, mother, and children). Participants' family income level ranged between 350 YTL to 2500 YTL.

2.2 Measures

Three instruments, namely, the Measure of Child Rearing Styles (see Appendix B, C), Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism Scale (see Appendix D), Religiosity Scale (see Appendix E), and Demographic Information Form (see Appendix F) were administered to the all participants of the study. Regarding child

sample, they received two Measures of Child Rearing Styles, one for their mothers, and the other for their fathers.

2.2.1 The Measure of Child Rearing Styles (Sümer & Güngör, 1999)

Parenting styles were measured by using the Measure of Child Rearing Styles developed by Sümer and Güngör (1999). The scale has two dimensions as parental control (demandingness/ supervision) and parental acceptance (involvement/ responsiveness). The control dimension includes items, which measure the extent to which parents give restrictions to the behaviors of their children, they monitor the behaviors of their children, and try to discipline them. The acceptance dimension includes items, which measure the extent to which parents are accepting, understanding, loving, and interested in towards their children (Sümer & Güngör, 1999).

Originally, the measure of child rearing styles consisted of 24, 5-point-Likert-type items. In later study, in which Güngör (2000) used both parent and child versions of this scale, she reexamined the factor structure of the scale and retained 22 items of it and formed as a 4-point-Likert-type scale (1 = not at all correct, 4 = always correct). Parent version of the scale includes items in which parents evaluate their own attitudes and behaviors towards their children. Child version of the scale includes same items but written from the perspective of the child. With this scale children evaluate their parents considering present time relationships with them. For the parent version of the measurement of childrearing styles Güngör (2000) reported Cronbach's alphas as .88 and .87 for control dimension and as .86 and .88 for acceptance dimension for mothers and fathers, respectively. Regarding child version of the scale, she reported Cronbach's alphas as .81 and .79 for control dimension and as .91 and .90 for acceptance dimension for mothers and fathers, respectively.

In order to test the correspondence of factor structure of parenting dimensions across three samples for this study, a series of factor analyses (varimax rotated) were conducted for mothers, fathers, and children, separately. The analyses with the three samples revealed similar results and the same items loaded on the same factors

except for two items –8 and 10-. They both had higher loadings on acceptance dimension in the perceived paternal style scale different from three others (perceived maternal, mother-reported and father-reported parental styles) in which they were included under control dimension. Thus, item 8 was excluded from all samples' scales whereas item 10, which was under control dimension in other three scales, and also had high loading under control dimension of perceived paternal style scale, was included under control dimension for the four scales. Two-factor solution with the mothers, fathers, and their children's perceived maternal and paternal styles accounted for 41 %, 43 %, 44 %, and 47 % of the variance, respectively. Item-total correlations ranged between .26 - .60 for mothers; between .32 - .66 for fathers; and between .32 - .76 for their children. Finally, reliability coefficients were found for acceptance dimension as .84, .84, .89, and .91; for control dimension as .80, .84, .82, and .82 for mothers, fathers, and their children's perceived maternal and paternal styles, respectively.

2.2.2 Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism Scale (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995)

In order to measure the four culture related orientations –VI, VC, HI, and HC- in individuals Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism scale by Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, and Gelfand (1995) was used in the present study. The scale consists of 32 items. For this study 5-point Likert-type scale was used (1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Equal number of items constitutes four subscales, namely, horizontal individualism (HI) (e.g., one should live ones life independently of others), horizontal collectivism (HC) (e.g., I feel good when I corporate with others), vertical individualism (VI) (e.g., it is important to me that I do my job better than others), and vertical collectivism (VC) (e.g., I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity). Initially, Singelis et al. (1995) reported .67(HI), .74(VI), .74(HC), and .68 (VC) Croncbah's alpha scores for 32-item scale.

The construct validity of these variables has been established for different cultures (e.g., Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Wasti, 2003). For the Turkish

sample Wasti (2003) reported .63, .68, .64, and .67 Cronbach's alpha scores for HI, HC, VI, and VC, respectively. In addition, in a cross-cultural study Çukur et al. (2004) reported .55, .63, .67, and .84 Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for the Turkish culture, respectively. Kurt (2000) also found .65, .61, .85, and .61 Cronbach's alphas, respectively.

Regarding the construct validity of the scale for the samples of the present study, exploratory factor analyses were conducted for three samples, separately. However, different factor structures emerged between samples and this required the exclusion of the most items of the scale in order to match factor structures along groups. For this reason, subscale scores were calculated based on the definitions of Singelis et al. (1995). It should also be noted that for the present study, the scale initially included 40 items, which were given by several researchers in Turkey. As a result of reliability analyses, 6 items (items 13, 14, 20, 27, 33, 39) with low item total correlations were excluded and remaining 34 items constituted the vertical and horizontal I-C scale. It should also be noted that different from original scale, 4 items (items 16, 17, 19, 22) written by Turkish researchers were included in the scale and placed in VC subscale. Item-total correlations ranged between .19 - .56 for mothers; between .19 - .60 for fathers; and between .25 - .56 for their children. Finally, reliability coefficients were found as .69, .68, .65 for HC; as .68, .73, .67 for HI; as .73, .69, .76 for VC; and as .66, .72, and .76 for VI for mothers, fathers, and their children, respectively.

2.2.3 Religiosity Scale (Mutlu, 1989)

Religiosity of people was measured by using Religiosity Scale developed by Mutlu (1989). The scale includes 14 items like "God really exists", "more pray is helpful for only psychological health" (reverse item), "the Qur'an conveys the command of God", and "in daily life, I give every sort of decision according to the principles stated in the Qur'an". This scale measures people's belief in essential elements of Islam (Mutlu, 1996) and the importance of these beliefs in their daily life. According to Mutlu (1989), people who believe in essential elements of a given religion (Islam) can be regarded as religious; the others who do not believe can be as nonreligious.

Considering Tarakeshwar et al. (2003) above-mentioned definitions of five dimensions of religiosity, it seems that religiosity scale used in this study is likely to measure the ideological dimension of them because of its emphasis on religious beliefs and their salience in people's life. Participants answered the scale on a 5-point-Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Mutlu (1989) reported .94 Cronbach's Alpha score for this scale.

Regarding the factor structure of the religiosity scale for the samples of the present study, after excluding items 3 and 5 with low factor loadings (their item-total correlations were also the lowest in the study of Mutlu), one factor solution explained 61 %, 63 %, and 61 % of the variances for mothers, fathers, and their children, respectively. Item-total correlations ranged between .50 - .87 for mothers; between .55 - .89 for fathers; and between .47 - .87 for their children. Cronbach's Alpha scores were calculated as .94 for mothers and their children and .95 for fathers.

2.2.4 Demographic Information Form

In order to obtain demographic information about participants demographic information form was prepared for mothers, fathers, and their children. It included questions about participants' age, education level, occupation type, religious denomination, family income, residency, and gender (for children only).

2.3 Procedure

Study measures were prepared as a set of questionnaires for mothers, fathers and their children, separately and handed in an envelope (including three sets of questionnaires) to each family. Each set included instruction part, demographic questions and vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism, parenting styles and religiosity scales.

Data were collected in several ways. Firstly, after searching for families (around the researcher's district) with a child in an age range of 17-25, home-visits were made

and face-to-face interactions were actualized with one or more members of the family. If they accept to participate, the questionnaires were given and taken back one or two days later. Secondly, some close friends were requested for delivering measurement sets to their neighbors or relatives who are married and has a child in the age range of the study. As a third way, university students were contacted in their classes, and requested to participate in the study, if they lived with both their father and mother. In all ways, the participants were instructed to respond to scales, individually, by researcher or delivery person.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Are there significant differences between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance? And, are there significant differences between low and high SES families in terms of the study variables?

3.1.1 Are there significant differences between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance?

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare the mothers, fathers, and their children on the study variables. These were presented in the following sections.

3.1.1.1 ANOVA results for VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity

One-way ANOVAs were conducted for the comparison between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of VC, VI, HC, HI, and religiosity. Results indicated a significant main effect on VC, $F(2, 681) = 23.20, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$; on VI, $F(2, 681) = 12.72, p < .001, \eta^2 = .03$; on HC, $F(2, 681) = 5.13, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$; and on HI, $F(2, 681) = 32.29, p < .001, \eta^2 = .08$. According to Post Hoc tests, as seen in Table 1, on VC, mothers ($M = 4.02; SD = .45$) scored higher than their children ($M = 3.73; SD = .52, p < .001$) and also fathers ($M = 3.93; SD = .45$) scored higher than their children ($M = 3.73; SD = .52, p < .001$). On VI, children ($M = 3.44; SD = .64$) scored higher than mothers ($M = 3.18; SD = .55$) and also fathers ($M = 3.41; SD = .64$) scored higher than mothers ($M = 3.18; SD = .55, p < .001$). On HC, mothers ($M = 4.14; SD = .45$) were higher than their children ($M = 4.00; SD = .45$). On HI, on the other hand, children ($M = 4.23; SD = .42$) scored higher than both their mothers

(M = 3.91; SD = .52) and fathers (M = 3.90; SD = .58) did. In terms of religiosity, however, results did not show a significant difference between groups.

In summary, regarding the comparisons of groups on VC, VI, HC, HI, and religiosity, results showed that on HI children score higher than their parents whereas on VC parents score higher than their children. In terms of HC and VI, however, there was a significant difference only between mothers and their children and according to results, mothers scored higher than their children on HC whereas children scored higher than their mothers on VI. Regarding the comparison between mothers and fathers, it was found that fathers score higher than mothers on VI.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviation Scores, and one-way ANOVA for the comparison of mothers, fathers, and their children on VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity

Variables	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>		<u>Child</u>		<u>ANOVA</u>	η^2
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F(2,681)	
VI	3.18	.55	3.41	.64	3.44	.64	12.72**	.03
VC	4.02	.45	3.93	.45	3.73	.52	23.20**	.06
HI	3.91	.52	3.90	.58	4.23	.42	32.29**	.08
HC	4.14	.45	4.07	.47	4.00	.45	5.13*	.02
Religiosity	4.02	.76	3.86	.91	3.91	.85	2.03	.00

Note: η^2 = effect size

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$

3.1.1.2 ANOVA results for parental control and acceptance

One-way ANOVAs were conducted for the comparison between each pair groups among mothers, fathers and their children in terms of parental control and acceptance. In terms of parental control, only significant difference was found between mothers and their children, $F(1, 448) = 7.08$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Accordingly, as seen in Table 2, mothers (M = 2.31; SD = .44) scored higher on parental control than their children did (M = 2.19; SD = .52). In terms of parental acceptance, the comparisons between mothers and fathers, $F(1, 448) = 22.13$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$; between mothers and their children, $F(1, 448) = 5.21$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$; and between

fathers and their children, $F(1, 448) = 18.69$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .04$, reached significance. Accordingly, mothers ($M = 3.33$; $SD = .39$) scored higher on parental acceptance than fathers ($M = 3.16$; $SD = .40$) and their children did ($M = 3.23$; $SD = .51$). In addition, fathers ($M = 3.16$; $SD = .40$) scored higher on parental acceptance than their children ($M = 2.94$; $SD = .63$) did.

In summary, with regard to two dimensions of parenting, results demonstrated more variations in terms of parental acceptance between groups than parental control. Regarding the reports of children and their parents', it seems that both mothers and fathers see themselves as more accepting than their children see them. In addition, interestingly, mothers also evaluate themselves as more controlling than their children evaluate them. Regarding the reports of mothers and fathers, results show that in terms of parental control they perceive themselves similarly; however, in terms of parental acceptance mothers see themselves as more accepting than fathers see themselves.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviation Scores, and one-way ANOVAs for the comparison of mothers, fathers, and their children on parental control and acceptance

Variables	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>		<u>Child</u>		<u>ANOVA</u>	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F (1,448)	η^2
Maternal cont.	2.31	.44	-	-	2.19	.52	7.08**	.02
Paternal cont.	-	-	2.32	.49	2.23	.55	3.71	.00
Maternal acc.	3.33	.39	-	-	3.23	.51	5.21*	.01
Paternal acc.	-	-	3.16	.40	2.94	.63	18.69***	.04
Parental cont.	2.31	.44	2.32	.49	-	-	.08	.00
Parental acc.	3.33	.39	3.16	.40	-	-	22.13***	.05

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

3.1.2 Are there significant differences between low and high SES families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance?

SES level of families was determined based on mothers' education level (see Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Accordingly, families in which mothers' education level are university graduate or above were treated as high SES group (in this group 72 fathers were also university or above graduated) and the others (families in which mothers' education level is high school graduate or below) as low SES group. In this way, 81 families constituted high SES group, whereas 144 families did low SES group. The family income level of high SES group ranged between 800 YTL and 25000 YTL and the family income level of low SES group did 350 YTL and 10000 YTL. For the comparison of low and high SES families in terms of the study variables, using scores taken from mothers, fathers, and their children, total family scores were calculated and used as each family's VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance scores.

Then, one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare low and high SES families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance. The results showed a SES main effect on VC, $F(1, 223) = 12.07, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$; on religiosity, $F(1, 223) = 66.12, p < .001, \eta^2 = .23$; on parental control, $F(1, 223) = 14.34, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$; and on HI, $F(1, 223) = 9.11, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04$. Accordingly, it was found that low SES families ($M = 3.95; SD = .35$) were higher on VC than high SES families ($M = 3.79; SD = .33$). Similarly, low SES families ($M = 4.21; SD = .64$) were also higher on religiosity than high SES families ($M = 3.45; SD = .73$) were. In addition, low SES families ($M = 2.33; SD = 2.14$) reported more parental control than high SES families did ($M = 2.14; SD = .40$). However, high SES families ($M = 4.11; SD = .29$) scored higher on HI than low SES families did ($M = 3.96; SD = .38$). In summary, the ANOVA results showed significant differences between low and high SES families in terms of religiosity, VC, HI, and parental control.

3.2 How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental control?

For the investigation of the predictors of the mother and father parental control, two hierarchical regression analyses were performed. In the first step the predictor variables were education level, family income, and age, in the second step they were VI, VC, HI, HC, and in the last step predictor variable was religiosity.

3.2.1 The predictors of mother parental control

A hierarchical regression analysis on maternal control showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of maternal control, Multiple $R = .52$, $F(8, 216) = 9.92$, $p < .001$. Education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity together explained 24 % of the variance in maternal control. As seen in Table 3, in the first step, family income and age were significant predictors. They remained to be significant in other steps and had negative relationship with maternal control. In the second step, the other significant predictors were VC and VI, which remained to be significant in third step. However, religiosity, which is added to the equation in the third step, did not make a significant contribution to the prediction of maternal control.

Table 3. Hierarchical regression on mother parental control

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.18	16.18***
Education	-.11	-1.64		
Income	-.20	-2.89**		
Age	-.26	-4.12***		
Step 2			.08	5.55**
Education	-.08	-1.13		
Income	-.17	-2.50*		
Age	-.24	-3.84***		
VI	.21	3.44**		
VC	.19	2.62**		
HI	-.05	-.74		
HC	-.1	-1.44		
Step 3			.01	3.71
Education	-.02	-.23		
Income	-.16	-2.37*		
Age	-.23	-3.70***		
VI	.21	3.37**		
VC	.15	2.01*		
HI	-.04	-.55		
HC	-.11	-1.56		
Religiosity	.15	1.93		
Multiple R = .52, Adjusted R ² = .24				
* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001				

3.2.2 The predictors of father parental control

A hierarchical regression analysis on paternal control showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of paternal control, Multiple R = .52, $F(8, 204) = 9.62$, $p < .001$. Education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity together explained 25 % of the variance in paternal control. As seen in Table 4, in the first step age and education level were significant predictors. They remained to be significant in second step and had negative relationship with paternal control. In the second step in which VI, VC, HI, and HC were added to the equation, the other significant predictor was VI. In the third step, in which religiosity was added to the equation, in addition to age and VI, religiosity emerged as a significant predictor.

Table 4. Hierarchical regression on father parental control

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.14	11.01***
Education	-.21	-3.02**		
Income	-.04	-.60		
Age	-.25	-3.79***		
Step 2			.06	4.08**
Education	-.16	-2.24*		
Income	-.09	-1.21		
Age	-.26	-4.02***		
VI	.19	2.53**		
VC	.12	1.39		
HI	.04	.51		
HC	-.14	-1.76		
Step 3			.07	20.74***
Education	-.08	-1.12		
Income	-.02	-.32		
Age	-.25	-4.05***		
VI	.16	2.23**		
VC	.02	.18		
HI	.1	1.36		
HC	-.13	-1.67		
Religiosity	.33	4.55***		
Multiple R = .52, Adjusted R ² = .25				
* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001				

3.3 How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental acceptance?

For the investigation of the predictors of the mother and father parental acceptance, two hierarchical regression analyses were performed. In the first step predictor variables were education level, family income, and age, in the second step they were VI, VC, HI, HC, and in the last step the predictor variable was religiosity.

3.3.1 The predictors of mother parental acceptance

A hierarchical regression analysis on maternal acceptance showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of maternal acceptance, Multiple R = .50, F (8, 216) = 9.01, p < .001. Education level, family

income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity together explained 22 % of the variance in maternal acceptance. As seen in Table 5, in the first step education level was significant predictor and remained to be significant in other steps. In the second step, in which VC, VI, HC, and HI were added to the equation, other significant predictors were VC, HC, and HI. In the third step, in which religiosity was added to the equation, VC, HC, HI, and education level remained as only significant predictors.

Table 5. Hierarchal regression on mother parental acceptance

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.05	3.45*
Education	.18	2.41*		
Income	.06	.80		
Age	-.11	-1.61		
Step 2			.20	19.15***
Education	.13	1.86		
Income	.07	1.01		
Age	-.10	-1.61		
VI	-.07	-1.12		
VC	.19	2.55*		
HI	.22	3.63**		
HC	.23	3.31**		
Step 3			.002	.59
Education	.16	2.00*		
Income	.07	1.07		
Age	-.10	-1.55		
VI	-.07	-1.15		
VC	.17	2.24*		
HI	.23	3.42**		
HC	.23	3.26**		
Religiosity	.06	.77		
Multiple R = .50, Adjusted R ² = .22				

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

3.3.2 The predictors of father parental acceptance

A hierarchical regression analysis on paternal acceptance showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of paternal acceptance, Multiple R = .44, $F(8, 216) = 6.39$, $p < .001$. Education level, family income, age, VC, VI, HC, HI and religiosity together explained 16 % of the variance in paternal acceptance. As seen in Table 6, in the first step, in which independent

variables were education level, family income and age, none of the predictors reached significance. In the second step, in which VC, VI, HC, and HI were added to the equation, VC and HI emerged as significant predictors. In the third step, in which religiosity was added to the equation, VC remained as only significant predictor.

Table 6. Hierarchical regression on father parental acceptance

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.004	.31
Education	.06	.85		
Income	-.03	-.45		
Age	-.03	-.48		
Step 2			.18	12.13***
Education	.08	1.17		
Income	-.02	-.26		
Age	-.007	-.11		
VI	-.12	-1.65		
VC	.29	3.47**		
HI	.16	2.05*		
HC	.15	1.91		
Step 3			.005	1.41
Education	.06	.81		
Income	-.04	-.50		
Age	-.01	.15		
VI	-.11	-1.53		
VC	.31	3.67***		
HI	.14	1.84		
HC	.15	1.88		
Religiosity	-.09	-1.19		
Multiple R = .44, Adjusted R ² = .16				

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

3.4 How do education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance predict children's VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity?

For the investigation of the predictors of children's VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity five hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. In first step, predictor variables were education level, family income, age, and gender; in second step, they were perceived parental control and perceived parental acceptance. As can be noticed, instead of using perceived maternal and paternal acceptance and control scores as

separate predictors, total perceived parental acceptance and parental control scores were calculated. The reason for this was the high correlations between perceived maternal and paternal control (.73) and between perceived maternal and paternal acceptance (.55) (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

3.4.1 The predictors of children's VI

A hierarchical regression analysis on VI showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of VI, Multiple $R = .28$, $F(6, 218) = 3.02$, $p < .01$. Education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance together explained 5 % of the variance in VI. As seen in Table 7, in the first step education level was the only significant predictor. It remained to be significant in second step and had a negative relationship with VI. In the second step, in which perceived parental control and acceptance were added to the equation, the other significant predictor was perceived parental control.

Table 7. Hierarchal regression on children's VI

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.04	2.25
Education of child	-.19	-2.26**		
Income	.05	-1.24		
Age	.03	.66		
Gender	.03	.43		
Step 2			.04	4.41**
Education	-.17	-2.06*		
Income	-.06	-.85		
Age	.08	.95		
Gender	-.004	-.06		
Parental acceptance	.07	1.43		
Parental control	.20	2.91**		
Multiple $R = .28$, Adjusted $R^2 = .05$				

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

3.4.2 The predictors of children's VC

A hierarchical regression analysis on VC showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of VC, Multiple $R = .42$, $F(6, 218) = 7.54$, $p < .001$. Education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance together explained 15 % of the variance in VC. As seen in Table 8, in the first step, family income was the only significant predictor and had a negative relationship with VC. In the second step, in which parental control and acceptance were added to the equation, significant predictors were perceived parental control and acceptance.

Table 8. Hierarchal regression on children's VC

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.03	1.44
Education of child	-.06	-.71		
Income	-.14	-2.06*		
Age	.03	.34		
Gender	.02	.29		
Step 2			.15	19.27***
Education	-.06	-.81		
Income	-.12	-1.90		
Age	.09	1.17		
Gender	-.05	-.81		
Parental acceptance	.35	5.44***		
Parental control	.24	3.77***		
Multiple $R = .42$, Adjusted $R^2 = .15$				
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$				

3.4.3 The predictors of children's HI

A hierarchical regression analysis on HI showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of HI, Multiple $R = .25$, $F(6, 218) = 2.34$, $p < .05$. Education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance together explained 4 % of the variance in HI. As seen in Table 9, in the first step, gender was the only significant predictor. It remained to be only significant predictor in the second step in which perceived parental control and

acceptance were added to the equation. This result showed that girls are more horizontally individualistic than boys are.

Table 9. Hierarchal regression on children's HI

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.05	3.10*
Education of child	-.06	-.70		
Income	.02	.28		
Age	.06	.78		
Gender	.23	3.42**		
Step 2			.007	.82
Education	-.05	-.62		
Income	.03	.43		
Age	.08	.92		
Gender	.21	3.13**		
Parental acceptance	.04	.63		
Parental control	.08	1.20		
Multiple R = .25, Adjusted R ² = .04				
* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001				

3.4.4 The predictors of children's HC

A hierarchical regression analysis on HC showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of HC, Multiple R = .26, F (6, 218) = 2.61, p < .05. Education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance together explained 4 % of the variance in HC. As seen in Table 10, in the first step, none of the independent variables reached significance. In the second step, in which perceived parental control and acceptance were added to the equation, the only significant predictor was perceived parental acceptance.

Table 10. Hierarchal regression on children's HC

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.01	.81
Education of child	.06	.74		
Income	-.08	-1.12		
Age	-.06	-.75		
Gender	.09	1.31		
Step 2			.05	6.12**
Education	.04	.48		
Income	-.09	-1.33		
Age	-.03	-.40		
Gender	.06	.93		
Parental acceptance	.23	3.49**		
Parental control	.02	.32		
Multiple R = .26, Adjusted R ² = .04				
* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001				

3.4.5 The predictors of children's religiosity

For the prediction of religiosity, initially a hierarchical regression analysis, in which predictor variables were education level, family income, age, gender, perceived parental control and acceptance, was conducted. In the regression output, the comparison of zero-order correlations with regression coefficients (Beta) showed that the perceived parental acceptance (both perceived paternal and maternal acceptance) did not have a significant zero-order correlation with religiosity (see Correlation Table for Children in Appendix A) but had a significant Beta weight. Further examinations indicated that parental control was a suppressor variable for perceived parental acceptance. For this reason the perceived parental acceptance was excluded from the analysis (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Re-performed hierarchical regression analysis showed that all independent variables together significantly contributed to the prediction of religiosity, Multiple R = .34, F (5, 219) = 5.89, p < .001. Education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control together explained 10 % of the variance in religiosity. As seen in Table 11, in the first step, family income was the only significant predictor. It remained to be significant in the second step and had a negative relationship with

religiosity. In the second step, in which perceived parental control was added to the equation, other significant predictor was perceived parental control.

Table 11. Hierarchal regression on children's religiosity

Variables	Beta	t	R square Change	F change
Step 1			.09	5.20**
Education of child	.03	.33		
Income	-.30	-4.47***		
Age	-.04	-.48		
Gender	.006	.09		
Step 2			.06	7.56**
Education	.05	.61		
Income	-.27	-4.06***		
Age	-.03	-.32		
Gender	-.02	-.26		
Parental control	.19	2.82**		
Multiple R = .34, Adjusted R ² = .10				

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

3.5 Are there significant differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC and religiosity?

Parenting styles of the families were determined based on the dimensions of parental control and acceptance. For this purpose, initially using parental acceptance and control scores taken from mothers, fathers, and their children, total parental acceptance and control scores of the families were calculated. Then using median split, families which are high on acceptance and control dimensions were classified as authoritative; which are low on acceptance and control dimensions were neglectful; which are high on acceptance but low on control dimension were indulgent-permissive; and families which are low on acceptance but high on control dimension were classified as authoritarian. As a result, 218 families were classified and 44 of them constituted the authoritative group, 49 neglectful group, 63 authoritarian group, and 62 constituted the permissive-indulgent group. For the comparison of these four families, total family scores on VI, VC, HI, HC and religiosity were used. Then one-way ANOVA was conducted in order to investigate the differences between authoritative, neglectful, authoritarian, and indulgent-

permissive families in terms of the VI, VC, HI, HC and religiosity. The results showed that there was a parenting style main effect on HC, $F(3, 214) = 6.34$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .08$; on HI, $F(3, 214) = 4.27$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$; on VC, $F(3, 214) = 10.05$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$; and on religiosity, $F(3, 214) = 8.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .11$. According to post hoc tests, as seen in Table 12, on HC authoritative families ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .36$) were higher than neglectful families ($M = 3.93$, $SD = .35$); and indulgent families ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .32$) were higher than neglectful families ($M = 3.93$; $SD = .35$), $p < .01$. On HI authoritative families ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .34$) were higher than authoritarian families ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .39$), $p < .01$; and indulgent families ($M = 4.07$, $SD = .37$) were higher than authoritarian families ($M = 3.90$; $SD = .39$), $p < .05$. On VC authoritative families ($M = 4.09$, $SD = .32$) were higher than neglectful ($M = 3.71$, $SD = .31$), $p < .001$; authoritarian ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .34$), $p < .05$; and indulgent families ($M = 3.91$, $SD = .35$), $p < .05$. On religiosity authoritative families ($M = 4.27$, $SD = .56$) were higher than neglectful ($M = 3.64$, $SD = .80$), $p < .001$ and indulgent families ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .80$), $p < .01$. In addition, authoritarian families ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .66$) were higher than neglectful ($M = 3.64$; $SD = .80$), $p < .01$, and indulgent-permissive families ($M = 3.75$; $SD = .80$), $p < .05$. Regarding VI, there was no significant difference between groups in terms of VI.

In summary, it seems that in terms of HC, neglectful families scored the least on it, whereas authoritative and indulgent-permissive families scored the highest. In terms of HI, neglectful and authoritarian families scored the least, whereas authoritative and indulgent-permissive families scored the highest. In terms of VC, authoritative families were higher than the other three families on it. In terms of religiosity, authoritative and authoritarian families constituted the most scoring group, whereas indulgent and neglectful families were the least scoring group.

Table 12. Means, Standard Deviation Scores, and one-way ANOVA for the Comparison of Authoritative, Indulgent-Permissive, Neglectful, and Authoritarian Families on HI, HC, VC, VI, and religiosity

	<u>Authoritative</u>		<u>Indulgent</u>		<u>Neglectful</u>		<u>Authoritarian</u>		<u>ANOVA</u>	
	(44)		(62)		(49)		(63)			
Variables	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F (3, 214)	η^2
HI	4.13	.34	4.07	.37	3.98	.27	3.90	.39	4.27*	.06
HC	4.16	.36	4.17	.32	3.93	.35	4.04	.29	6.34**	.08
VC	4.09	.32	3.91	.35	3.71	.31	3.90	.34	10.05**	.12
VI	3.45	.39	3.33	.45	3.25	.38	3.40	.37	2.12	.00
Religiosity	4.27	.56	3.75	.80	3.64	.80	4.10	.66	8.42**	.11

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, main findings of the study are discussed with regard to the basic research questions in the introduction section. After evaluating the findings associated with research questions, some contributions and limitations of the study are presented with suggestions for future research.

4.1 Are there significant differences between mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance?

The comparison of the mothers, fathers, and their children in terms of the study variables showed that there are significant differences between groups in all study variables except for religiosity. Regarding the comparisons in terms of VI, VC, HI, and HC, results demonstrated that both mothers and fathers are more vertically collectivists than their children whereas children are more horizontally individualistic than their parents. These generational differences imply that parents give more importance to the traditional cultural aspects of Turkey such as family integrity and respect for authority as reflected in VC whereas children attribute more importance to the more contemporary cultural aspects such as independency from others, individual development, and self reliance as reflected in HI. This finding of the study may be explained in two ways. Firstly, the finding that parents emphasize the more traditional aspects whereas children do more newly developed cultural expectations may indicate the existence of social change in Turkey undergoing a change from traditionalism to modernism (e.g., Karakitapoğlu-Aygün & İmamoğlu, 2002). Especially, concerning that different from parent sample most of the child sample of the study is university students or graduates, the related finding is likely to confirm other research findings indicating that educated people in more developed urban settings which reflect cultural transition centers of Turkey, have more individualism

related tendencies (e.g., İmamoğlu, 1987; Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005; Karakitapoğlu-Aygün & İmamoğlu, 2002). Secondly, it may also be true that independent from socioeconomic status, older people may become more traditional or conservative whereas younger people may become more open to change and stimulation. For example, in one longitudinal study Feather (1979) found that with increasing age people give more importance to social normative patterns such as family and national security and less importance to values such as freedom, stimulation, and creativeness (cited in İmamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 1999). In this sense, it seems also possible that in relation with their developmental needs adult people especially parents may attribute more importance to family life and family integrity whereas young children want more freedom and independence in their life. In a supporting way with this interpretation, in a study investigating differences between university students and their parents in 1970s and the differences between university students in 1970s and 1990s in terms of I-C related tendencies in Turkey, İmamoğlu and Karakitapoğlu-Aygün (1999) reported that generational differences in 1970s are much more than cohort differences between 1970s and 1990s and added that for parents socio-cultural normative values are more important whereas for their children individualism related values are so.

In terms of HC and VI, results showed that although there are no significant differences between fathers and their children, there are significant differences between mothers and their children. Accordingly, results indicated that mothers are more horizontally collectivists than their children whereas children are more vertically individualistic than their mothers. Thus, it seems that mothers give more importance to the concepts such as the welfare of close others, oneness with in-group members, and interpersonal connectedness as reflected in HC whereas children attribute more importance to the concepts such as being the best among others, competitiveness for the highest social status, and dominance over others as reflected in VI. In this sense, it is arguable that mothers with higher HC score tend to see themselves as more emotionally related with close others such as family members, coworkers, and neighbors (Kashima et al., 1995) whereas children with higher VI score are less relational and more group disunity oriented than their mothers are (Kashima & Hardie, 2000). Consistently, Kashima and Hardie (2000) claimed that

“the equality among in-group members and communal sharing reflected by horizontal collectivism (Singelis et al., 1995) have strong implications for the relational orientation as well” (p. 27). In addition, distinguishing between in-group-oriented (akin to VC) and relationship-oriented collectivism (akin to HC) some researchers argued that the former reflects cultural differences whereas the latter do gender differences as women being more emotionally related than men (e.g., Kashima et al., 1995; Kashima & Hardie, 2000). Thus, the finding that mothers are higher on HC than their children may be seen as support for this argument. However, not finding significant gender difference among parent sample in terms of HC, this study suggests that adult women and men similarly emphasize the aspects of HC; on the other hand, different from fathers, mothers as being relational oriented score significantly higher than their children in this domain. In a consistent way, in terms of VI reflecting competitiveness rather than interdependency between people, it was found that children have higher score than their mothers but not their fathers. This may imply that in a context of free market economy and liberalization in Turkey both fathers maybe as breadwinners and their children as young people see competitiveness as necessary for having high positions in society different from mothers. In addition, considering the comparisons between mothers and fathers in terms of VI, VC, HI, and HC, the finding that fathers are higher on VI than mothers may be interpreted as a reflection of gender difference in terms of VI. In a consistent way, other researchers also found that vertical individualism is higher among men than among women (Kashima & Hardie, 2000; Singelis et al., 1995). Thus, the finding that adult men give more importance to the social dominance over others, competitiveness for higher status, and differentiation from others as reflected in VI than adult women seems to confirm general gender related knowledge asserting that males tend to be more competitive, object oriented (instrumental), risk preferring, aggressive and dominance oriented than females do (see Beit-Hallahmi, & Argyle, 1997). However, not finding gender difference in terms of VI among children (see Table 7), the present study suggests that more educated younger boys and girls in Turkey similarly concern for having high positions in society and being better than others as reflected in VI.

Considering the religiosity, results indicated that there are no significant differences between mothers, fathers, and their children. Although one may expect that older people should be more religious than younger people (because older people benefit from religion more than younger people, especially in terms of social support and belief in after-life) (see Beit-Hallahmi & Argyle, 1997), the finding that all family members, mothers, fathers and their children, are similarly religious supports the literature arguing that the most important part of religious socialization takes place in the family and parents have strong influence on their children's religiosity (see Bao, Whitbeck, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999). In addition, indicating that regardless of age and gender Turkish family members believe in religion and attribute importance to it in their life, this finding provides evidence for the notion that Islamic belief system is an inseparable aspect of Turkish identity (İmamoğlu, 2005).

Considering the comparisons in terms of parental control and acceptance, results showed that both mothers and fathers evaluate themselves as more accepting than their children evaluate them. One explanation for this parent-child disagreeableness on parental acceptance may be parents' more willingness to perceive themselves as loving mothers and fathers regardless of their real attitudes and behaviors. On the other hand, for children it may be argued that as outside observers children tend to be more modest in their evaluations of parental acceptance. In terms of parental control, however, results also demonstrated that mothers see themselves as more controlling than their children see them. Probably, this implies that mothers perceive parental control in a more positive way whereas children perceive it in a more negative way. To say differently, parental control may mean different things for mothers and their children. For example, mothers may evaluate parental control as necessary for the good of the child whereas children may see it something bad such as dominating, cold, and hostile (Lau, Hau, Cheung, Lew, & Berndt, 1990). Regarding the comparisons between mothers and fathers, results indicated that mothers see themselves as more accepting than fathers do, although they do not differ in terms of parental control. This finding partly supports the well-known gender difference on parenting asserting that mothers are more accepting and less controlling than fathers (see Berndt, Cheung, Lau, Hau, & Lew, 1993). Accordingly, mothers as nurturing agents are seen as more loving, understanding, and tolerant whereas fathers as

breadwinners are seen as more distancing and dominating towards their children. However, considering the mothers and fathers of the study, it seems that mothers and fathers similarly concern the discipline of their children, supervise them, and give restrictions for their behaviors although mothers continue to be more nurturing agents in family.

4.2 Are there significant differences between low and high SES families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, and parental control and acceptance?

The comparison of low and high SES families in terms of the study variables showed that low SES families have higher scores on VC, religiosity, and parental control than high SES families whereas high SES families have higher score on HI than low SES families. Firstly, accepting that all religiosity, VC, and parental control are relevant to the aspects of traditional Turkish culture whereas HI reflects more newly developed cultural expectations, the related finding of the study may imply that in Turkey people from lower socioeconomic status tend to be more traditional or collectivist oriented whereas people from higher socioeconomic status tend to be more individualistic oriented. This supports the notion that in Turkey with socioeconomic development people tend to become more individualistic and less collectivist oriented and implies the direction of social change in Turkey as from collectivism (VC) to individualism (HI) (see Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Moreover, not finding SES difference on VI, this study suggests that individualism in Turkey is likely to be experienced in a context of equality between people as reflected in HI rather than in a context of inequality or competition as reflected in VI (see also Tables 1, 2). In addition, in terms of HC, the absence of SES difference may imply that with increases in socioeconomic status in Turkey the emphasis on close relationships and interdependencies between people as reflected in HC do not diminish and exist with individualistic tendencies as argued by other researchers (İmamoğlu, 1987, 1998, 2003; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990, 1996, a, b, 2005). To summarize, it may be argued that with increases in socioeconomic status in Turkey the kind of collectivism which focuses on the importance of in-group (family) as a whole and accept self sacrifice for the benefit of in-group as reflected in VC tend to decrease whereas the kind of collectivism which focuses on the interdependent and equal

relationships between in-group members as reflected in HC tend to remain and coexist with more newly developed individualistic tendencies (HI).

In addition, finding that low and high SES families differ in terms of individualism (HI) and collectivism (VC) this study supports other researchers arguing that SES is important factor affecting within cultural variations in terms of I-C (e.g., Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997; Triandis, 1989). Accepting that HI and VC reflect prevalent kinds of individualism and collectivism around the world, this study also confirms other research findings indicating that SES is negatively correlated with collectivism and positively correlated with individualism (Freeman, 1997). In terms of Kağıtçıbaşı's family models, accepting that the aspects of VC are relevant to the aspects of family model of interdependence, the related finding of the study also seems to support the notion that family model of interdependence not only reflects the ideal family pattern of collectivist cultures but also it explains the family relations of low SES settings (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996a). This may imply that families, which attribute more importance to the family as a whole and the self-sacrifice for the benefit of family as reflected in VC, tend to experience both material and emotional interdependencies between family members. In this context, regarding SES difference on HI, it may also be argued that with increases in socioeconomic status material interdependencies between family members do decrease and they attribute more importance to the concepts such as independency from others and self reliance as reflected in HI (e.g., İmamoğlu, 1987; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005).

In terms of parental control and acceptance, the finding that there is SES difference on parental control but not on parental acceptance also seems to parallel with the notion that material (and parental control) but not psychological interdependencies (and parental affection) between family members are relevant to socioeconomic status (İmamoğlu, 1987; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996a, b, 2005). Accordingly, it seems that in low SES families, which are more likely to have both material and emotional interdependencies between family members, more parental control is experienced. On the other hand, in high SES families less parental control is experienced because of decreasing material interdependencies. This may imply that parental control, which is likely to restrict the development of individualistic tendencies in children, is

likely to decrease with social change in Turkey. In a consistent way with this study, other researchers in Turkey also found that mothers from both low and high SES groups attribute importance to psychological contribution of the children (parental affection) whereas mothers from low SES groups give more importance to the material contributions (parental control) than high SES mothers (İmamoğlu, 1987; Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005).

Regarding SES difference on religiosity, it may also be explained in other ways, in addition to previously mentioned interpretation. Firstly, not finding generation difference but finding SES difference on religiosity, this study suggests that religiosity is more relevant to the socio economic status of people rather than their generational status in Turkey. For example, as one of the indicators of socioeconomic status relevant to the religiosity, this study indicated family income (see Table 11), which emerged as a strong negative predictor of religiosity in the child sample of the study. In a consistent way, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997) argued that socio demographical variables have important effects on religiosity and should be given priority over other variables for explaining religiosity. Actually, in a similar way with the related findings of the study, Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997) also reported that regardless of given religion and country, people from low socio economic status tend to be more religious than people from high socio economic status. As an explanation for this, they suggested that people experiencing economical and/or social deprivation become more religious in order to compensate these deprivations. However, it is true that religiosity is very broad construct and can mean different things for different people. Thus, it may be a more useful strategy to consider religiosity as a multidimensional construct for future researchers investigating socio demographical correlates of religiosity in Turkey.

4.3 How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental control?

Regarding the predictors of maternal and paternal control, results showed that age, family income, VI, and VC are significant predictors of maternal control whereas age, VI, and religiosity are significant predictors of paternal control. Initially

regarding the socio demographical variables, age for both mothers and fathers, and family income for only mothers were found as significant correlates of parental control. In terms of age, results indicated that both older mothers and fathers are less likely to report parental control than younger parents do. Contrary to this finding, one may expect positive relationship between parental control and age rather than negative relationship because, as mentioned previously, older people tend to be more traditional and family oriented. In this sense, Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) also argued that there should be intergenerational differences in terms of childrearing orientations. However, it should be noted that the related finding of the study shows age differences rather than generation difference. From another side of view, this finding may imply that older mothers and fathers have older children and so they report less parental control. As an explanation for this, some researchers suggested that parents tend to perceive their younger children as more immature and so become more supervising, monitoring and restrictive towards them (Scott, Scott, Boehnke, Cheng, Leung, & Sasaki, 1991). In other words, parents with younger children may more rely on themselves as authority figures. In a consistent way, Wilcox (2002) reported negative relationship between both fathers' and children's age and residential paternal involvement. This line of consideration also implies that parental control rather than parental acceptance (as mentioned later, age was not a predictor of parental acceptance) is likely to vary in accordance with the children's age. Accordingly, it is arguable that because parental control more than parental acceptance is related with socialization values and goals (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997), parents with younger children are more likely to try to shape the behaviors of their children.

In terms of family income, results revealed that mothers with lower family income are more likely to report parental control than mothers with higher family income. The emergence of family income as a significant correlate of maternal control but not paternal control probably implies that in terms of financial support mothers are more dependent on their children than fathers are. Regarding the mother sample of the study, most of them are housewives and have educational status under university level. In this sense, they are likely to feel financially insecure especially concerning their life experiences in their old age. Actually, in an early Turkish value of the children study Kağıtçıbaşı (1982) reported that mothers different from fathers

primarily concern the old age security value of the children probably because of their economical weaknesses. Accordingly, it may be argued that probably concerning their life security mothers with lower family income tend to want their children to be more dependent on family and so report more parental control.

In terms of VI, VC, HI, and HC, results showed that VI is a predictor of both maternal and paternal control. The results indicated that mothers and fathers who have higher scores on VI have also higher scores on parental control. This is actually one of the expectable results because VI reflects the acceptance of inequalities between in-group members. However, regarding that individualistic orientation is more related with valuing independency from others rather than obedience to others, one may expect that VI should not be positive correlate of parental control. In this sense, on the other hand, it is noteworthy that as two kinds of individualism, VI differs from HI in important ways. For example, as mentioned previously, Soh and Leong (2002) reported that VI is more related to power, desire to influence and dominate others whereas HI is related with the emphasis on self-direction. In a consistent way, in Turkey Çukur et al. (2004) found negative correlation between VI and the emphasis on self-direction. Actually, for the finding that parents who are higher on VI are also higher on parental control and so tend to encourage their children to be obedient, Singelis et al. (1995) suggested suitable explanation asserting that

among individualists, verticality brings a recognition that inequalities between people necessitate a certain amount of conformity in the service of the hierarchy, whereas horizontalness increases the sense that individuals should be free from others' influence (p. 268).

In a study examining value domains of Turkish people İmamoğlu and Karakitapoğlu-Aygün (2002) also reported that

the loading of self enhancement (characterized mostly by hierarchy and power values), normative patterning, and tradition-religiosity (collectivism related value domains) under the same factor seems to be consistent with the findings that power distance and collectivism are among the important features defining Turkish society and that power distance and collectivism are related (Hofstede, 1980; Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars, 1996) (p. 344).

In this sense, it is arguable that the maintenance of power distance requires conformity in both collectivist (VC) and VI contexts, as also indicated by this study (VC was also found as correlate of maternal control). Therefore, this study suggests that both mothers and fathers, who give importance to the hierarchal relationships in a competitive way and accept unequal relationships between in-group members as reflected in VI, tend to become more demanding, supervising, and restrictive parents and so they are likely to try to make children accept their authority and conform their standards. Regarding other cultural orientations as predictors of parental control, in addition to VI, VC was also found as significant predictor of maternal control. However, different from VI, VC was also predictor of both maternal and paternal acceptance. Thus, the discussion about VC will be made in the following section.

In terms of religiosity, results demonstrated that religiosity is the strong correlate of paternal control although it was not a significant correlate of maternal control, after controlling for the effects of cultural orientations. Accordingly, results indicated that more religious fathers tend to be more controlling towards their children. Firstly, the results are consistent with the earlier findings suggesting that religiosity is relevant to the traditionalism and collectivism among Turkish people (Çukur et al., 2004; İmamoğlu, 1999; Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000) (see also Appendix A). This finding may also imply that religious fathers who are likely to be concerned with the maintenance of cultural and religious conventions such as family integrity and respect for authority tend to be more restrictive, supervising, and demanding towards their children. In this way, it is likely that religious fathers encourage their children to be integrated into family life, accept their fathers as authority figures and respect for them. In a consistent way, as mentioned previously, İmamoğlu (1999) argued that in line with Islamic and cultural patterns, Turkish Muslim people value respectfulness, obedience, conformity, and responsibility of children in their relationships with parents. In addition, Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000) found that more religious Turkish teachers prefer traditional extended families to nuclear families and they claimed that regardless of socio demographical variables such as education level and family income religiosity is important variable determining cultural value orientations of Turkish people. In a supporting way, in terms of religiosity and cultural orientations, in this study it was found that after eliminating

the effects of cultural orientations, religiosity continues to be significant predictor of paternal control, although this was not so for maternal control (see Tables 3, 4).

Considering such a gender difference in the impact of religiosity on parental control, previously mentioned studies (e.g., Ellison & Sherkat, 1993; Mahoney et al. 2001) actually do not consider gender differences in this domain. However, in a different way the present study suggests that religiosity is more important variable for father parental control than for mother parental control, which requires further explanations. Firstly, the finding that beyond cultural orientations religiosity is strong correlate of paternal control rather than maternal control may imply fathers' greater exposure to religion related activities in Turkey. Actually, it is fact that Islamic principles do not allow women for praying in public areas, namely mosque, where only Muslim men can go regularly and participate in several religious activities. In such participations, men are also likely to listen for Islamic teachings including messages about family life and particularly about parent-child relationships, which may encourage men to raise children who are respectful, obedient to authority figures and responsible for their family. In addition, regarding that religious teachings also talk about traditional gender roles, particularly motherhood and fatherhood (Mahoney, 2005) and religiosity is relevant to the acceptance of traditional gender roles (Steggerda, 1993), it may also be argued that religious fathers tend to accept themselves as authority figures in the family. Therefore, it is suggestible that religious fathers are more likely to perceive themselves more responsible for the discipline of their children than religious mothers.

4.4 How do education level, family income, age, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity predict mother and father parental acceptance?

Regarding the predictors of maternal and paternal acceptance, results demonstrated that education level, VC, HI, and HC are significant predictors of maternal acceptance whereas only VC is a significant predictor of paternal acceptance. Initially regarding socio demographical variables, it was found that different from fathers, more educated mothers have more parental acceptance score than less educated mothers. The finding that for mothers, education level is important variable

affecting their parental acceptance may be interpreted in a context of value of the children study. In a recent Turkish value of the children study, Kağıtçıbaşı and Ataca (2005) found that educated mothers are less likely to be concerned with the children's material-economical contributions to the family than less educated mothers and as an explanation they suggested that urban settings provide old age security resources for especially educated mothers. Accordingly, it is arguable that more educated mothers of the study who are likely to rely on their own resources especially concerning their future life tend to encourage their children to find their own way rather than make demands on them and so they report more parental acceptance. On the other hand, regarding fathers, the finding that education level is not significant predictor of paternal acceptance may imply that independent from their education level fathers rely on their own resources rather than children as resources and so education level do not make difference on paternal acceptance. Actually, indicating that education level is a significant correlate of maternal acceptance rather than paternal acceptance, the study results also confirm other researchers arguing that education level is more relevant to maternal behavior and attitudes than paternal behavior and attitudes (Hoff et al., 2002).

In terms of VI, VC, HI, and HC, results revealed that HI and HC and less strongly VC are significant correlates of maternal acceptance whereas only VC is a significant correlate of paternal acceptance. Firstly, the finding that mothers who have higher scores on HI and HC have also higher scores on parental acceptance is expected because both HI and HC are related with the acceptance of equal relationships between in-group members. In terms of HC, results suggest that mothers who emphasize the interrelatedness and equal relationships between in-group members as reflected in HC value also close relationships with their children and behave more understanding and loving towards them. In terms of HI, results suggest that mothers who give importance to the equality of people in an independent and autonomous manner as reflected in HI accept also their children's individuality and become more tolerant and understanding towards their children's individualistic tendencies. In addition, the finding that both HI and HC orients mothers to report more parental acceptance may be seen as supporting the idea that balanced family contexts in which high acceptance and low control exist in parent-child relationships are relevant

to the development of both interpersonal integration and intrapersonal differentiation orientations in people (İmamoğlu, 2003). In an earlier study, actually, Kurt (2000) reported that there is a positive relationship between HI and intrapersonal differentiation orientation and between HC and interpersonal integration orientation among Turkish people. Regarding the differences between mothers and fathers, however, not finding HI and HC as significant predictors of paternal acceptance, the present study suggests that HI and HC are more relevant to the maternal acceptance than paternal acceptance.

Regarding other cultural orientations, results also demonstrated VC as significant predictor of both maternal and paternal acceptance. In terms of VC, however, results also indicated that VC is not only a significant correlate of maternal and paternal acceptance; it is also a predictor of maternal control. Initially, considering the mothers, predicting both maternal control and acceptance, VC may be seen as causing contrasting results different from other cultural variables. Actually, it was only cultural variable having significant positive relationships with both parental control and acceptance (see Appendix A). This can be explained considering the characteristics of VC. The finding that VC orients mothers to use both parental control and acceptance implies that mothers, who attribute importance to the family as a whole, accept the self sacrifice for the benefit of the family, and unequal relationships between family members as reflected in VC, tend to be loving, understanding but at the same time restrictive and supervising towards their children. In other words, it may be argued that using both parental control and acceptance, mothers encourage their children to be integrated into family life. As mentioned previously, accepting that the aspects of VC are relevant to the characteristics of the family model of interdependence, this finding is also likely to imply that mothers (especially regarding lower SES mothers who had higher scores on VC) who are concerned with the maintenance of both material and emotional interdependencies between family members tend to be both controlling and accepting towards their children. Relating both maternal control and acceptance with collectivism (VC), the related finding of the study is actually likely to reflect integrative family contexts, in which “nurturance, sacrifice, as well as, strict, intrusive, overprotective control” exist in parent-child relationships in order to ensure family integrity/harmony (İmamoğlu,

2003). In a consistent way, as mentioned previously, Triandis also (1995) argued that collectivists consider both acceptance and interdependence in childrearing and control their children by providing high rates of interaction, guidance, and consultation in order to lead conformity. However, finding VC as predictor of both maternal control and acceptance but only of paternal acceptance, the present study also suggests that mothers emphasizing the collectivism (VC) are more likely to use both parental control and acceptance than fathers emphasizing the collectivism (VC). On the other hand, considering the fathers, results suggest that fathers giving importance to the family as a whole as reflected in VC are likely to report parental acceptance more than parental control. The emergence of VC as a significant and strong predictor of paternal acceptance rather than paternal control may imply that fathers emphasizing the importance of family life and family integrity tend to be accepting and loving towards family members, particularly their children. In other words, differently from mothers (VC was not only significant predictor of maternal acceptance), it seems necessary for fathers to give importance to family life and to accept self-sacrifice for the benefit of family (VC) in order to become loving and understanding fathers.

4.5 How do education level, family income, age, gender, and perceived parental control and acceptance predict children' s VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity?

Regarding the predictors of VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity in children, results indicated that the predictors of VI are education level and perceived parental control; the predictors of VC are perceived parental control and acceptance; the predictor of HI is gender; the predictor of HC is perceived parental acceptance; and the predictors of religiosity are family income and perceived parental control. In terms of VI, regarding socio demographical variables, results revealed that less educated people are more likely to emphasize the aspects of VI than more educated people. Contrary to this finding, one may expect positive relationship between VI and education level rather than negative relationship, because, as mentioned previously, individualistic tendencies tend to increase rather than decrease with education level in Turkey. However, the related finding of the study again attracts attention to the usefulness of

distinguishing between HI and VI as two kinds of individualism and suggests that education level is negatively correlated with the emphasis on independency from others in a context of inequality (VI) rather than in a context of equality (HI). Thus, it seems that people who give importance to the unequal relationships in a competitive way as reflected in VI are likely to be less educated than others. In other words, results imply that less educated people are more likely to strive for higher positions in a society, are willing for being more successful (especially financially) and dominant over others. Actually, in a supporting way, Kasser, Ryan, Zax, and Sameroff (1995) reported that people from disadvantaged socioeconomic circumstances including lower educational status tend to give more importance to the external rewards such as materialistic success and explained that feeling insecure about themselves for living safety life, socio-economically disadvantaged people tend to attribute more importance to the materialistic values more than pro-social values. In this sense, the finding that less educated people score higher on VI may imply that less educated young people in Turkey, in which economical conditions require young people to have good qualities particularly high education levels for having satisfied jobs, are likely to feel insecure about themselves, especially concerning their future life. So, they may be more concerned with having higher/highest status in society than more educated young people. In terms of VI, results also showed that young people who perceive more parental control are more likely to emphasize the aspects of VI than others. Accordingly, it seems that young people who perceive their parents as more controlling and restrictive tend to accept unequal relationships between in-group members and approve competitiveness for higher positions in society as reflected in VI. In other words, it may be argued that young people who emphasize the hierarchal relationships in a competitive way are likely to perceive their parents as authority figures.

In terms of VC, on the other hand, results demonstrated that both perceived parental control and acceptance are strong correlates of VC in children. Accordingly, it seems that young people of the study, who perceive their parents as controlling and/or accepting tend to give importance to the family as a whole and to accept self-sacrifice for the benefit of family as reflected in VC. This probably implies that perceived parental control is relevant to children's acceptance of hierarchal

relationships in a family as an aspect of VC and so they tend to perceive their parents as authority figures. On the other hand, perceived parental acceptance may reflect children's emphasis on the family life and family integrity as another aspect of VC. In a consistent way with integrative family contexts (İmamoğlu, 2003), it may also be argued that young people of the study, who define their parents with restrictive, controlling and also loving and understanding terms, are more likely to emphasize the family integrity and to accept self sacrifice for the benefit of family as reflected in VC than others.

In terms of HI, results revealed that rather than perceived parental control and acceptance being male or female is relevant to HI in children. Accordingly, results indicated that young females are more horizontally individualistic than their male counterparts. Considering that most of the child sample of the study is university students or graduates, the related finding may imply that educated females are more likely to attribute importance to the individualistic tendencies (HI) such as independency from others (in a context of equality), self reliance, and individual responsibility than educated males. The explanation for this may be that with social change in Turkey women may need more individualistic orientation in order to make good careers in society (Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 2004). In a consistent way with the related finding, other researchers also found that educated Turkish women attribute more importance to the independency from others than their men counterparts (İmamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 2002; Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, 2004). In terms of perceived parental behavior and attitudes, not finding perceived parental control and/or acceptance as correlates of HI in children, this study proposes that regardless of their parental experiences, young people attribute more/less importance to the concepts such as self reliance, independency from others, and individual responsibility as reflected in HI. Actually, among other cultural orientations the child sample of the study scored the highest on HI (see Table 1). This may imply that independent from their perceived parental control and acceptance young people, who were mostly university students, attribute importance to HI in a context of socio-cultural change in Turkey.

In terms of HC, results showed that perceived parental acceptance is positive correlate of HC in children. Accordingly, it seems that young people of the study who perceive their parents as loving and understanding rather than controlling and restrictive are likely to emphasize the interrelatedness between close others and equal relationships as reflected in HC. This implies that young people who evaluate their relationships with parents as warmth and affectionate tend to give importance to the interrelated relationships with close others. In a consistent way with the related finding, in Turkey İmamoğlu (2003) reported that people who have high scores on interpersonal integration orientation are likely to define their parents as accepting rather than controlling. In a supporting way, other researchers also reported that nurturing, caring and responsive family environments facilitate the development of pro-social values in children (Kasser, Ryan, Zax, & Sameroff, 1995).

In terms of religiosity, regarding socio demographical variables results indicated that young people with lower family income are more likely to be religious than others. As discussed previously, this finding actually supports the other finding of the study indicating that lower SES people are more religious than higher SES people. Regarding perceived parental behavior and attitudes, results also demonstrated that people who perceive more parental control are more likely to be religious than others. Accordingly, it seems that young people of the study who perceive their parents as more restrictive and supervising are more likely to emphasize the religious conventions. Probably, this implies that religious young people who are likely to give importance to the traditional family relations tend to see their parents, maybe especially fathers, as authority figures in the family.

4.6 Are there significant differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC and religiosity?

Regarding the differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families in terms of VI, VC, HI, HC and religiosity, results demonstrated that there are significant differences between groups as well as similarities. In terms of HC, results indicated that authoritative and indulgent-

permissive families score higher than neglectful families on HC. Accordingly, it seems that families in which equality and interrelatedness between close others are valued as reflected in HC are likely to involve parent child relationships characterized by high acceptance-high control or high acceptance-low control rather than low levels of control and acceptance. This implies that families valuing interrelatedness between close others and equal relationships are least likely among others to involve parent child relationships characterized by indifference, ignorance, and few involvements as reflected in neglectful parenting. Regarding the finding that both high control-high acceptance (authoritative parenting style) and high acceptance-low control (indulgent parenting style) characterize HC families, it may imply that the togetherness of control and acceptance in authoritative families mean something different from the separated existence of them. For example, the existence of control with acceptance may have positive meaning (i.e., order setting) rather than negative meaning (i.e., dominating) (Lau et al. 1990). Thus, in both indulgent and authoritative families, parent-child relationships may be perceived as warmth and loving and family members may attribute importance to interrelatedness between close others as reflected in HC.

In terms of HI, results indicated that authoritative and indulgent-permissive families score higher than authoritarian families on HI. Accordingly, it seems that families in which equality and independency from others are valued as reflected in HI are likely to involve parent child relationships characterized by high acceptance- high control or high acceptance-low control rather than high control-low acceptance. This implies that families valuing independency from others and individuality of people are least likely among others to involve parent child relationships characterized by restrictiveness, supervision, and demandingness. As explained above, it also seems that both indulgent and authoritative families perceive their parent-child relationships as warmth and loving rather than controlling and give importance to the independency from others in a context of equality as reflected in HI.

In terms of VC, results revealed that authoritative families score higher than all authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families on VC. Accordingly, it seems that families in which family integrity and hierarchal relationships between

family members are valued as reflected in VC are likely to involve parent child relationships characterized by restrictiveness, supervision but also love and understanding. This implies that families emphasizing on the aspects of VC are most likely among others to be high on both parental control and acceptance. In this sense, the finding parallels with other findings of the study, one indicating that VC is relevant to both parental control and acceptance, the other indicating that perceived parental control and acceptance are relevant to the children's VC. This also supports the notion that in order to maintain family integrity, integrative family contexts involve "nurturance, sacrifice, as well as, strict, intrusive, overprotective control" in parent-child relationships (İmamoğlu, 2003).

In terms of religiosity, results indicated that authoritative and authoritarian families score higher than indulgent and neglectful families. Accordingly, it seems that families in which religious conventions are emphasized are likely to involve parent child relationships characterized by high control-low acceptance or high control-high acceptance rather than high acceptance and low control or low acceptance and low control. This implies that families emphasizing the religious conventions are least likely among others to involve parent child relationships characterized by the absence of control.

4.7 General Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between VI, VC, HI, HC, religiosity, some socio demographical variables, and parental control and acceptance from perspective of mothers, fathers, and their children. Regarding the parent sample of the study, firstly, results demonstrated that socio-demographical variables, namely education level and family income are more relevant to the maternal acceptance and control than paternal acceptance and control, respectively. Secondly, in terms of the cultural orientations, results demonstrated that the emphasis on VI is relevant to both paternal and maternal control. In terms of VC, on the other hand, results showed that VC is relevant to maternal control and acceptance and also paternal acceptance. Thus, generally speaking, regarding the difference between VC and VI, different from VC, finding VI as predictor (also stronger) of both maternal

and paternal control (see Tables 3, 4), in a consistent way with other researchers (Çukur et al., 2004; Soh & Leong, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), the present study also indicated that VI is more relevant to the power orientation in people than VC. Regarding other cultural orientations, it was found that HC and HI are relevant to maternal acceptance rather than paternal acceptance. Thirdly, in terms of religiosity, results showed that religiosity has more influence on paternal control than maternal control.

Regarding the child sample of the study, in general, results demonstrated that perceived parental behavior and attitudes as well as socio demographical characteristics of young people are relevant to their cultural orientations and religiosity. Considering the parental correlates of cultural orientations in children, results also indicated that the thoughts and ideas of young people about VC are more strongly influenced by their parental experiences than the thoughts and ideas about VI, HI, and HC (see Tables 7, 8, 9, 10).

Considering the relationships between parental control and acceptance, VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity from perspective of mothers, fathers, and their children, results also revealed that VI is relevant to parental control in all samples of the study. In terms of other cultural orientations, results also demonstrated that VC is relevant to parental control and acceptance and HC is relevant to parental acceptance in mother and child samples. On the other hand, religiosity was relevant to parental control in father and child samples of the study. Accordingly, it can be speculated that parents transmit their own cultural orientations and religiosity to their children thorough their parental behavior and attitudes.

The other purpose of this study was to investigate the differences between mothers, fathers, and their children and also the differences between low and high SES families in terms of the study variables. Results demonstrated that parents and low SES people are more vertically collectivists whereas children and high SES people are more horizontally individualistic, so this study is likely to evidence cultural transition in Turkey (see Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Moreover, not finding generation and SES difference on HC, this study supported other researchers arguing that with socioeconomic development in Turkey interrelated relationships between

close others do not decrease (İmamoğlu, 1987, 1998, 2003; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990, 1996, a, b, 2005). To say differently, this study indicated that with increases in socioeconomic status in-group based collectivism (VC) tends to decrease whereas relationship based collectivism (HC) tends to remain in Turkey. In terms of individualism, not finding generation and SES difference on VI different from HI, this study also indicated that with increases in socioeconomic status Turkish people emphasize the independency from others in a context of equality (HI) rather than in a context of inequality (VI). To conclude, this study suggests that rather than verticality dimension of I-C reflecting inequality between people, horizontality dimension of I-C reflecting equality between people is likely to characterize the aspects of Turkish culture in future.

Another purpose of this study was to investigate the differences between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families in terms of the VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity. Results demonstrated that there are differences as well as similarities between authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent-permissive, and neglectful families in terms of the VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity. In this sense, it is suggestible that new conceptualizations and operational definitions of these four categories of parenting styles may be useful for future researchers in order to make more distinguishable conclusions about the relationships between cultural orientations, religiosity and the categories of the parenting styles.

Considering the unreported findings of the study, they also have important implications for researchers. Firstly, regarding the zero-order relationships between VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity (see Appendix A) the related findings of the study showed consistency with Çukur et al. (2004) study examining the relationships between these constructs in Turkey. Accordingly, both studies indicated positive relationships between HC, VC, and religiosity. In addition, both studies showed that among young people there is a positive relationship between VI and religiosity (see Appendix A). This consistency in results may encourage researchers to further investigate the relations between VI, VC, HI, HC, and religiosity for Turkish people.

Secondly, regarding the zero-order relationships between parental control and acceptance from perspective of parents and their children (see Appendix A), this study

has also implications. Accordingly, finding that there is a significant negative relationship between parental control and acceptance among child sample different from parent sample, this study proposes that different from parents, children tend to evaluate parental control and acceptance as contrasting constructs. In this sense, it may be suggested that parents as being more collectivist oriented may perceive parental control more positively whereas children as being more individualistic oriented may perceive it more negatively such as “over control”, as argued by other researchers in a theoretical way (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997; Triandis, 1995).

Following the implications of the study, it is also important to mention the limitations for the present study. Initially, regarding the construct validity of the vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism scale used in the study, the construct validity of this scale could not be provided for the samples of the study. Secondly, SES level of people was determined based on mothers’ education level. Although in general expected results were obtained, it may be more useful strategy to consider other indicators of SES such as residency, occupation, family income, and other family members’ education level. Thirdly, generational differences were dealt with between groups, which were unequal in terms of the education level. The participants of the study were also heterogeneous in terms of the socioeconomic status, although this variety within each sample provided information about socio demographical correlates of the study variables.

Finally, it should be noted that this study just dealt with vertical and horizontal I-C as personal tendencies or attitudes of people about these constructs. This study did not consider VI, VC, HI, and HC as self-construal types. In a consistent way, Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) claimed that vertical and horizontal I-C do not totally reflect either relational I-C (the consideration of self construal) or normative I-C (the consideration of cultural values), although, in a theoretical way, Triandis (1995) conceptualized VI, VC, HI, and HC in people as describing the unequal independent, unequal interdependent, equal independent, and equal interdependent selves, respectively. Therefore, rather than reflecting the characteristics of people’s real self-other relations, the results of the study should be interpreted as reflecting the people’s

tendencies or attitudes about four types of cultural orientations, namely, VI, VC, HI, and HC.

REFERENCES

- Alwin, D.F. (1986). Religion and parental childrearing orientations: Evidence of a Catholic-Protestant convergence. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(2), 424-440.
- Amato, P.R., & Fowler, F. (2002). Parenting practices, child adjustment, and family diversity. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 703-716.
- Bao, W., Whitbeck, L.B., Hoyt, D.R., & Conger, R.D. (1999). Perceived parental acceptance as a moderator of religious transmission among boys and girls. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(2), 362-374.
- Barber, B. K. (2001). Reintroducing parental psychological control. In B.K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp.3-15). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Baumrind, D. (1968). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 37, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In J. Brooks-Gunn, R. Lerner, & A. C. Petersen (Eds.). *The encyclopedia on adolescence* (pp. 746-758). New York: Garland.
- Beit-Hallahmi, B., & Argyle, M. (1997). *The psychology of religious behavior, belief and experience*. London: Routledge.
- Berndt, T. J., Cheung, P. C., Lau, S., Hau, K., & Lew, W. J. F. (1993). Perceptions of parenting in Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong: Sex differences and societal differences. *Developmental Psychology*, 29(1), 156-164.
- Chen, C.C., Meindl, J.R., & Hunt, R.G. (1997). Testing the effects of vertical and horizontal collectivism: A study of reward allocation preferences in China. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 28(1), 44-70.
- Chiou, J-S. (2001). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism among university students in the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 14(5), 667-678.
- Chirkov, V.I., Lynch, M., & Niwa, S. (2005). Application of the scenario questionnaire of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism to the assessment of cultural distance and cultural fit. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 469-490.

- Coplan, R.J., Hastings, P.D., Seguin, D.G.L., & Moulton, C.E. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mother's parenting goals, attributions, and emotions across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 2(1), 1-2
- Çukur, C.Ş., Guzman, M. R. T. DE, & Carlo, G. (2004). Religiosity, values, and horizontal and vertical individualism-collectivism: A study of Turkey, the United States, and the Philippines. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 144(6), 613-634.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as a context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(3), 487-496.
- Durbin, D.L., Darling, N., Steinberg, L., & Brown, B.B. (1993). Parenting style and peer group membership among European-American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 3(1), 87-100.
- Ellison, C.G., & Sherkat, D.E. (1993). Obedience and autonomy : Religion and parental values reconsidered. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 32(4), 313-329.
- Freeman, M.A. (1997). Demographic correlates of individualism and collectivism. A study of social values in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 28, 321-341.
- Frosh, S. (2004). Religious influences on parenting. In M. Hoghughi, & N. Long (Eds.). *Handbook of parenting: Theory and research for practice* (pp. 98-109). New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Göregenli, M. (1995). Kültürümüz açısından bireycilik toplulukçuluk eğilimleri: Bir başlangıç çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 10(35), 1-14.
- Göregenli, M. (1997). Individualist-collectivist tendencies in a Turkish Sample. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 28(6), 787-794.
- Güngör, D. (2000). *Bağlanma stillerinin ve zihinsel modellerin kuşaklararası aktarımında anababalık stillerinin rolü*. Doctoral Dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara.
- Halman, L., Pettersson, T., & Verweij, J. (1999). The religious factor in Harwood, contemporary society. *International Journal of Comparative Studies*, 40, 141-160.
- RL., Schoelmerich, A., Ventura-Cook, E. Schulze, P.A., & Wilson, S.P. (1996). Culture and class influences on Anglo Puerto Rican mothers' beliefs regarding long-term socialization goals and child behavior. *Child Development*, 67, 2446-2461.

- Hoff, E., Laursen, B., & Tardiff, T. (2002). Socioeconomic Status and Parenting. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed). *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 2. Biology and ecology of parenting* (pp. 231-252). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. (1987). An interdependence model of human development. In Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Ed.), *Growth and progress in cross cultural psychology* (pp. 138-145). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. (1995). Değişim sürecinde aile: evlilik ilişkileri, bireysel gelişim ve demokratik değerler. Aile Kurultayı: Değişim sürecinde aile: Toplumsal katılım ve demokratik değerler (pp. 33-51). Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. (1998). Individualism and collectivism in a model and scale of balanced differentiation and integration. *The Journal of Psychology*, 132(1), 5-105.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. (1999). Some correlates of religiosity among Turkish adults and elderly within a cross-cultural perspective. In L. E. Thomas, S. A. Eisenhandler (Eds.), *Religion, belief, and spirituality in late life* (pp. 93-110). Springer Publishing Company.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. (2003). Individuation and relatedness: Not opposing but distinct and complementary. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 129(4), 367-402.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (1999). 1970' lerden 1990' lara değerler: Üniversite düzeyinde gözlenen zaman, kuşak ve cinsiyet farklılıkları. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 44(14), 1-19.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. (2005). Family: Modern Islamic Discourses: Turkey and the Caucasus. In S. Joseph (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Women & Islamic Cultures: Family, Law and Politics* (pp. 165-167). Brill: Leiden & Boston.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1982). Türkiye' de çocuğun değeri, kadının rolü, ve doğurganlığı. In N. Abadan-Unat (Ed.). *Türk Toplumunda Kadın* (pp. 73-95). İstanbul: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1990). Family and socialization in cross cultural perspective: a model of family change. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation 1989* (pp. 135-200). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996a). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from other side*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996b). The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. *European psychologist*, 1(3), 180-186.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J.W. Berry, M.H. Segall, & Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Eds.). *Handbook of Cross Cultural Psychology: Vol. 3.* (pp.1-50). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 36(4), 403-422.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three-decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 5(3), 317-337.
- Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (2002). *Self construals, perceived parenting styles and well-being in different cultural and socio-economic contexts*. Doctoral Dissertation, METU, Ankara.
- Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (2004). Self, identity, and emotional well-being among Turkish university students. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138(5), 457-478.
- Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z., & İmamoğlu, E. O. (2002). Value domains of Turkish adults and university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 333-351.
- Kashima, E.S., & Hardie, E.A. (2000). The development and validation of the relational, individual, and collective self aspects (RIC) scale. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 19-48.
- Kashima, Y., Kim, U., Gelfand, M.J., Yamaguchi, S., Choi, S-C., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 925-937.
- Kasser, T., Koestner, R., & Lekes, N. (2002). Early family experiences and adult values: A 26-year, prospective longitudinal study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(6), 826-835.
- Kasser, T., Ryan, R. M., Zax, M., & Sameroff, A. J. (1995). The relations of maternal and social environments to late adolescents' materialistic and prosocial values. *Developmental Psychology*, 31(6), 907-914.
- Kimmelmeier, M., Burnstein, E., Krumow, K., Genkova, P., Kanagawa, C., Hirshberg, M.S., Erb, H., Wiczorkowska, G., & Noels, K.A. (2003). Individualism, collectivism and authoritarianism in seven societies. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 34(3), 304-322.

- Kurt, A. (2000). *A comparison of three self-construal conceptualizations and scales with reference to issues of culture and gender*. Master's Thesis, METU, Ankara.
- Kuşdil, M.E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Lamborn, S.D., Mounts, N.S., Steinberg, L. & Dornbusch, S.M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.
- Lau, S., Hau, K., Cheung, P. C., Lew, W. J. .F., & Berndt, T. J. (1990). Relations among perceived parental control, warmth, indulgence, and family harmony of Chinese in Mainland China. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(4), 674-677.
- Lee, C., & Early, A. (2000). Religiosity and family values: Correlates of God-image in a Protestant sample. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 28(3), 229-239.
- Loeb, R.C. (1975). Concomitants of boys' locus of control examined in parent-child interactions. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 353-358.
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp.1-101). New York:Wiley.
- Mahoney, A., Pargament, K. I., Tarakeshwar, N., & Swank A. B. (2001). Religion in the home in the 1980s and 1990s: A meta-analytic review and conceptual analysis of links between religion, marriage, and parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(4), 599-596.
- Mahoney, A. (2005). Religion and conflict in marital and parent-child relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(4), 689-706.
- Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 96(2), 224-253.
- Mutlu, K. (1989). Bir dindarlık ölçeği: Sosyoloji'de yöntem üzerine bir tartışma. *İslami Araştırmalar*, 3(4), 194-199.
- Mutlu, K. (1996). Examining religious beliefs among university students in Ankara. *British Journal of Sociology*, 47(2), 352-359.
- Neff, K. (2003). Understanding how universal goals of independence and interdependence are manifested within particular cultural contexts. *Human Development*, 46, 312-318.

- Oishi, S., Schimmack, U., Diener, E., & Suh, E.M. (1998). The measurement of values and individualism-collectivism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(11), 1177-1189.
- Pulkkinen, L. (1982). Self control and continuity from childhood to adolescence. In P. B. Baltes & O. G. Brim (Eds.). *Life span development and behavior: Vol.4*. New York: Academic Press.
- Saroglou, V., Delpierre, V., & Dernelle, R. (2004). Values and religiosity: A meta-analysis of studies using Schwartz's model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 721-734.
- Schaefer, C.A., & Gorsuch, R.L. (1992). Dimensionality of religion: Belief and motivation as predictors of behavior. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 11(3), 244-254
- Schwartz, S.H., & Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across cultures: Taking a similarities perspective. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 32, 268-290.
- Scott, W.A., Scott, R., Boehnke, K., Cheng, S., Leung, K., & Sasaki, M. (1991). Children's personality as a function of family relations within and between cultures. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 22(2), 182-208.
- Shor, R. (1998). The significance of religion in advancing a culturally sensitive approach towards child maltreatment. *Family Studies: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 79(4), 400-406.
- Singelis, T.M., Triandis, H.C., Bhawuk, D.S., & Gelfand, M. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross Cultural Research*, 29, 240-275.
- Singelis, T.M., Bond, M.H., Sharkey, W.F., & Lai, C.S.Y. (1999). Unpacking culture's influence on self esteem and embarassability: The role of self construals. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 30, 315-341.
- Soh, S., & Leong, F.TL. (2002). Validity of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism in Singapore: Relationships with values and interests. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 33(1), 3-15.
- Steggerda, M. (1993). Religion and the social position of women and men. *Social Compass*, 40(1), 65-73.
- Strunk, D.R., & Chang, E.C. (1999). Distinguishing between fundamental dimensions of individualism-collectivism: Relations to sociopolitical attitudes and beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27(4), 665-671.

- Sunar, D. (2002). Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family. In E. Özdalga & R. Liljestrom (Eds.), *Autonomy and dependence in family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective*. Istanbul, Turkey: Swedish Research Institute.
- Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999). Çocuk yetiştirme stillerinin bağlanma stilleri, benlik değerlendirmeleri ve yakın ilişkiler üzerindeki etkisi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14(44), 25-58.
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tarakeshwar, N., Stanton, J., & Pargament, K.I. (2003). Religion: An overlooked dimension in cross-cultural psychology. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 34, 377-394.
- Triandis, H.C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506-520.
- Triandis, H.C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H.C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist*, 51, 407-415.
- Triandis, H.C., & Gelfand, M.J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118-128.
- Wasti, S.A. (2003). The influence of cultural values on antecedents of organizational commitment: An individual-level analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(4), 533-554.
- Wilcox, W.B. (2002). Religion, convention, and paternal involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 780-792.
- Yılmaz, A. (2001). Eşler arasındaki uyum, anne-baba tutumu ve benlik algısı arasındaki ilişkilerin gelişimsel olarak incelenmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 16(47), 1-20.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CORRELATION TABLES

Zero-Order Correlations of the Study Variables for Mothers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.Acceptance							
2.Control	-.12						
3. VI	.06	.26**					
4. VC	.28**	.23**	.18**				
5. HI	.33**	-.03	.28**	.14*			
6. HC	.38**	-.02	.07	.49**	.23**		
7.Religiosity	.02	.32**	.06	.40**	-.17	.14*	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Zero-Order Correlations of the Study Variables for Fathers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.Acceptance							
2.Control	-.1						
3. VI	.04	.18**					
4. VC	.38**	.16*	.23**				
5. HI	.19**	.09	.53**	.29**			
6. HC	.33**	-.04	.12	.59**	.13*		
7.Religiosity	.01	.37**	.06	.34**	-.09	.13*	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Zero-Order Correlations of the Study Variables for Children

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. M. Acceptance									
2. M. Control	-.13*								
3. P. Acceptance	.55**	-.07							
4. P. Control	-.03	.73**	-.20**						
5. VI	.001	.20**	.04	.20**					
6. VC	.26**	.21**	.24**	.18**	.19**				
7. HI	.11	.07	.002	.1	.36**	-.01			
8. HC	.21**	.01	.21**	.00	.01	.56**	.12		
9. Religiosity	.07	.23**	.13	.18**	.24**	.49**	-.06	.28**	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

APPENDIX B

THE MEASURE OF CHILD REARING STYLES FOR PARENTS

(ANNE VE BABALAR İÇİN ANABABALIK STİLLERİ ÖLÇEĞİ)

	Hiç doğru değil	Doğru Değil	Doğru	Çok doğru
1. Çocuğumla sık sık onu rahatlatıcı bir şekilde konuşurum.				
2. Her davranışını sıkı sıkıya kontrol etmek isterim.				
3 Çocuğuma nasıl davranacağı ya da ne yapacağı konusunda her zaman yararlı fikirler veririm.				
4. Çocuğuma, sorunları olduğunda onları daha açık bir şekilde görmesinde her zaman yardımcı olurum.				
5. Ne zaman, ne yapması gerektiği konusunda talimat veririm.				
6. Kurallarına aykırı davrandığında onu kolaylıkla affetmem.				
7. Sorunlarını çözmesinde çocuğuma destek olurum.				
8. Benimkinden farklı bir görüşe sahip olmasına genellikle tahammül edemem.				
9. Çocuğum, sevgi ve yakınlığıma her zaman güvenir.				
10. Benim düşüncelerime ters gelen birşey yaptığında onu suçlamam.				
11. Çocuğumla aramızda fazla yakın bir ilişkimiz yoktur.				
12. Bir problemi olduğunda bana anlatmaktansa, kendisine saklamayı tercih eder.				
13. Onun ne hissettiğiyle veya ne düşündüğüyle pek ilgilenmem.				
14.Çocuğumla birbirimize çok bağlıyız.				
15. Onun, benim istediğim hayatı yaşaması konusunda ısrarlıyım.				
16. Bir sorunu olduğunda bunu hemen anlarım.				
17. Arkadaşlarıyla ilişkilerine karışırım.				
18. Geç saatlere kadar oturmasına izin vermem.				
19. Arkadaşlarıyla geç saate kadar dışarıda kalmasına izin vermem.				
20. Hangi saatte hangi arkadaşıyla buluşacağını bilmek isterim.				
21. Boş zamanlarını nasıl değerlendireceğine karışırım.				
22. Arkadaşlarıyla dışarı çıkmasına nadiren izin veririm.				

APPENDIX C

THE MEASURE OF CHILD REARING STYLES FOR CHILDREN

(ÇOCUKLAR İÇİN ANABABALIK STİLLERİ ÖLÇEĞİ)

	ANNEM				BABAM			
	Hiç doğru değil	Doğru Değil	Doğru	Çok doğru	Hiç doğru değil	Doğru Değil	Doğru	Çok doğru
1. Benimle sık sık rahatlatıcı bir şekilde konuşur.								
2. Her davranışımı sıkı sıkıya kontrol eder.								
3 Nasıl davranacağım ya da ne yapacağım konusunda bana hep yararlı fikirler verir.								
4.Sorunlarım olduğunda onları daha açık bir şekilde görmemde hep yardımcı olur.								
5. Ne zaman, ne yapmam gerektiği konusunda talimat verir.								
6. Kurallarına aykırı davrandığımda beni kolaylıkla affetmez.								
7. Sorunlarımı çözmemde destek olur.								
8. Onunkinden farklı bir görüşe sahip olmama genellikle tahammül edemez.								
9. Sevgi ve yakınlığına her zaman güvenirim.								
10. Onun düşüncelerine ters gelen birşey yaptığımda suçlamaz.								
11. Fazla yakın bir ilişkimiz yoktur.								
12. Bir problemim								

olduğunda ona anlatmaktansa, kendime saklamayı tercih ederim.								
13. Benim ne hissettiğimle veya ne düşündüğümle gerçekten ilgilenmez.								
14. Onunla birbirimize çok bağlıyız.								
15. Onun istediği hayatı yaşamam konusunda hep ısrarlı olur.								
16. Bir sorunum olduğunda bunu hemen anlar.								
17. Arkadaşlarımla ilişkilerime çok karışır.								
18. Geç saatlere kadar oturmama izin vermez.								
19. Arkadaşlarımla geç saate kadar dışarıda kalmama izin vermez.								
20. Hangi saatte hangi arkadaşımı buluşacağımı bilmek ister.								
21. Boş zamanlarımı nasıl değerlendireceğime karışır.								
22. Arkadaşlarımla dışarı çıkmama nadiren izin verir.								

APPENDIX D

VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL INDIVIDUALISM-COLLECTIVISM SCALE

(YATAY VE DİKEY BİREYCİLİK TOPLULUKÇULUK ÖLÇEĞİ)

- ___ 1) Mutluluğum büyük ölçüde çevremdekilerin mutluluğuna dayanır.
- ___ 2) Kazanmak herşeydir.
- ___ 3) Genellikle kendi çıkarlarımı yakın çevremın yararı için feda ederim.
- ___ 4) Bir şeyi başka insanların benden daha iyi yapması beni rahatsız eder.
- ___ 5) Yakın çevremdekilerin birbirleriyle uyumunu korumak benim için önemlidir.
- ___ 6) İşimi diğerlerinden daha iyi yapmak benim için önemlidir.
- ___ 7) Komşularımın ufak tefek şeyleri paylaşmak hoşuma gider.
- ___ 8) Çalışma arkadaşlarımdın iyiliğı benim için önemlidir.
- ___ 9) Rekabet doğanın kanunudur.
- ___ 10) Eğer çalışma arkadaşlarımdın birisi ödöl alırsa bu beni gururlandırır.
- ___ 11) Özgün bir birey olmak benim için önemlidir.
- ___ 12) Başka bir kişı bir şeyi benden daha iyi yaptığı zaman kendimi gergin ve uyarılmış hissederim.
- ___ 13) Genellikle kendi işimle uğraşırım.
- ___ 14) Yakın çevremın aldığı kararlara saygı göstermek benim için önemlidir.
- ___ 15) Başkalarına güvenmektense kendime güvenirim.
- ___ 16) Hangi fedakârlık gerekirse gereksin aile üyeleri birbirlerine kenetlenmelidir.
- ___ 17) Anne-baba ve çocuklar mümkün olduğu kadar birlikte yaşamalıdır.
- ___ 18) Başkalarından bağımsız bireysel kimliğim benim için çok önemlidir.
- ___ 19) Kendi isteklerimden fedakârlık yapmak gerekse de aileme bakmak benim görevimdir.
- ___ 20) Yaşadıklarım kendi yaptıklarım yüzündendir.
- ___ 21) Ben başkalarından ayrı özgün bir bireyim.
- ___ 22) Yakın çevremde çoğunluğun isteklerine saygı gösteririm.
- ___ 23) Kendine özgü ve birçok yönden başkalarından farklı olmaktan hoşlanırım.

- ___ 24) Bir karar vermeden önce yakın arkadaşlara danışıp onların fikirlerini almak önemlidir.
- ___ 25) Maddi güçlük içinde olan bir akrabama imkânlarım ölçüsünde yardım ederim.
- ___ 26) Rekabet olmaksızın iyi bir topluma sahip olmak mümkün değildir.
- ___ 27) İnsan hayatını başkalarından bağımsız olarak yaşamalıdır.
- ___ 28) Eğer ailem onaylamıyorsa çok zevk aldığım bir aktiviteden fedakârlık edebilirim.
- ___ 29) Başkalarıyla işbirliği yaptığım zaman kendimi iyi hissederim.
- ___ 30) Başkalarıyla rekabet edebileceğim ortamlarda çalışmak hoşuma gider.
- ___ 31) İnsanlarla konuşurken açık ve dosdoğru olmayı tercih ederim.
- ___ 32) Çocuklara görevin zevkten önce geldiği öğretilmelidir.
- ___ 33) Benim için zevk başkalarıyla vakit geçirmektir.
- ___ 34) Başarı hayattaki en önemli şeydir.
- ___ 35) Eğer başarılı olursam bu benim yeteneklerim sayesinde.
- ___ 36) Yakın çevremdeki insanlarla anlaşmazlığa düşmekten nefret ederim.
- ___ 37) Ailemi memnun edecek şeyleri nefret etsem de yaparım.
- ___ 38) Yaşlanan anne ve babamız evde bizimle birlikte yaşamalıdır.
- ___ 39) Bazı insanlar galip gelmenin önemli olduğunu vurgularlar, ben onlardan biri değilim.
- ___ 40) Bireysel kimliğim benim için çok önemlidir.

APPENDIX E

RELIGIOSITY SCALE

(DİNDARLIK ÖLÇEĞİ)

- ___ 1. Din, gerçeği ve güzelliği aramadır.
- ___ 2. Günlük hayatta her türlü kararımı Kur’anda belirtilen esaslara göre veririm.
- ___ 3. Dini konuları tartışmamak gerekir.
- ___ 4. Dini konular ile ilgilenirim.
- ___ 5. Allah ve tabiat aynı manayı ifade eder.
- ___ 6. Allah’a inanmayan bir insan bile günlük hayatta mutlu ve huzurlu bir insan olabilir.
- ___ 7. Cennet ve cehennem diye bir yer yoktur.
- ___ 8. Mahşer günü herkes Allah’a hesap verecektir.
- ___ 9. Allah gerçekten mevcuttur.
- ___ 10. Dini konular ile ilgilenmem.
- ___ 11. Kıyamet günü vardır.
- ___ 12. İbadetin faydası yalnız psikolojiktir.
- ___ 13. Kur’an Allah’ın emirlerini iletir.
- ___ 14. Cennet ve cehennem vardır.

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

(DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU)

Anne Demografik Bilgi Formu

1. Yaşınız:
2. Eğitim Durumunuz: 1) okur-yazar 3) ortaokul 5) üniversite
2) ilkokul 4) lise 6) lisansüstü
3. Dininiz nedir?
4. Kaç yıllık evlisiniz?
5. Ailenizin toplam aylık geliri ne kadardır?

Baba Demografik Bilgi Formu

1. Yaşınız:
2. Eğitim Durumunuz: 1) okur-yazar 3) ortaokul 5) üniversite
2) ilkokul 4) lise 6) lisansüstü
3. Dininiz nedir ?
4. Kaç yıllık evlisiniz?
5. Ailenizin toplam aylık geliri ne kadardır?

Çocuk Demografik Bilgi Formu

- 1) Cinsiyetiniz: Erkek () Kız ()
- 2) Yaşınız:
- 3) Eğitim Durumunuz: 1) okur-yazar 3) ortaokul 5) üniversite öğrencisi
2) ilkokul 4) lise 6) üniversite mezunu
- 4) Dininiz nedir?
- 5) Ailenizin toplam aylık geliri ne kadardır?