

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTING STYLES OF MOTHERS AND
EMOTION REGULATION SKILLS OF CHILDREN

LEMAN İŞBİTİREN

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2022

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTING STYLES OF MOTHERS AND
EMOTION REGULATION SKILLS OF CHILDREN

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Early Childhood Education

by
Leman İşbitiren

Boğaziçi University

2022

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Leman İşbitiren, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date

ABSTRACT

The Relationship between Parenting Styles of Mothers and Emotion Regulation Skills of Children

The aim of the current study was to explore the relationship between mothers' parenting styles and the emotion regulation skills of preschool children in Turkish cultural context. It was assumed that parenting styles of mothers are related to emotional regulation skills of their children. In this quantitative research, the sample was composed of 408 mothers whose children attend one of various preschool programs. For the purposes of data collection, the mothers were invited to participate in the study via various educational sites and social media accounts. The mothers of 193 girls and 215 boys filled out the forms containing demographic information and two scales. First of all, mothers completed the demographic information forms that asked them about age, education levels, working status, and family income, alongside their children's age, gender, and how long they were in preschool. The Emotion Regulation Checklist (ERC) (Altan, 2006; Shields & Cicchetti, 1997) and Parenting Styles Scale (PAS) (Demir & Şendil, 2008) were completed by the mothers. The emotion regulation skills were investigated using two subscales (i.e., emotion regulation and lability/negativity). Their parenting styles were examined using four subscales (i.e., democratic, authoritarian, overprotective, and permissive). In the bivariate correlation analysis, a significant relationship was found between parent's democratic style and children's emotion regulation. In addition to that, authoritarian, permissive, and overprotective parenting was significantly and positively linked to lability/negativity. In the hierarchical multiple regression analysis, democratic style predicted children's emotion regulation, whereas their authoritarian style predicted their children's lability/negativity.

ÖZET

Annelerin Ebeveynlik Tutumları ile Çocukların Duygu Düzenleme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişki

Bu çalışmanın amacı, annelerin ebeveynlik stilleri ile okul öncesi çocukların duygu düzenleme becerileri arasındaki ilişkiyi Türkiye bağlamında araştırmaktır. Bu çalışmada, annelerin ebeveynlik stillerinin çocukların duygu düzenleme becerileri ile ilişkili olduğu varsayılmıştır. Bu nicel araştırmanın örneklemini çocukları okul öncesi eğitim programlarına devam eden 408 anne oluşturmuştur. Verilerin toplanması için anneler çeşitli eğitim siteleri ve sosyal medya hesapları aracılığıyla araştırmaya katılmaya davet edilmiştir. Araştırmada 193 kız çocuğu, 215 oğlan çocuğu annesi, demografik bilgi ve iki ölçekten oluşan formları doldurmuştur. Anneler, öncelikle yaş, eğitim durumu, çalışma durumu ve aile geliri; çocukların yaşı, cinsiyeti ve anaokuluna devam etme sürelerini içeren demografik bilgi formlarını tamamlamıştır. Ardından, Duygu Düzenleme Ölçeği (DDÖ) (Altan, 2006; Shields ve Cichetti,1997) ve Ebeveyn Tutum Ölçeği (ETÖ) (Demir ve Şendil, 2008) anneler tarafından doldurulmuştur. Duygu düzenleme becerileri iki alt boyutta (duygu düzenleme ve değişkenlik/olumsuzluk) incelenirken; ebeveynlik stilleri dört alt ölçek tarafından incelenmiştir (demokratik, otoriter, aşırı koruyucu ve izin verici). İki değişkenli korelasyon analizinde, ebeveynin demokratik tarzı ile çocukların duygu düzenlemesi arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Buna ek olarak, otoriter, izin verici ve aşırı koruyucu ebeveynlik değişkenlik/olumsuzluk ile anlamlı ve pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Ayrıca hiyerarşik çoklu regresyon analizinde ebeveynin demokratik tarzının çocukların duygu düzenlemesini yordadığı, ebeveynin otoriter tarzının ise çocukların değişkenlik/olumsuzluğunu yordadığı bulunmuştur.

*This thesis is dedicated to my beloved family who has
always believed and supported me;
Dilek, İhsan and Yaman İşbitiren*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my warmest thanks and sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Mine Göl-Güven for her endless support during this process. Without her guidance, patience and immense knowledge I could not have been accomplished to complete this study.

I would also thank to my jury members. I am grateful to Assist. Prof. Nalan Babür and Assoc. Prof. Mustafa Yaşar for their constructive feedbacks and valuable time they spared to improve this study.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my lovely housemates Oya Öztürk and Tuğba Siner who always support me and provide me a warm working environment.

I would also like to thank my dear friends, Ayşe Hilal Avcı, Büşra Yazıcıoğlu, Büşra Güneş, Deniz Sevcan Doğan, Buket Dilan Akpınar, Arda Berk Şentürk and Serhat Bakırtaş who are always behind me with their encouragement.

Last but not least, I owe my special thanks to my mother Dilek İşbitiren, my father İhsan İşbitiren and my brother Yaman İşbitiren. I have always felt their support and understanding during my hard times. Their existence in my life always makes me feel stronger.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research questions.....	4
1.2 Conceptual framework.....	5
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Emotion regulation	11
2.2 Parenting styles	14
2.3 How parenting styles and children’s emotion regulation are connected to demographics	16
2.4 The relation between parenting styles and emotion regulation.....	21
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	23
3.1 Research design	23
3.2 Participants	25
3.3 Instruments	26
3.4 Procedure	28
3.5 Research ethics	29
3.6 Data analysis	30
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	32
4.1 Normality	32
4.2 Descriptive findings on demographics of mothers and their children.....	33
4.3 Descriptives for emotion regulation and parenting attitudes	37
4.4 Comparison of mothers parenting styles scores by demographics of mothers.....	38

4.5 Comparison of children’s emotion regulation skills scores by demographics of mothers	43
4.6 Comparison of mothers’ parenting styles scores by demographics of children	45
4.7 Comparison of children’s emotion regulation skills scores by demographics of children	48
4.8 Bivariate correlations among demographics, emotional regulation, and parenting style.....	50
4.9 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis for variables predicting emotion regulation	57
4.10 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis for variables predicting emotion lability/negativity	61
4.11 Multicollinearity statistics.....	65
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	67
5.1 The comparison of demographics, children’s emotion regulation and mother’s parenting styles.....	67
5.2 The relationship between the demographics, children’s emotion regulation and mothers’ parenting styles	71
5.3 The relationship between parenting styles and emotion regulation	75
5.4 Conclusion	78
5.5 Limitations.....	81
5.6 Suggestions	83
APPENDIX A: ETHICAL PERMISSION FORM	87
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR MOTHERS (TURKISH)	88
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR MOTHERS (ENGLISH)	91

APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM FOR MOTHERS AND THEIR CHILDREN (TURKISH).....	93
APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM FOR MOTHERS AND THEIR CHILDREN (ENGLISH).....	94
APPENDIX F: EMOTION REGULATION CHECKLIST (ERC) (TURKISH).....	95
APPENDIX G: EMOTION REGULATION CHECKLIST (ERC) (ENGLISH).....	98
APPENDIX H: PARENTING ATTITUDE SCALE (TURKISH)	100
APPENDIX I: PARENTING ATTITUDE SCALE (ENGLISH)	104
REFERENCES.....	108

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Normality Analysis for Study Variables.....	33
Table 2. Descriptive Findings on Demographic Information of Mothers.....	35
Table 3. Descriptive Findings on Demographic Information of Children.....	36
Table 4. Descriptives for Emotion Regulation Checklist and Parenting Attitude Scale.....	38
Table 5. Comparison of Mothers' Parenting Styles Scores by Demographics of Mothers.....	42
Table 6. Comparison of Children's Emotion Regulation Skills Scores by Demographics Mothers.....	45
Table 7. Comparison of Mothers' Parenting Styles Scores by Demographics of Children.....	48
Table 8. Comparison of Children's Emotion Regulation Skills Scores by Demographics Children.....	50
Table 9. Bivariate Correlations among Emotion Regulation and Parenting Styles.....	53
Table 10. Bivariate Correlations among Parenting Styles and Mother-Child Variables.....	55
Table 11. Bivariate Correlations Among Emotion Regulation and Parenting Styles.....	57
Table 12. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Emotion Regulation.....	59

Table 13. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Emotional/Lability/Negativity.....	63
Table 14. Multicollinearity Statistics.....	66

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Self-regulation is a multifaceted concept; it refers to the ability to regulate and modulate one's emotions, cognition, and behaviors (Eisenberg, Smith & Spinrad, 2011). Preschool years are remarkable periods of time for children to develop their self-regulation skills considering that early schooling environments require children to concentrate their attention, regulate their emotions, and avoid behaviors that are destructive or harmful to others (McClelland & Cameron, 2012). Self-regulation is closely related with the emotion regulation process (Baumeister & Vohs, 2003). One of the most common definitions of emotion regulation was presented by Gross (1998b), as a mechanism by which people control what feelings they have, when they have them, and how they feel and express them. Children learn how to cope with various complicated emotions in socially appropriate ways during the first eight years of their life (Craig & Dunn, 2007). Developing emotion regulation skills during childhood is vital for children's socio-emotional growth because it allows them to respond appropriately to the emotional demands of growing up, as well as the difficulties they face in their world around them (Macklem, 2007).

Emotion regulation processes refer to attitudes, abilities, and techniques that serve to regulate, inhibit, and enhance emotional experiences and expressions, whether with an effort or automatic ways (Calkins & Hill, 2007). The family setting is a place that children improve their emotion regulation abilities. An affective family atmosphere that parents provide to their children has a significant impact on the development of emotion regulation and communication skills of a child (Macklem, 2008). Parents involve their children's learning and developing emotion

regulation abilities process through their parenting styles and related strategies (Morris, Silk, Myers & Robinson, 2007). More specifically, mothers tend to spend a considerable amount of time together with their children throughout their early years when they are in a developmental period in which they learn about the world by watching, listening, and imitating their mothers (Denham & Kochanoff, 2002). For instance, children of more responsive mothers who support their children to regulate their feelings had greater emotional regulation (Denham, 1993). Furthermore, Denham and colleagues (1991) found that children whose mothers use positive parenting techniques (i.e., enabling autonomy for their child, providing support and positive communication) exhibit higher levels of emotional competence when interacting with peers. Thus, the sample of the current study focused solely on the mothers and their children. The other reason for choosing preschoolers as a sample is because many regard early childhood as a significant period in human life. Children during this phase start to use their emotion regulation abilities actively. Moreover, the experiences they acquire during the first years of life have a long-lasting influence on them throughout the rest of their lives.

On the other hand, while parenting styles are related to children emotion regulation abilities, they are also partly culturally constructed and differ based on social cultural and socio-economic conditions (Thompson & Meyer, 2007). In the context of Turkish culture, even though it includes diversities and dynamic nature, collectivist patterns, gender biases, and strong emotional ties are stillexisted within the Turkish families (Sunar & Fişek, 2005). These culture-based characteristics lead theconstruction of a hierarchical and authoritarian family environment which is shown in strong parental control (Kağıtçıbaşı,2007). Moreover, some demographics such as a child's age, gender, income level of family, education level of mothers and

working status are also significant factors for emotional regulation of children and parenting style of mothers. For instance, a number of studies indicate that gender linked to levels of emotion regulation of children (Morris et al., 2007). Furthermore, when compare with boys, girls usually have better emotion regulation skills (Morris, et al., 2002). Moreover, when income level of families taken into consideration, children from lower socioeconomic families are more likely to show low level of emotion regulation skills (Ackerman, Brown & Izard, 2004). Low socioeconomic status is also tied to limitation of emotion regulation in communication (Miller & Olson, 2000). Therefore, it is significant to consider the relation between socioeconomic status and the other demographic characteristics which are forming children's emotion regulation skills, including the parenting styles which are constructed by features of culture.

Previous research has been investigated the relation between parenting styles, socio-economic status (SES), demographic characteristics and emotion regulation of children in Western cultures (Evans & Kim, 2013). However, in Turkey there is not much research based on especially about associations between Turkish mothers' parenting styles and emotion regulation abilities of Turkish children. Likewise, there are few research on the relation between SES and children emotion regulation abilities (Gülseven, Kumru, Palermo, Selçuk & Sayıl, 2018). Relatedly, other demographics about children and mothers in Turkey have rarely been taken into consideration linked to the parenting styles and emotion regulation of children. Considering this, in Turkish cultural context further research is needed to better understand the relationship among parenting styles of mothers and children's emotional regulation (Gülseven, et al., 2018). Consequently, the aim of the current study is to examine the relationship between Turkish mothers' parenting styles and

their children's ability to regulate their own emotions.

1.1 Research questions

Aligned to the aim, the study seeks to answer the following related four research questions:

- 1) Do emotion regulation skills (i.e., emotion regulation and lability/negativity) of 36-72months old children differ depending on demographics of children and mothers?
- 2) Do parenting styles (i.e., democratic, authoritarian, overprotective, and permissive) of mothers differ depending on the demographics of children and mothers?
- 3) Are there any associations between the demographics of mothers (i.e., age, number of children, working status, education level, family income level), and children (i.e., age, gender, duration of attending a preschool) and children's emotion regulation skills, and parenting styles of their mothers?
- 4) Do parenting styles predict emotion regulation and lability/negativity of children when demographics of mothers are controlled?

1.2 Conceptual framework

In the literature, various parenting styles are classified. Several of them are based on the theoretical framework of Baumrind's Parenting Styles Theory (1967) which is widely used in parenting research. Based on this theory, Baumrind classifies authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative parenting as dimensions in the original model. Permissive parents focus on their children's desires rather than imposing authority on or making demands of them. Authoritarian parents give particular importance to compliance and show punitive manners to ensure that rules are followed. In contrast, authoritative parents appreciate the autonomy of their children and support verbal interaction with them. Afterwards, the initial definitions of Baumrind have been reinterpreted under two main dimensions of demandingness and responsiveness with the inclusion of a fourth parenting style, which has called neglecting (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Maccoby & Martin (1983) have largely concentrated their research on the construction of parenting styles and, to a lesser extent, their relationship to children's developmental outcomes. Beyond those, the assessment of high and low scoring via these dimensions have led to the occurrence of eight different parenting styles classifications such as overprotective parents (Rodriguez, Donowick & Crowley, 2009). Overprotective parents are not likely to encourage the autonomy of their children and they tend to see their children as an individual who needs continual care (Demir & Şendil, 2008).

Throughout the years and nowadays researchers still have demonstrated and developed their frameworks based upon the Baumrind's parenting style theory and its related definitions even though, it was established many years ago. Given that the concept of parenting style is a dynamic construct, it could be evolved and reconceptualized based on the original theory and definitions, and regard to needs of

modernized and developing cultures alike. In respect to this, in current study, theory of Baumrind's parenting style and related definitions were firstly taken into consideration.

Parenting styles and children's developmental outcomes are structured by across culture and various SES backgrounds (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Cultural norms and expectations have an impact on parenting practices (Acar, Veziroğlu-Çelik, Çelebi, İngeç & Kuzgun, 2019). Every culture has certain qualities that set it apart from other societies (Bornstein 2012). Parents from various cultures differ in their ideas and values, which therefore lead to the emergence of variety of parenting styles linked to a child's behavior and development (Sen, Yavuz-Muren & Yağmurlu, 2014). Thus, while parenting styles change among cultures, they may also impact child outcomes in different ways (Yağmurlu & Sanson, 2009).

Most of the studies on parenting styles has taken place in individualistic cultures (Haslam, Poniman, Sumangi & Boediman, 2020). The findings from collectivistic non-Western civilizations are contrary to those in Western culture groups, hence indicating that the impact of parenting strategies on child regulation may be dependent on one's particular culture (Prevo & Tamis-LeMonda, 2017). Similarly, those same parenting behaviors might represent a different role in different cultural settings, and different parental practices might serve the same function (Acar et al., 2019). For instance, although authoritative parenting styles provide European American children positive social and academic outcomes, whereas children from China and Hong Kong take advantage of authoritarian parenting styles regarding developmental and learning outcomes (Bornstein, 2012). Moreover, in most Middle Eastern countries, authoritarian parenting does not relate with negative outcomes for children (Haslam et al, 2020).

Several cross-cultural research about families and parents have investigated and focused on the distinction between individualistic-collectivistic and independent-interdependent contexts (Bugental & Grusec, 2006). Cultures which are individualistic shows independent characteristics, and they value self and autonomy whereas collectivistic societies are seen as interdependent and they give importance to interrelations and group unity more than self. Relatedly, there are some major differences between cultures and within the culture. Thus, although the framework for parenting styles is widely used in cross-cultural research, it is not consistent in relation to parenting styles and emotion regulation (Haslam et al, 2020). For example, in collectivistic cultures certain emotions such as anger and sadness are thought as being negatively related to interrelatedness, individuals who are living in that culture limit the expression of these feelings. On the other hand, in individualistic cultures, people are more likely to show and talk about their anger and sadness. With regard to parenting, in Western countries, authoritative parenting style is seen something that supports children's emotional development (Bornstein, 2002). Moreover, previous findings suggest that in collectivist societies, authoritarian parenting is not considered harmful to emotion control (Jabeen, et al., 2013). Cultures like collectivistic and individualistic both have different perception about regulation and expression of feelings and have parents who tend to inhibit or encourage their children to express these emotions.

However, Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) has discussed the discrimination of interdependent-independent values of cultures and proposes that both autonomy focus of individualistic and relatedness focus of collectivistic views are important for children needs and they can exist together. She suggests three family models which includes The Family Model of Interdependence (FMInt), The Family Model of

Independence (FMInd) and The Family Model of Emotional Interdependence (FMEInt). Each model explains the relational, autonomous and relational-autonomous aspects of families. FMEInt refers to families who are from collectivistic and non-Western families and who have lower education and SES background. Authoritarian parenting is used more in the context of the first family model. On the contrary, FMInd is more prevalent in Western and individualistic cultures, and which includes families with high education and SES levels. Permissive parenting style is seen more within the family model of independence. This family model values independence and autonomy whereas the first one involves interdependence between family members and hierarchical relationships. FMEInt focuses on the synthesis of independence and interdependence instead evaluating them separately. It refers significance of both autonomy and emotional dependence. Parents control children's attitudes but also, they support their independence. In addition, authoritative parenting is prevalent for this model. Also, this model usually includes families who are from non-Western, collectivistic and middle-income level.

In accordance with the three family models, SES is associated with parents' affection, responsiveness, and punitive attitudes. Parents who earn a lower income are likely to use tougher strategies due to financial difficulties and it decreases the resources. Thus, they become more self-centered, and they do not tend to encourage their children to regulate feelings. Conversely, parents with higher SES level more likely to focus on their children needs as they are under less stress because they have less concerns in relation to resources that they can provide their children. They are more responsive and supportive to encourage their children's emotion regulation and independency.

Research also points that in addition to relations between culture-based family models, parenting styles and children emotional development outcomes, regulation of emotions differs across cultural contexts of self (Kitayama, 2002). Along with this, parenting practices vary between the three aspects of family models, as do the variables of the self (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005). Relatedly, Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) also present a model of “Agency, Interpersonal Distance, and the Types of Selves and Families”. According to model, the heteronomous-related self is introduced first and it improves within the family model of interdependence. This type of self shows high relatedness and low independence. Secondly, the autonomous-separate self is presented. This kind of self is seen in the family model of independence and it includes a high level of independence but low level of relatedness. Moreover, the autonomous-related self is proposed within the model.

This type of self improves in the family model of emotional interdependence, and values both relatedness and independence. The last one is a heteronomous-separated self, which develops in families who place importance on the hierarchical, whilst rejecting and obedience parenting practices. In parallel with this model, according to findings, Western and other individualistic cultures which give more importance to autonomy, and value such emotions like anger and pride as well as initially think about their personal emotion regulation (Trommsdorff & Rothbaum, 2006). On the contrary, non-Western and other collectivistic cultures which emphasize relatedness first and focus on interpersonal emotional regulation rather than self and try not to harm group unity (Trommsdorff & Rothbaum, 2006).

As a result, different cultures have different characteristics and they differ in terms of their perceptions and beliefs. Families from different cultures are likely to value different parenting styles, family models and perception of self. These culture-

based differences also related with the children's developmental outcomes such as emotion regulation abilities. In the light of the culturally based and comprehensive perspectives of both Kağıtçıbaşı's family and self-models, the aim of the current study was to investigate the relationship between Turkish mothers' parenting styles and children's emotion regulation by taking into consideration their demographics.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The main aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between parenting styles of mothers and emotion regulation skills of children in Turkish cultural context, within the demographic variables of mothers and children. This chapter includes definitions of emotion regulation and parenting styles, a review of the relevant literature by emphasizing on the relationship between those two concepts and on their connection with demographics as well as an explanation of the study's theoretical perspectives.

2.1 Emotion regulation

Emotion regulation is known as the way of starting, repressing, sustaining or controlling the strength, consistency and outcome of feelings such as attitudes and reactions to gain social and individual objectives (Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2004). Cole and colleagues (2004) describe it as various behavioral, attentional, and emotional processes that enable children to operate their feelings and attitudes effectively in their social context. Furthermore, Calkins and Hill (2007) proposed that emotion regulation procedures can be performed either with or without effort using instruments aimed at modulating and facilitating effective expressions and perceptions or inhibiting them. In other respects, emotion regulation can be described as the child's ability to remain adaptable and react to a variety of circumstances, while also controlling emotions to make effective interaction within the environment (Rydell, Berlin, & Bohlin, 2003).

Although researchers are still debating how best to define the concept of emotion regulation because there is no complete agreement about what this construct constitutes. Nevertheless, emotion regulation skills are basically divided into two categories: emotion regulation and emotion lability/negativity. Emotion regulation is the ability for someone to manage intense feelings while maintaining calm feeling simultaneously. Emotion lability/negativity is known as to react immediately while also having difficulty to suppressing unpleasant emotional reactions (Cole, Martin & Dennis, 2004). Emotion regulation is important for social adaptive functioning. In contrast, lack of emotion regulation skills alongside emotion lability/negativity in children may lead them to experience uncontrolled or overregulated expression of feelings and difficulties in social competence and transitioning into school (Calkins & Hill, 2007).

Emotion regulation skills can be seen as an emerging process over years even though many of them are inherent within individuals since birth (Bozkurt & Demircioğlu, 2017). Children tend to be very competent at using such fundamental skills at a young age. Continuous and gradual improvement at learning emotions and showing emotion control are observed during infancy and toddlerhood (Calkins & Hill, 2007). During the first year, infants make attempts to regulate emotions under the guidance of autonomic biological mechanisms such as sucking to comfort themselves or crying to ask for help in times of distressing circumstance (Bozkurt & Demircioğlu, 2017). During those early ages, caregivers assist children in regulating their feelings by adjusting their exposure to stimulating events and by intervening to relieve anxiety, anger, or apprehension by using calming or diversion strategies (Eisenberg, & Spinrad, 2004). That's why, throughout this period, the primary caregiver has an active role on emotion regulation of infants by taking advantage of

early signs of emotion regulation (Brownell & Kopp, 2007). As they understand that caregivers can act in a way that will support them in the regulation process, their signals and redirection become specifically social (Diener, Mangelsdorf, McHale & Frosch, 2002).

Children's emotional regulation abilities develop gradually and become more advanced during the preschool years. Relatedly, it is thought that preschool years are the best time to investigate how children think about emotions, largely because preschool children pay close attention to their social environment when trying to make an attempt to comprehend emotions (Denham & Kochanoff, 2002).

Throughout their preschool years, children develop skills that help them regulate their own emotions, as well as how to react to circumstances that include emotions. In other words, preschool children are in a process of development to being competent socially and emotionally.

Parents have a significant role in their children's improvement of emotion regulation in their family context (Ahmetoğlu, İlhan-İdiz, Acar & Encinger, 2017). Regarding the family context, parenting styles may include supporting children to understand the meaning of different emotions as well as providing them emotion regulation techniques (Morris et al. 2007). As children become older, they can perceive the differences between strategies and reactions of parents to various feelings (Çorapçı, Aksan & Yağmurlu, 2012). These relationships within the family settings encourage children to develop their emotion regulation skills by modeling their parents, as well as acquire parents' culture related demands from their children respecting emotion regulation (Acar et al., 2019).

Considering the contribution of developmental knowledge, it is reasonable to assume that the preschool years are important because this is when children have the opportunity to experience actively participate in different environments (e.g., school context, peers, home). Because these important relationships occur within the context of early relationships and by the direct contribution of parents, this study will examine the ways in terms of parenting styles.

2.2 Parenting styles

Parenting style is a major component in constructing family environment and has significant associations with children's developmental outcomes. A variety of parenting styles has been discovered in the extensive literature throughout the years such as authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and overprotective. The parents with overprotective parenting styles are more likely to be responsive, warm and less likely to support autonomy. Authoritarian parenting is defined as expecting complete obedience to an organized setting with defined rules, and regularly monitoring their children's behaviors (Carapito et al., 2018). It includes adult centered and punitive practices. When a child's attitudes do not reach expectations of authoritarian parents, they emphasize obedience and prefer to use punitive methods (Carapito et al., 2018). Authoritative parenting involves understanding of and being responsive to need of children while also setting appropriate rules. This one is seen as more beneficial style compared to others and includes more child centered attributes. Lastly, the permissive parenting style refers to setting minimum expectation and limitation for the child (Kalburan & Ivrendi, 2016).

On the other hand, even though there are some generalization regards to parenting styles, different cultural characteristics shape parenting practices. Various cultures have different values and this can in turn influence how parents raise their children. For example, Western individualistic cultures are known as using authoritative parenting style since they value autonomy. On the other hand, parents in non-Western collectivistic cultures usually have authoritarian parenting style as the purpose of the society is to encourage interconnectedness and compliance more than independence to support group harmony (Rudy & Grusec, 2001). Turkish cultural context is known as collectivistic and both authoritarian and overprotective parenting styles are more common (Kalbura, 2016). According to Kağıtçıbaşı (2007) since Turkish culture and family values are not same with the Western societies, reflection of parenting styles also perceived differently by parents and children. For instance, parents in Turkey exhibit both control and warm attributes which is perceived positively by children whereas children from a Western culture respond to the same parenting practices negatively. Moreover, even though there is a general thought about authoritarian parenting related to negative outcomes for children, according to research authoritarian parenting is viewed positively by parents in Turkey (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Regarding to cultural context, Turkish mothers also usually present both high responsiveness and parental control to their children (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2010). However, within the cultural context, some different demographic backgrounds of Turkish mothers such as education, income level, age, working status, number of children associate with the different parenting practices. In the following part of the literature review, differences in regard to their background will be elaborated.

2.3 How parenting styles and children's emotion regulation are connected to demographics

Considering the important contributions of parents and context of culture, parenting styles are emphasized as essential aspect regard to emotion regulation. Besides this, school experience is almost equally crucial in development of emotion regulation of children (Schlesier, Roden & Moschner, 2019). Children first improve their social and problem-solving skills, academic development, and the ability to identify their needs and emotions at the preschool age (Hosokawa & Katsura, 2017). Also, emotion regulation might have a relation with other features of functioning such as building relationship with peers and teachers through the context of a school environment (Séguin & MacDonald, 2018). Thus, school experience has a significant role in improvement of emotion regulation of preschool age children including encouraging classroom context, positive teacher-children relationship, and supportive peer interactions. In school environment, teachers contribute to children emotional development with supporting their peer interactions and also their relations with parents in home (Sabol & Pianta, 2012). In other words, preschool environment provides plenty of opportunities for children to support their social and emotional development (Kramer, Caldarella, Christensen & Shatzer, 2009). However, even though extensive evidence demonstrates that preschool years are significant for the development of children's skills, few significant findings exist about the role of duration of attending a preschool especially in Turkish cultural context related to child's emotion regulation skills.

Beyond preschool experiences, differences in gender related to emotion regulation considered associated with environmental factors such as gender-related thoughts of families (Brody & Hall, 2008). Gender, as a feature of a child's

personality, is likely to influence how the family environment affects the emotion regulation of children (Morris et al., 2007). For example, according to a study, parents generally prefer to encourage girls for expressions of sadness and they support boys for expression of anger (Chaplin, Casey, Sinha & Masey, 2010). Parents also tend to support more interactional emotion regulation methods with girls and more active emotion regulation techniques with boys (Sheeber, Davis, & Hops, 2002). Also, in Turkish cultural context, parents are more likely to tolerate anger of boys rather than of girls (Ataca, Kağıtçıbaşı & Diri, 2005). However, this perspective is likely to change specifically in urban areas by modernization. This progress in Turkish culture brings some alterations in regard to gender (Ataca et al., 2005). Parents are more likely to present equal attitudes towards their daughters and sons.

According to various studies, the gender of children related to their emotion regulation skills (Maleki, Mardani, Mitra-Chehrzad, Dianatinasab & Vaismoradi, 2019). Also, differences in parenting practices regarding children's gender are related to the levels of emotion regulation of children. Moreover, some data suggest that girls and boys express their feelings differently and that girls have better emotion regulation than boys (Eisenberg et al., 2001). In other words, boys are more likely than girls to exhibit anger rather than sadness. They are also more inclined to express anger in the face of disappointment and stress, whereas girls are more likely to exhibit sadness than anger (Chaplin & Aldao, 2013). However, inconsistent with previous research, Çorapçı and colleagues (2012) found that the expression of anger and sadness related with regulation did not have variations regard to gender differences. Also, Yağmurlu and Altan (2010) have not found any significant difference between boys and girls in relation to expressing different level of anger or sadness.

The development of emotion regulation is also associated with age. Findings from various research with young children have identified that significant thresholds in the improvement of abilities to control emotional and behavioral reactions have been attained when a child reaches the third years old (Bell & Calkins, 2000). As children grow older, they become more aware of distinctive responses of their parents to different emotions (Corapci et al., 2012). As the autonomy of the child increases the particular strategies of parents contribute to the child's knowledge about emotion regulation skills (Calkins & Hill, 2007). The child will then use this knowledge in a number of situations, both in a conscious manner and in an unconsciously, automatic manner (Calkins & Hill, 2007). Thus, after the age of three, the child begins to understand and demonstrate their emotion management skills more consciously. They build on their previous knowledge of emotional expression, develop themselves to realize every person has different emotions, start to understand causes and results of emotions, perceive more complicated feelings and begin to internalize emotion regulation (Denham & Kochanoff, 2002).

Although, SES as identified by parental education, occupation and family income have strong relations with parenting practices and children's ability, the mechanisms by which SES associate the development of children are less clear (Duncan & Magnuson, 2003). The use of a single SES component is not regarded as a sufficient method of controlling for SES or comprehending its impacts on children's outcomes (Duncan & Magnuson, 2003). For this reason, the present study addresses multiple indicators such as mothers' age, working status, education, income level, and number of children.

In this regard, parents with higher degrees of parental education have more knowledge and abilities concerning child development (Hosokawa & Katsura, 2017).

Several studies have shown that education level of the parents is one of the factors that strongly associated to parental practice (Ömeroğlu, 1996). Also, it was documented that as education level increases parents tend to show more democratic parenting and less overprotective parenting (Ömeroğlu, 1996). On the other hand, low level of education has been related to permissive and authoritarian parenting (Coolahan, 2002). General findings related to maternal education showed that mothers who have low level education are less responsive and attentive to their children's feelings (Sassler, Cunningham & Lichter, 2009). Also, it was discovered that mothers age and education level were found related to their expectations with obedience. As age and educational level of mothers increased, they are less likely to expect and value obedience from their children (Mayer, Albert, Tommsdorff & Schwarz, 2005). Similarly, there is a substantial link between a high maternal education level and the children's emotion regulation skills (Maleki et al, 2019). Furthermore, increases in education and relatedly working status of mothers have been stated to linked to parenting practices (Ocakçı, Ayyıldız & Kulakçı, 2006). Higher family income allows parents to pay more for their children's services, opportunities, and an environment that promotes development (Conger, Conger & Martin, 2010). Parenting practices of mothers who are not working found related to authoritarian and overprotective parenting whereas employed mothers' parenting styles discovered associated to democratic practices (Ocakçı et al., 2006). Also, there was a relation found between the income level of mothers and parenting styles. It was documented that mothers with low-income level more likely to show overprotective and authoritarian parenting practices, whereas mothers with high income level showed more democratic parenting style (Ocakçı et al., 2006). This contradiction might be caused of traditional family type in Turkish cultural context.

Sunar and Fişek (2005) indicated that because of the gender norms, mothers are seen as the one and only responsible person for both household and childrearing. This point of view may increase the burden of mothers and make their parenting practices more stressful and nonresponsive to their children.

Also, it is indicated that the children of poor families are more likely to grow up in families that are cold and unsupportive (Bradley, Corwyn, McAdoo & Coll, 2001). Likewise, it is discovered that children with low income parents are more likely to show anger instead of sadness (Garner & Spears, 2000). Moreover, the findings based on welfare recipients also imply that programs that enhance both work and income have positive effects on mothers and young children with regard to psychological well-being and parent-child relationship (Duncan & Magnuson, 2005). It has discovered that higher family incomes connected with maternal employment, including low-wage employment, can increase children's well-being (Smith et al., 2000). Also, mothers who have more children are more likely to show authoritarian parenting style and more on responsive attitudes (Ocakçı et al., 2006).

There are few studies that investigate the associations between mothers' parenting practices and SES in Turkish cultural context. Nevertheless, the limited number of research shows that Turkish parents with low SES background are more likely to use punitive practices, whereas Turkish parents with higher SES background tend to be more responsive (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). In other words, parenting becomes more punitive and less responsive as a result of persistent poverty and economic challenges. On the other hand, the value of traditional Turkish families, particularly gender roles and position of women, has evolved as a result of social development and modernization (Sunar, 2002). As a consequence of modernity and social progress, an increasing number of women have had

employment status (Amorim & Rossetti-Ferreira, 2004). The rising rate of mothers' education and employment status have been showed positive relation with parenting styles (Ocakçı et al., 2006).

2.4 The relation between parenting styles and emotion regulation

Parenting styles are seen as an important part of family context and crucial predictor for how children regulate their emotion (Morris et al. 2007). Many previous studies have found a link between parenting styles and children's emotional regulation abilities (Morris et al. 2007). For example, parents with authoritative parenting styles who are responsive and warm enable parenting techniques such as understanding and responding to their children's emotional signs (Morris et al. 2007). Positive parenting techniques such as warm relationship and inductive reasoning, as well as decreased level of power assertion are related to improved emotional regulation skills (Yağmurlu & Altan, 2010). This type of parents encourages their children's emotion regulation skills by calming them down, naming their feelings, and providing solutions to their problems. Besides warmth and supportive practices, positive parenting behaviors include clear boundaries that reduce confusion and let children express their emotions appropriately (Morris et al. 2017). Children whose mothers practice positive parenting demonstrate better regulation for their emotions than those whose parents do not (Yağmurlu & Altan, 2010).

In contrast to positive parenting strategies, negative parenting methods, which include strong physical discipline practices and punishment, predict children's incompetence in emotionregulation abilities. A previous study revealed that emotional difficulties were related to lack of parental warmth and excessive psychological control (Aunola et al., 2013). Negative responses of mothers to a

child' anger (e.g., ignoring, punishing) anticipate poor emotional regulation and inhibit children from learning how to resolve their anger (Yağmurlu & Altan, 2010). Morris and colleagues (2007) discovered that maternal hostility was negatively related with children's emotional regulation.

Permissive parents show a high level of affection and a lack of control. Children who have permissive parents do not have a chance to realize boundaries and are left alone to regulate their own feelings (Wischert, 2016). Thus, permissive parenting has been found to be negatively associated with emotion regulation skills (Jabeen, Anisul-Haque & Riaz, 2013). Furthermore, the parents who show an overprotective parenting style are extremely controlling and supervisory to behaviors and feelings of their children; this attribute inhibits their independence and the development of emotion regulation skills (Fox & Calkins, 2010). Thus, they usually tend to ask for support to help regulate their feelings and behaviors.

In addition to this, cultural studies present that parenting styles constructed by cultural rules and greatly related to children ability to regulate their emotions (Harkness & Super, 2002). In Turkish cultural context, mothers who provide responsive and emotional support are more likely to have children with a high level of emotion regulation, whereas mothers who use punitive practices and expect compliance all the time are more likely to have children with low level of emotion regulation (Altan-Aytun, Yağmurlu & Yavuz, 2013). Notably, parenting styles differs based on the various demographic backgrounds and cultural values. These parenting practices are significantly related to predicting how children regulate their emotions. However, there are limited number of research regarding parenting styles of Turkish mothers and relationship to emotion regulation of children. Thus, more research is needed to generalize the findings of previous studies.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In order to investigate the relationship between parenting styles of mothers and emotion regulation skills of children based on the demographics of mothers and children, quantitative research method is used. In this chapter, firstly, characteristics of the sample of the current study were presented. Secondly, the instruments used in the study were described regarding their content and properties. Lastly, the procedure of data gathering, and data analysis were presented.

3.1 Research design

In the current study, quantitative research was conducted to investigate the relationship between parenting styles of mothers and emotion regulation skills of children. Demographics of the mothers and their children were also assessed to explore their relationships with mothers' parenting style and children's emotion regulation.

Quantitative research is the statistical presentation and manipulation of data for the aim of defining and interpreting the phenomena that those observation reflect (Sukamolson, 2007). Furthermore, quantitative research is defined by Cohen (1980) as social research that integrates empirical procedures and empirical assertions. Quantitative research includes a variety of forms; namely survey, correlational, experimental, and causal- comparative research. Each type has its own distinct characteristics (Sukamolson, 2007). A type of correlational research was chosen to conduct this study since the main purpose of correlational research is investigating associations between two or more variables in the same sample or between the same

variables in two samples (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The aim of the current study was also to discover relationships between mothers' parenting styles and their children's ability to regulate their own emotion. Another goal of correlational research is to determine how closely changes in one variable are associated with variances in one or more other variables (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Relatedly, in the current study, the relationship among demographics, mothers' parenting styles, and children's emotion regulation.

One of the other main objectives of quantitative studies is to provide consistent and reliable measures that can be used for statistical analysis (Goertzen, 2017). Namely; frequencies, percentages, proportions, and relationships are examples of measurements that can be used to assess and give evidence for variables (Goertzen, 2017). Cohen (1968) proposed that parametric analyses such as t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) study correlations between variables so that quantitative investigations would provide correlational evidence (Curtis, Comiskey & Dempsey, 2016). In the light of this information, in the current study, frequencies, *t*-test and ANOVA were carried out to present correlational evidence. Also, bivariate correlational analysis and multiple regression were run out to assess relation and prediction scores between variables.

Furthermore, quantitative research methods, such as correlational studies, often employ large samples obtained through a rigorous procedure. This is significant since the goal of quantitative sampling is to create statistically meaningful data that can be generalized for a whole sample group (Norwood, 2010). In the light of this information, in the current study the sample consisted of 408 mothers so that find out correlations and offer reliable findings to generalize them for the target population.

3.2 Participants

In this quantitative research, the sample consisted of 408 mothers whose children are at preschool ages and attending preschool programs. Likewise, all of the demographic data is obtained from the mothers, the majority of whom between 31 and 38 of age (71.3%). Also, the Emotion Regulation Checklist (ERC) (Altan, 2006; Shields & Cicchetti, 1997) and Parenting Styles Scale (Demir & Şendil, 2008) were completed by the mothers to obtain information about their parenting styles and emotion regulation skills of children. The sample of children consisted of 47.3 % girls (n=193) and 52.7 % boys (n=215). The mothers answered the survey having the following age groups: 44.9 % of the children (n = 183) were between 61 and 72 months old, 38.5 % of the children (n=157) were between 48 to 60 months old, 16.7 % of children (n=68) were between 36 and 47 months old.

In the current study, the demographic information form and two instruments were completed by the mothers since mothers are often the primary caregivers for children, and because children learn much about appropriate emotional expressions and coping mechanisms from their mothers through the process of emotion regulation (Yağmurlu & Altan, 2010). Also, the role of mothers and their relationship with their children is crucial for the development of emotion regulation skills and regulate their behavior adaptively (Lincoln, Russell, Donohue & Racine, 2016). It is a process which begins during infancy with sensitive and responsive interactions in the environment of caregiving and it proceeds through the preschool years (Lincoln et al, 2016).

For the purposes of data collection, the research was announced at education websites as well as on social media accounts. Then, the link for the online forms over google documents were sent to mothers to answer the demographic information,

Likert-type checklists and scales.

3.3 Instruments

In this research, demographic information form and two different instruments, namely the Emotion Regulation Checklist (ERC) (Altan, 2006; Shields & Cichetti, 1997) and Parenting Styles Scale (Demir & Şendil, 2008) were used. The demographic information form included questions about mothers and their children. Emotion regulation skills are investigated by two subscales (i.e., emotion regulation and lability/negativity); parenting styles examined by four subscales (i.e., democratic, authoritarian, overprotective, and permissive).

3.3.1 Demographics of mothers and children

Related demographic information for mothers were about their age, how many children they had, their educational level, working status, and monthly income level of their families. The mothers stated their ages and the number of children by typing in. Responses of education level of mothers included: (a) primary, (b) secondary, (c) high school, (d) associate degree program, (e) academy program, (f) university education, (g) master's degree and (f) PhD degree. Responses for the working status of mothers were categorized into two options that were employed and unemployed. Answers for income level of their families categorized into five from below 2.500 TL to above 10.001 TL, with three additional options in between. Information related to children were obtained from mothers. Questions about children addressed age, gender, and how long they had been attending preschool. Age of children was specified by three options; (a) 36-47 months, (b) 48-60 months, (c) 61-72 months. Gender of children was indicated as a girl and a boy. Responses for duration of

attending a preschool consisted of three categories: (a) less than 1 year, (b) 1 year, (c) more than 1 year (APPENDIX C).

3.3.2 Emotion regulation checklist (ERC)

The Emotion Regulation Scale was developed by Shields and Cicchetti in 1997. Altan had adapted the scale into Turkish in 2006 and used it to assess children's emotion regulation skills. The Emotion Control Scale has 24 items and two subscales: lability-negativity and emotional regulation (APPENDIX D). Items on the lability-negativity subscale examine arousal reactivity, emotional sensitivity, expression of negative emotions, and mood lability, while the emotional regulation subscale assesses appropriate developmental behaviors, empathy, appropriate emotion display, and emotional awareness. For instance, “Can say when s/he is feeling sad, angry or mad, fearful or afraid.”, “Takes pleasure in the distress of others (e.g. laughs when another person gets hurt or punished, enjoys teasing others.)” and “Is emphatic towards others; shown concern when others are upset or distressed.” are some of the items in the scale. The response alternatives for each item on the Likert type scale were divided into four groups. Options are graded on a scale of 1 to 4 while evaluating the scale. The “never/rarely” option is evaluated as 1 point, the “sometimes” option as 2 points, the “frequently” option as 3 points and the “always” option as 4 points. The child's high scores on the scale suggest that the child has a high level of emotion regulation skills. Both mothers and teachers can fill out the scale. In present study, the information will be gathered from the mothers whose children are between 36-72 months old.

In the original scale, Shields and Cicchetti (1997) discovered the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient for the lability/negativity subscale to be .96

and for the emotional regulation subscale to be .83. Moreover, Altan (2006) stated the internal consistency coefficient for the overall scale as .75 for the mother form and .84 for the teacher form. In this study, it was found .64. According to the results of the studies, while it is seen that the internal consistency coefficients of the scale are high, also it can be said that it is a valid and reliable scale. Internal reliabilities of the domains of the checklist were computed with Cronbach's alpha in SPSS. It was .59 for "emotion regulation", .80 for "lability/negativity".

3.3.3 Parenting attitude scale (PAS)

This scale was developed by Demir and Şendil in 2008 on the purpose of finding out attitudes of parents to their children who are aged between 2 and 6. The scale has four dimensions: democratic, authoritarian, overprotective, and permissive. The final version of the scale has 46 items (APPENDIX E). These are some examples from the items such as "I help my child learn to be independent.", "I punish my child for the slightest mistake." and "I keep my child away from work that might discourage her/him." Internal consistency was assessed for the democratic, authoritarian, overprotective, and permissive subscales. Accordingly, Cronbach alpha values for each were .83, .76, .75, and .74 respectfully (Demir & Şendil, 2008). According to results of the validity and reliability assessments, the Parents Attitude Scale (PAS) has good psychometric qualities. Internal reliabilities of the domains of the scale were computed with Cronbach's alpha in SPSS. It was .80 for "democratic", .85 for "authoritarian", .81 for "overprotective" and .68 for "permissive"

3.4 Procedure

The data gathering process was started by making an announcement on education

websites such as cocukbogazici.com as well as on social media accounts. Parents were mainly reached from social media groups who are living in different cities of Turkey by using convenience sampling to reach mothers. On the first page of the online form included the consent form for the mothers. The mothers who agreed to participate, first of all filled out the demographic information forms that include age, gender and duration of attending a preschool of the children; age, education levels, working status of mothers, numbers of children that mothers had, and monthly income level of their families. After demographic information, the Emotion Regulation Checklist (ERC) (Altan, 2006; Shields & Cicchetti, 1997) and Parenting Styles Scale (Demir & Şendil, 2008) were completed by the participant mothers. The online form took approximately 20 minutes for the mothers. Contact information of the thesis advisor, researcher and the Ethics Committee in Social Sciences and Humanities were listed in the first part of the online forms for the participants to contact in case they had any questions about the research.

3.5 Research ethics

The ethical approval was sought and granted by Boğaziçi University the Ethics Committee of the Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences (SOBETIK) (APPENDIX A). The potential participants were approached by educational websites and social media accounts. The purpose of the study and data collection process were provided to them via online forms. Online informed consent was provided to further explain the study. All of the participants were required to approve the informed consent form prior to demographic questions and scales to indicate their willingness to be part of the study. The participants check the box to indicate for their consent prior to the second page of the online form. They were adequately

informed about the study and about the potential risks in a consent letter. The mothers were informed that Parenting Attitude Scale consisted of certain sensitive items such as beating the child and that of any confirmation of child abuse would be reported to Provincial Directorates of the Ministry of Family and Social Policies (ASPİM). Moreover, an explanation was clearly given to the participants that they had a power of freedom of choice to decide whether to participate or withdraw from the study at any time, even after the informed consent had been approved. E-mail addresses of the thesis advisor, the researcher, and the Ethics Committee in Social Sciences and Humanities were provided in the case that participants have any questions or address any concerns about the research. The anonymity and confidentiality of the participants were protected by not obtaining their names and identity during the data collection, analysis and reporting of the study findings. The information and data storage on the cloud system and personal laptop were protected by using passwords that were only held by the researcher. All anonymized electronic data from the current study will be securely stored for five years. Later, the data will be destroyed when it is no longer needed.

3.6 Data analysis

In the current study, all statistical analyses were conducted through the 27th version of Statistical Package for Social Sciences -SPSS ©. Data was gathered via convenience sampling from different regions of Turkey by using an online form to reach out for participants who are accessible. Prior to main analyses, all demographics, independent, and dependent variables were examined for missing data. In the present study, no participant was removed due to missing data. Thus, the data collected from 408 participants were examined in the analyses. Reverse coding

was conducted for two items of emotion regulation subscale, 16, 18; and four items of lability/negativity subscale, 4, 5, 9, 11. No item was required reverse coding for Parenting Attitudes Scale. After conducted reverse coding, main analyses were performed. Then, two scales for emotion regulation and four scales for parenting styles were generated. Following that, reliability analyses were conducted for the total and subscales. Cronbach's alpha scores were used to identify internal consistencies. The process of main analyses followed several steps. Firstly, normality was assessed for each subscale by examining skewness and kurtosis statistics.

Secondly, descriptive analysis such as frequencies, percentages, means, minimums and maximums, and standard deviations of the demographic characteristics of the sample were carried out. Afterwards, descriptive data of the study variables were laid out. Then, *t*-test and one-way ANOVA were run to evaluate group differences. In addition to these, bivariate correlation analyses were performed to assess associations between variables. Following that, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to test prediction of independent variables on dependent variables by taking into consideration of control variables. In hierarchical multiple regression, predictors cannot be included more than two categories so some of the variables which have more than two categories such as duration of attending a preschool, age of children and mothers, education level, and income level of mothers were recoded. Thus, duration of attending a preschool renamed as attending a preschool. Finally, multicollinearity statistic was checked by assessing Tolerance and VIF values.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In the results section, the findings gathered from 408 mothers' responses were presented. In bivariate correlation analysis, a statistically significant and positive relationship was found between parent's democratic style and children's emotion regulation. Also, democratic parenting was found significantly and negatively associated with lability/negativity. In addition to this, while authoritarian parenting style was found significantly and negatively related to emotion regulation of children, the finding showed that it was significantly and positively related to lability/negativity. Furthermore, permissive parenting was found significantly and positively related to lability/negativity. Moreover, according to the findings of multiple regression analysis, it was found that while mothers' democratic style predicted children's emotion regulation, authoritarian style predicted children's lability/negativity.

4.1 Normality

Descriptive statistics, including skewness and kurtosis, were tested to assess normality of each subscale. Curran and his colleagues (1996) indicated the criterion for skewness is ± 2 and for kurtosis is ± 7 . The normality test indicated that Parenting Attitude Scale, including democratic, authoritarian, overprotective, and permissive subscales, and Emotion Regulation Checklist, including emotion regulation and lability/negativity subscales, were normally distributed. Normality analysis for study variables is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Normality Analysis for Study Variables

Variables	Skewness	Kurtosis
Emotion Regulation	-.558	.214
Lability/Negativity	.861	.953
Democratic Parenting	-1.397	2.649
Authoritarian Parenting	1.159	2.047
Overprotective Parenting	-.138	-.572
Permissive Parenting	.436	.370

4.2 Descriptive findings on demographics of mothers and their children

In the current study, 13.2 % of mothers were between 23 and 30 years of age (n = 54), 71.3 % of them were between 31 and 38 (n = 291), while the remaining 15.4 % of them were 39 and above (n = 63). The mean of mothers' age was 35.71 (SD = 4.867). With respect to the education level of the mothers, while 42.9 % of them (n = 175) graduated from a university, 14.2 % of them (n = 58) graduated from a master program, and 15.4 % of them (n = 63) had a high school education/diploma.

Moreover, according to working status, 51.0 % of the respondent mothers (n=208) were employed, 49.0 % of them (n=200) were unemployed. Furthermore, based on the mothers' reports about the income level of their families, 37.5 % of them earned a family income level of over 10.0001 TL per month. Number of children that mothers have ranged from 1 to 6 and 93.1 % of mothers' number of children ranged

from 1 to 3, while 6.9 % of mothers have more than 3 children. Descriptive findings on demographics of mothers are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Findings on Demographics of Mothers

Variables	<i>N</i>	%
Mothers' Age		
23-30	54	13.2
31-38	291	71.3
39 and above	63	15.4
Children Number		
Only 1	145	35.5
2 and above	263	64.5
Education level		
Primary Education	4	1.0
Secondary Education	11	2.7
High School Education	63	15.4
Associate Degree Program	59	14.5
Academy Program	18	4.4
University Education	175	42.9
Master's degree	58	14.2
PhD Degree	20	4.9
Working Status		
Employed	208	51
Unemployed	200	49
Monthly Income Level of the Family		
0 TL-2.500 TL	10	2.5
2.501 TL-4.000 TL	58	14.2
4.001 TL-6.000 TL	86	21.1
6.001 TL-10.000 TL	101	24.8
10.001 TL and above	153	37.5
Total	408	100

There were 193 girls (47.3 %) and 215 boys (52.7 %). It was 44.9 % of the children (n = 183) whose ages were between 61 to 72 months old, 38.5 % of the children (n=157) whose ages were between 48 to 60 months old and remaining 16.7 % of children (n=68) whose ages were between 36 to 47 months old. According to the responses of the participant mothers, 52.2 % of the children (n=213) had been attending a preschool for less than one year, 7.1 % of them (n=29) had been attending only for 1 year and 40.7 % of them (n=166) had been attending for more than 1 year. Descriptive findings on demographics of children are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Findings on Demographics of Children

Variables	<i>N</i>	%
Children's Age		
36-47 Months	68	16.7
48-60 Months	157	38.5
61-72 Months	183	44.9
Gender		
Girl	193	47.3
Boy	215	52.7
Duration of Attending a Preschool		
Less than 1 year	213	52.2
1 year	29	7.1
More than 1 year	166	40.7
Total	408	100

4.3 Descriptives for emotion regulation and parenting attitudes

Emotion regulation and lability/negativity are the two subscales of Emotion Regulation Checklist; democratic, authoritarian, overprotective, and permissive are the four subscales of Parenting Attitude Scale. The average score of total emotion regulation checklist was found 2.42 ($M=2.42, SD=0.22$). It was found for emotion regulation subscale 3.32 ($M= 3.32, SD= 0.35$) and for the lability/negativity 1.96 ($M=1.93, SD=0.43$). The mean score for total parenting attitude scale was found that 3.27 ($M = 3.27, SD = 0.26$). It was revealed for its democratic subscale 4.63 ($M = 4.63, SD = 0.32$), authoritarian subscale 1.82 ($M = 1.82, SD = 0.59$), overprotective subscale 3.47 ($M = 3.47, SD = 0.74$), and permissive subscale 2.26 ($M = 2.26, SD = 0.56$). Means, standard deviations and minimum-maximum score ranges of Emotion Regulation Checklist and Parenting Attitude Scales involving their subscales are identified in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptives for Emotion Regulation and Parenting Attitudes

	N	Min	Max	M	SD
Emotion Regulation Checklist	408	1.95	3.14	2.4239	.22054
Emotion Regulation	408	2.00	4.00	3.3238	.35511
Lability/Negativity	408	1.07	3.73	1.9363	.43756
Parenting Attitude Scale	408	2.48	4.15	3.2707	.26513
Democratic	408	3.00	5.00	4.6308	.32910
Authoritarian	408	1.00	4.73	1.8211	.59247
Overprotective	408	1.67	5.00	3.4785	.74396
Permissive	408	1.00	4.22	2.2658	.56089

4.4 Comparison of mothers parenting styles scores by demographics of mothers

Regard to research question, it was investigated that whether mothers parenting styles differ or not depending on demographics of mothers. One way ANOVA was performed to compare the differences of the three different age groups of mothers among parenting styles. A one way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in mean overprotective parenting style score between at least two groups ($F(2,405) = [4.803]$, $p = .009$). The result of the Tukey HSD test for multiple comparisons revealed that the mean value of overprotective parenting style

score was significantly different between mothers in the 23-30 and 39-55 age groups ($p = .018$, 95% C.I. = [.0529, .6960]).

Moreover, it is found that overprotective parenting was also significantly different between mothers in the 31-38 and 39-55 ages groups ($p = .014$, 95% C.I. = [.0489, .5308]). There was no statistically significant difference in mean overprotective parenting scores between the mothers in the 23-30 and 31-38 age groups ($p = .718$). The results suggest that younger mothers are more likely to show an overprotective parenting style to their children.

Also, there was statistically significant difference between mothers who have one child ($M = 4.6755$, $SD = .28032$) and mothers who have two and more ($M = 4.6061$, $SD = .35121$) in relation to democratic parenting style, $t(406) = 2.04$, $p = .03$. Also, there was statistically significant difference found between mothers who have one child ($M = 2.3517$, $SD = .60774$) and mothers who have two and more ($M = 2.2184$, $SD = .52855$) in relation to permissive parenting style, $t(406) = 2.31$, $p = .021$. It indicates that mothers who have one child are more likely to show either democratic or permissive parenting style.

On the other hand, there was not statistically significant difference found between mothers who have one child ($M = 1.7530$, $SD = .59812$) and mothers who have two and more ($M = 1.8586$, $SD = .58709$) in relation to authoritarian parenting style, $t(406) = -1.72$, $p = .085$. Also, there was no significant difference between mothers who have one child ($M = 3.4582$, $SD = .78904$) and mothers who have two and more ($M = 3.4896$, $SD = .71921$) in relation to overprotective parenting style, $t(406) = -.40$, $p = .684$.

A one-way ANOVA was also conducted to compare the differences of education level of mothers among parenting styles. It is found that there was a

statistically significant difference in mean overprotective parenting style score between at least two groups ($F(7,400) = [4.882]$, $p = .000$). Post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of overprotective parenting style score was significantly different between those who finished high school education and those who had university education ($p = .000$, 95% C.I. = [.1387, .7836]). Moreover, it is found that overprotective parenting was significantly different between high school education and master's degree of mothers ($p = .002$, 95% C.I. = [.1215, .9203]). Furthermore, it is found that overprotective parenting style was also significantly different between high school education - PhD degree of mothers ($p = .006$, 95% C.I. = [.1221, 1.2488]). Likewise, it is found that overprotective parenting was significantly different between secondary education and PhD degree of mothers ($p = .038$, 95% C.I. = [.0251, 1.6729]). The results suggest that mothers who have a high level of education tend to be less overprotective parenting style and vice versa. There was a statistically significant difference between employed ($M = 3.3777$, $SD = .75588$) and unemployed mothers ($M = 3.5833$, $SD = .71834$) with regard to overprotective parenting style, $t(406) = -2.815$, $p = .005$. The working mothers are less likely to be overprotective than non-working mothers.

A one-way ANOVA carried out to compare the differences of income level of the families among parenting styles of the mothers. It is found that there was a statistically significant difference in mean overprotective parenting style score between at least two groups ($F(4,403) = [5.215]$, $p = .000$). According to results of Tukey HSD Test for multiple comparisons, the mean value of overprotective parenting style was significantly different between the families whose income level is ranged between 2,501 and 4,000 TL and those whose income level was 10.001 TL

and above ($p = .000$, 95% C.I. = [.1597, .7758]). The results seem to indicate that mothers who have a high level of family income are less likely to show an overprotective parenting style. Findings related to comparison of mothers' parenting styles by demographics of mothers are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of Mothers Parenting Styles Scores by Demographics of Mothers

		Sample Size	Democratic Parenting	Authoritarian Parenting	Overprotective Parenting	Permissive Parenting	
Mothers' Age	<i>F</i> -value		.77	.65	4.80**	1.59	
	Sum of squares		.16	.45	5.21	1.00	
	Mean square		.08	.22	2.61	.50	
	23-30	54	4.62	1.82	3.59	2.21	
	31-38	291	4.64	1.83	3.51	2.29	
Number of Children	39 and above	63	4.58	1.74	3.22	2.16	
	<i>t</i> -value (<i>df</i> =406)		2.04*	-1.72	-.40	2.31*	
	Only 1	145	4.67	1.75	3.45	2.35	
Education Level	2 and above	263	4.60	1.85	3.48	2.21	
	<i>F</i> -value		1.07	1.51	4.88**	1.61	
	Sum of squares		.75	3.07	14.20	2.93	
	Mean square		.15	.61	2.84	.58	
	Primary Education	4	4.52	2.00	3.75	2.30	
	Secondary Education	11	4.66	1.61	4.01	2.04	
	High School Education	63	4.68	1.69	3.84	2.24	
	Associate Degree Program	59	4.67	1.80	3.55	2.28	
	Academy Program	18	4.59	1.60	3.30	1.91	
	University Education	175	4.61	1.85	3.38	2.32	
	Master's Degree	58	4.55	1.94	3.32	2.23	
	PhD Degree	20	4.70	1.85	3.16	2.31	
	Working Status	<i>t</i> -value (<i>df</i> =406)		.86	1.75	-2.81**	1.70
		Employed	208	4.64	1.87	3.37	2.31
		Unemployed	200	4.61	1.76	3.58	2.21
	Income Level	<i>F</i> -value		.59	.92	5.21**	2.54
		Sum of squares		.25	1.30	11.08	3.15
Mean square			.06	.32	2.77	.78	
0 TL-2.500 TL		10	4.68	1.75	3.82	2.52	
2.501 TL-4.000 TL		58	4.59	1.79	3.77	2.21	
4.001 TL-6.000 TL		86	4.67	1.81	3.53	2.18	
6.001 TL-10.000 TL		101	4.61	1.91	3.49	2.39	
10.001 TL and above		153	4.62	1.77	3.30	2.23	

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

4.5 Comparison of children's emotion regulation skills scores by demographics of mothers

Related to research question, it was analyzed that whether children emotion regulation differ or not depending on demographics of mothers. Emotion regulation and lability/negativity scores were compared based on the demographics of the mothers. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean age of the mothers and emotion regulation skills of children ($F(2,405) = [2.14], p = .118$). Also, according to results there was not any significant difference between the mean age of the mothers and lability/negativity ($F(2,405) = [2.33], p = .098$). According to findings of the current study, there was no statistically significant difference between employed mothers ($M = 3.3486, SD = .34716$) and unemployed mothers ($M = 3.2981, SD = .36226$) for emotion regulation, $t(406) = 1.43, p = .152$. Likewise, there was not any significant difference between employed mothers ($M = 1.9179, SD = .40831$) and unemployed mothers ($M = 1.9553, SD = .46631$) with regard to lability/negativity, $t(406) = -.862, p = .389$. According to findings of the current study, there was no statistically significant difference between mothers who have only one child ($M = 3.3397, SD = .35985$) and mothers who have two and above children ($M = 3.3151, SD = .35285$) for emotion regulation, $t(406) = .668, p = .505$. According to findings of the current study, there was no statistically significant difference between mothers who have only one child ($M = 1.9228, SD = .44588$) and mothers who have two and above children ($M = 1.9437, SD = .43359$) with regard to lability/negativity, $t(406) = -.463, p = .644$.

Moreover, there was no statistically significant difference in mean of monthly family income and emotion regulation skills ($F(4,403) = [1.178], p = .320$). Also, according to results there was not any significant difference in mean of monthly

family income and lability/negativity ($F(4,403) = [2.031]$, $p = .089$). On the other hand, one way ANOVA was performed to compare the eight different education levels for emotion regulation and lability/negativity. One way ANOVA revealed that there was not any statistical difference in mean lability/negativity scores between any education level ($F(7,400) = [.913]$, $p = .496$). However, there was a statistically significant difference in mean emotion regulation score between at least two groups ($F(7,400) = [4.882]$, $p = .03$). Tukey HSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of emotion regulation style score was significantly different between high school education and PhD degree ($p = .032$, 95% C.I. = $[-.5639, .0139]$). The findings suggested that children whose mother has a PhD degree are more likely to show emotion regulation. Findings related to the comparison of children's emotion regulation by demographics of mothers is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Comparison of Children's Emotion Regulation Skills Scores by Demographics of Mothers

		Sample Size	Emotion Regulation	Lability/Negativity
Mothers' Age	<i>F</i> -value		2.14	2.33
	Sum of squares		.53	.88
	Mean square		.26	.44
	23-30	54	3.23	2.05
	31-38	291	3.33	1.92
	39 and above	63	3.36	1.89
Number of children	t-value (<i>df</i> =406)		.66	-.46
	Only 1	145	3.33	1.92
	2 and above	263	3.31	1.94
Education Level	<i>F</i> -value		2.15*	.91
	Sum of squares		1.66	1.01
	Mean square		.33	.20
	Primary Education	4	3.28	2.16
	Secondary Education	11	3.19	1.93
	High School Education	63	3.23	2.00
	Associate Degree Program	59	3.29	1.96
	Academy Program	18	3.44	1.80
	University Education	175	3.33	1.93
	Master's Degree	58	3.49	1.86
PhD Degree	20	3.52	1.89	
Working Status	t-value (<i>df</i> =406)		1.43	-.86
	Employed	208	3.34	1.91
	Unemployed	200	3.29	1.95
Income Level	<i>F</i> -value		1.17	2.03
	Sum of squares		.59	1.54
	Mean square		.14	.38
	0 TL-2.500 TL	10	3.33	2.08
	2.501 TL-4.000 TL	58	3.26	2.03
	4.001 TL-6.000 TL	86	3.30	1.91
	6.001 TL-10.000 TL	101	3.30	1.97
10.001 TL and above	153	3.36	1.87	

*= $p < .05$ **= $p < .01$

4.6 Comparison of mothers' parenting styles scores by demographics of children

In respect to research question, it is assessed that whether mothers' parenting styles

differ or not depending on demographics of children. Accordingly, the comparisons resulted in having no statistically significant difference between girls ($M = 3.5049$, $SD = .75546$) and boys ($M = 3.4548$, $SD = .73445$) in regard to overprotective parenting style, $t(406) = -.679$, $p = .498$. Also, no statistically significant difference was revealed between girls ($M = 4.6370$, $SD = .32551$) and boys ($M = 4.6252$, $SD = .33296$) with regard to democratic parenting style, $t(406) = -.362$, $p = .717$. In addition to these, there was not any statistically significant difference between girls ($M = 1.8262$, $SD = .59871$) and boys ($M = 1.8165$, $SD = .58817$) in relation to authoritarian parenting style, $t(406) = -.362$, $p = .869$. Lastly, there wasn't any statistically significant difference between girls ($M = 2.2660$, $SD = .58367$) and boys ($M = 2.2656$, $SD = .54099$) in relation to permissive parenting style, $t(406) = -.006$, $p = .995$. Findings related to the comparison of mothers parenting styles by gender of children suggest that gender had no relation with any of mothers' parenting styles. Furthermore, there was not any statistically significant difference found in mean age and democratic parenting style ($F(2,405) = [.043]$, $p = .958$), authoritarian parenting style ($F(2,405) = [.273]$, $p = .761$), overprotective parenting style ($F(2,405) = [10.437]$, $p = .133$) and permissive parenting style ($F(2,405) = [1.608]$, $p = .202$).

Findings based on comparing the mothers parenting styles by the age of children showed that age had no relation with any of mothers' parenting styles. On the other hand, there was a statistically significant difference found in the mean overprotective parenting style score between at least two groups when it came to the duration of their children in preschool ($F(2,405) = [10.437]$, $p = .000$). According to results of Tukey HSD Test, the mean value of overprotective parenting style was significantly different between the mothers whose children have less than 1 year experience and whose children have more than 1 year experience in a preschool ($p =$

.000, 95% C.I. = [.1331, .4873]). Also, based on the result from Tukey HSD Test, the mean value of overprotective parenting style was significantly different between the mothers whose children had only 1 year experience and whose children had more than 1 year experience in a preschool ($p = .006$, 95% C.I. = [-.7955, -.1068]). The findings suggested that mothers whose children had been in preschool more than one year are less likely to show an overprotective parenting style than mothers whose children had been in preschool just one year or less. Findings related to the comparison of mother's parenting styles by demographics of children are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Comparison of Mothers' Parenting Styles Scores by Demographics of Children

		Sample Size	Democratic Parenting	Authoritarian Parenting	Overprotective Parenting	Permissive Parenting
Children's Age	<i>F</i> -value		.04	.27	2.02	1.60
	Sum of squares		.009	.19	2.23	1.00
	Mean square		.005	.09	1.11	.50
	36-47 Months	68	4.63	1.79	3.61	2.31
	48-60 Months	157	4.62	1.80	3.49	2.30
	61-72 Months	183	4.63	1.84	3.40	2.21
Gender	<i>t</i> -value (<i>df</i> =406)		-.36	-.16	-.67	-.006
	Girl	193	4.63	1.82	3.50	2.26
	Boy	215	4.62	1.81	3.45	2.26
Duration of Attending a Preschool	<i>F</i> -value		.31	2.66	10.43**	.49
	Sum of squares		.06	1.85	11.04	.31
	Mean square		.035	.92	5.52	.15
	Less than 1 year	213	4.62	1.76	3.59	2.29
	1 year	129	4.66	1.77	3.73	2.24
	More than 1 year	166	4.63	1.90	3.28	2.23

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

4.7 Comparison of children's emotion regulation skills scores by demographics of children

In view of the research question, it is evaluated that whether children's emotion regulationskills differ or not depending on demographics of children. Emotion regulation and lability/negativity scores were compared based on gender of children.

Results of the independent *t test* analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference between girls ($M = 3.3271$, $SD = .35603$) and boys ($M = 3.3209$,

$SD = .35508$) for emotion regulation, $t(406) = -.174, p = .862$ (See Table 5). Also, there was not any statistically significant difference between girls ($M = 1.9022, SD = .43248$) and boys ($M = 1.9668, SD = .44085$) with regard to lability/negativity, $t(406) = 1.491, p = .137$ (See Table 8). The results indicate that the gender of children does not have any difference with regard to emotion regulation and lability/negativity. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean age of children and their emotion regulation skills ($F(2,405) = [.93], p = .393$). Also, according to the results there was not any significant difference between the mean age of children and lability/negativity ($F(2,405) = [2.13], p = .119$). The results indicate that the age of children does not have any difference in relation with emotion regulation and lability/negativity.

According to findings of the current study, there was no statistically significant difference in the mean score of emotion regulation skills and duration of attending a preschool ($F(2,405) = [1.97], p = .140$). Also, there was no significant difference between lability/negativity and duration of attending a preschool ($F(2,405) = [.22], p = .798$). The results suggest that the duration of attending a preschool does not have any difference in relation with emotion regulation and lability/negativity of children. Findings related to the comparison of children's emotion regulation by demographics of children are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Comparison of Children's Emotion Regulation Skills Scores by Demographics of Children

		Sample Size	Emotion Regulation	Lability/Negativity
Children's Age	<i>F</i> -value		.936	2.13
	Sum of squares		.236	.814
	Mean square		.118	.407
	36-47 Months	68	3.27	1.96
	48-60 Months	157	3.33	1.98
Gender	61-72 Months	183	3.33	1.88
	t-value (<i>df</i> =406)		-.17	1.49
	Girl	193	3.32	1.90
Duration of Attending a Preschool	Boy	215	3.32	1.96
	<i>F</i> -value		1.97	.22
	Sum of squares		.49	.08
	Mean square		.24	.04
	Less than 1 year	213	3.29	1.94
	1 year	129	3.36	1.95
	More than 1 year	166	3.35	1.91

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

4.8 Bivariate correlations among demographics, emotional Regulation, and parenting Style

By taking into consideration of the research question, relationship between each parenting style and mother-child demographics were assessed. Bivariate correlations among the parenting styles and mother-child variables were conducted by Pearson Product Moment Correlation as they were seen in Table 6. The results showed that mothers' age was significantly and negatively related to overprotective parenting styles $r = -.138, p = .005$. The findings suggested that children whose mothers are older are less likely to show overprotective parenting. In addition to this, the findings

showed that number of children was significantly and negatively related to democratic parenting $r = -.101, p = 0.21$. This finding indicated that mothers who have more children are less likely to show democratic parenting or vice versa.

Also, the number of children found significantly and positively related to authoritarian parenting $r = .085, p = 0.42$. This result suggests that mothers who have more children than the others are more likely to show authoritarian parenting. Moreover, the findings indicated that the education level of mothers was significantly and negatively associated with overprotective parenting $r = -.262, p = .000$. This finding implies that mothers who have a high-level education are less likely to show overprotective parenting. Also, the education level of the mothers was significantly and positively related with authoritarian parenting $r = .116, p = .009$. This finding suggests that mothers who have a high education level are more likely to show authoritarian parenting. Moreover, working status was significantly and positively related with overprotective parenting $r = .138, p = .005$. Besides these, there was a significant and negative correlation between monthly family income and overprotective parenting $r = -.215, p = .000$. This finding suggests that mothers whose families have high monthly income level are less likely to show overprotective parenting.

Apart from these, children's age $r = -.099, p = .045$ and duration of attending a preschool $r = -.196, p = .000$ were significantly and negatively related to overprotective parenting. These findings indicate that mothers whose children are older than others are less likely to show overprotective parenting. According to this finding, it appears that mothers whose children have spent more time in preschool education are less likely to show overprotective parenting. Duration of attending a preschool was also significantly and positively correlated with authoritarian parenting $r = .110, p = .013$.

In other words, mothers whose children have more preschool education experience are more likely to show authoritarian parenting. Bivariate correlations findings between parenting styles and mother- child variables are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Bivariate Correlations among Parenting Styles and Mother-Child Variables

Variables	Democratic Parenting	Authoritarian Parenting	Overprotective Parenting	Permissive Parenting
Mothers' age	-.038	-.040	-.138**	-.027
Number of children	-.101*	.085*	.020	-.114*
Education level	-.068	.116*	-.262**	.047
Working status	-.043	-.087	.138**	-.084
Monthly family income	-.014	-.006	-.215**	.000
Children's age	.010	.034	-.099*	-.080
Gender	.018	.008	.034	.000
Duration of attending preschool	.028	.110*	-.196**	-.049

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Regarding the research question, associations among emotion regulation skills and mother- child demographics was investigated. Bivariate correlations among the emotion regulation and mother-child variables were conducted by Pearson Product Moment Correlation as they were seen in Table 10. The results showed that mothers' age was significantly and positively correlated with emotion regulation of

children $r = .095, p = .028$. Also, it was significantly and negatively related to lability/negativity $r = .093, p = .031$. These findings suggest that mothers who are older than the others are more likely to have children who show emotion regulation and less likely to have children who show lability/negativity. On the other hand, the number of children they had was not significantly related with emotion regulation $r = -.033, p = .252$ and lability/negativity $r = .023, p = .322$. Moreover, education level was significantly related with emotion regulation of children $r = .150, p = .001$ but it was not significantly associated with lability negativity $r = .088, p = .077$. This result indicates that high level educated mothers are more likely to have children who show emotion regulation.

Apart from these, monthly income level was found significantly and positively related with emotion regulation $r = .088, p = .038$ and it was significantly and negatively correlated with lability/negativity $r = -.114, p = .011$. These findings indicate that children whose families have high income levels are more likely to show emotion regulation and less likely to show lability/negativity. In addition to these, the duration of attending a preschool was significantly related with emotion regulation $r = .095, p = .028$ but it was not significantly correlated with lability/negativity $r = -.030, p = .540$. This finding suggests that children who have more experiences in a preschool are more likely to exhibit emotion regulation. Bivariate correlations findings between emotion regulation and mother-child variables are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Bivariate Correlations among Emotion Regulation and Mother-Child Variables

	Emotion Regulation	Lability/Negativity
Mothers' Age	.095*	-.093*
Number of children	-.033	.023
Education Level	.150**	-.088
Working Status	-.071	.043
Monthly Income Level	.088*	-.114*
Children's Age	.050	-.081
Gender	.009	-.074
Duration of Attending a Preschool	.095*	-.030

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Regarding the research question, associations between emotion regulation skills of children and parenting styles of mothers were assessed. As indicated in the following table (Table 11), democratic subscale was significantly related to emotion regulation subscale $r = .279, p = .000$. However, there was a significant negative association between democratic parenting style and lability/negativity $r = -.295, p = .000$. In addition to these, there was a significant negative relationship between authoritarian parenting and emotion regulation $r = -.174, p = .000$ as well as a significant and positive association between authoritarian parenting and lability/negativity $r = .383, p = .000$. Furthermore, overprotective parenting style was significantly related to lability/negativity $r = .097, p = .026$ but it was not significantly correlated with emotion regulation $r = -.067, p = .088$. Besides these, it was found that permissive parenting style was significantly correlated with lability/negativity $r = .151, p = .001$ but it was not significantly related with emotion regulation $r = -.074, p = .069$. The findings suggests that children whose mothers show democratic parenting styles are more likely to have emotion regulation skills.

Moreover, children of the democratic mothers are less likely to show lability/negativity. Also, the results showed that children whose mothers have authoritarian, overprotective and permissive parenting styles are more likely to show lability/negativity. In other words, children whose mothers have authoritarian parenting are less likely to show emotion regulation. Bivariate correlations findings between emotion regulation and parenting styles are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Bivariate Correlations Among Emotion Regulation and Parenting Styles

	Emotion Regulation	Lability/Negativity
Democratic Parenting	.279**	-.295**
Authoritarian Parenting	-.174**	.383**
Overprotective Parenting	-.067	.097*
Permissive Parenting	-.074	.151**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

4.9 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis for variables predicting emotion regulation

Children's emotion regulation and lability/negativity were significantly correlated with mothers' demographics except working status and number of children (see Table 10), whereas only duration of attending a preschool from children's demographics was significant with emotion regulation. It indicates that mothers' demographics are potential confounds when predicting children's emotion regulation and lability/negativity. Thus, mothers' demographics were included as control variables in hierarchical regression analysis for predicting both emotion regulation and lability/negativity.

Regarding the research question, it is analyzed that whether parenting styles predict emotion regulation of children or not when mothers' demographics were controlled. Thus, firstly hierarchical multiple regression analyses were carried out to examine the possible associations between parenting styles of mothers and emotion

regulation of children which is one of the subscales of emotion regulation checklist after controlling for demographics of mothers. A three-stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with emotion regulation as the dependent variable. Mothers' demographics (e.g., age, working status, education level, income level, number of children), were entered at step one as control variables. After controlling for the demographic variables of mothers, variables related to children's demographic information (age, gender and attending a preschool) were entered at step two and parenting styles of mothers at step three. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis findings for variables predicting emotion regulation are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Emotion Regulation

Variables		ΔR^2	F	β	p
Step 1: Control Variables	.021	.021	1.69		.13
Age of mother				.04	.40
Working status				-.02	.65
Education				.12*	.03
Income				-.01	.78
Number of children				-.02	.61
Step 2	.026	.005	1.33		.22
Age of mother				.04	.43
Working Status				-.01	.84
Education				.12	.04
Income				-.01	.78
Number of children				-.02	.61
Gender				.009	.86
Age of child				-.03	.51
Attending a Preschool				.08	.14
Step 3	.117	.090	4.36**		.000
Age of mother				.035	.46
Working Status				.002	.96
Education				.15*	.007
Income				-.016	.78
Number of children				.004	.92
Gender				.008	.86
Age of child				-.047	.38
Attending a Preschool				.075	.17
Democratic				.26**	.000
Authoritarian				-.071	.19
Overprotective				-.018	.73
Permissive				-.042	.41

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Dependent variable: Emotion Regulation

In the first step, demographics of mothers were entered into hierarchical multiple regression analysis to control these variables and to evaluate how much variability there was in the outcome by these variables. The control variables predicted approximately % 2 of variance in emotion regulation and the first model was not significant ($R^2 = .02$, $F(5, 402) = .13$, $p > .001$). Among the control variables, age, working status, income and number of children were not significant in the first step whereas education of mothers ($\beta = .12$, $p < .05$) was a significant predictor with higher emotion regulation. That is, mothers who have higher level of education were more likely to have children who were better able to regulate their emotions than children whose mothers with lower-level education.

After controlling for demographics of mothers, in second step (demographics of children) increased explained variance to % 2.6 for emotion regulation but the second model was not significantly predict dependent variable ($R^2 = .026$, $F(8, 399) = 1.33$, $p > .001$). After controlling mothers' demographics, none of the controlled variables and demographics of children were significant in second step of regression. It indicates that, after controlling mothers' demographics, none of the variables from second step strongly predict emotion regulation of children.

Following that, the third step showed that, model three (parenting styles) increased explained variance to % 11,7 for emotion regulation and the model was significant ($R^2 = .117$, $F(12, 395) = 4.36^{**}$, $p < .001$). In model three, among the first model variables, education of mothers again found significant predictor for emotion regulation ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$). It indicates that, after controlling mothers' demographics, associations still existing between education of mothers and emotion regulation of children. Also, it explains that mothers with higher level of education are more likely to have children with greater emotion regulation. Moreover, among

parenting styles only democratic parenting style significantly predicted emotion regulation and higher democratic parenting styles being associated with greater emotion regulation ($\beta = .26, p < .001$). The significant contribution of democratic parenting style indicates that the addition of this predictor variable now has a statistically significant contribution to predicting the dependent variable. That is, Turkish mothers who have democratic parenting style more tend to have children with greater level of emotion regulation. Lastly, according to hierarchical multiple regression analysis, democratic parenting style was the strongest predictor of emotion regulation ($\beta = .26$), followed by the education level of the mothers ($\beta = .15$) and attending a preschool ($\beta = .07$).

4.10 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis for Variables predicting emotion Lability/Negativity

Regarding the research question, it is examined that whether parenting styles predict lability/negativity of children or not when mothers' demographics were controlled. Therefore, secondly, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were carried out to examine the possible associations between parenting styles of mothers and emotion lability/negativity of children which is the other subscale of emotion regulation checklist with demographics of mothers as control variables. A three-stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with emotion lability/negativity as the dependent variable. Mothers' demographics (age, working status, education, income, number of children), were entered at step one as control variables. After controlling for the demographic variables of mothers, variables related to children's demographic information (age, gender and attending a preschool) were entered at step two and parenting styles of mothers at step three. Hierarchical multiple

regression analysis findings for variables predicting lability/negativity are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Emotion Lability/Negativity

Variables	R ²	Δ R ²	F	β	p
Step 1: Control Variables	.012	.012	.972		.43
Age of mother				-.06	.22
Working status				.005	.93
Education				-.071	.22
Income				-.014	.82
Number of children				.017	.72
Step 2	.027	.015	1.40		.19
Age of mother				-.06	.23
Working Status				.004	.94
Education				-.06	.26
Income				-.01	.77
Number of children				.025	.61
Gender				-.08	.09
Age of child				-.01	.06
Attending a Preschool				.05	.36
Step 3	.208	.184	8.64**		.000
Age of mother				-.03	.44
Working Status				.01	.77
Education				-.10*	.05
Income				-.009	.87
Number of children				-.012	.78
Gender				-.08	.06
Age of child				-.09	.07
Attending a preschool				.03	.45
Democratic				-.17*	.001
Authoritarian				.30**	.000
Overprotective				.03	.49
Permissive				.07	.12

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Dependent variable: Lability/Negativity

In the first step, demographics of mothers were entered into hierarchical multiple regression analysis to control these variables and to evaluate how much variability there is in the outcome by these variables. The control variables predicted approximately % 1,6 of variance in emotion lability/negativity and the first model

was not significant ($R^2 = .016$, $F(5, 402) = .97$, $p > .05$). Among the control variables, none of the mothers' demographics were found significant.

After controlling for demographics of mothers, in second step (demographics of children) increased explained variance to % 2.7 for emotion lability/negativity but the second model was not significantly predict dependent variable ($R^2 = .027$, $F(8, 399) = .19$, $p > .001$). After controlling mothers' demographics, none of the variables related to children's demographics contributed significantly to the regression model. In addition to this, none of the controlled variables found significant in second step of regression. It indicates that, after controlling mothers' demographics, children's demographics doesn't predict emotion lability/negativity and they don't have significant contribution to the model.

Following that, the third step showed that, model three (parenting styles) increased explained variance to % 20.8 for emotion regulation and the model was significant ($R^2 = .208$, $F(12, 395) = 8.64^{**}$, $p < .001$). In model three, among the first model variables, education of mothers again proved to be significant predictor for emotion lability/negativity ($\beta = -.10$, $p < .05$). It indicates that, after controlling mothers' demographics, associations still existing between education of mothers and emotion lability/negativity of children. Since there were a negative and significant associations between education level and the dependent variable, it explains that mothers with higher level of education are less likely to have children with emotion lability/negativity. Also, among parenting styles democratic parenting style was found significantly and negatively associated to the dependent variable ($\beta = -.17$, $p < .05$) whereas higher authoritarian parenting style being associated with higher level of emotion lability/negativity ($\beta = .30$, $p < .001$). In sum, the significant and negatively associations of democratic parenting style indicates that as democratic

parenting increases emotion lability/negativity decreases. In addition to this, authoritarian parenting style predict emotion lability/negativity more than other parenting styles. That is, children with mothers who havedemocratic parenting style less likely to show emotion lability/negativity whereas children with mothers who haveauthoritarian parenting style are more likely to show emotion lability/negativity. Lastly, the hierarchical multiple regression analysis demonstrated, authoritarian parenting style was the strongest predictor of emotion lability/negativity ($\beta = .30$), followed by democratic parenting style ($\beta = -.17$) and education level of mothers ($\beta = -.10$).

4.11 Multicollinearity statistics

Analysis of collinearity statistics conducted among the variables to see whether predictor variables are highly correlated with one another in predicting emotion regulation and lability/negativity. It was found that the data met the assumptions of collinearity in predicting emotion regulation and lability/negativity. According to results, in predicting emotion regulationand lability/negativity variance inflation factors (VIF) ranged from 1.022 to 1.507 and tolerance values ranged from .664 to .978. The results showed that there was no multicollinearity concernamong the variables in the chosen models as VIF scores were well below 10, and tolerance scores above 0.2. Findings for multicollinearity statistics are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Multicollinearity Statistics for Emotion Regulation

Collinearity Statistics	<i>Tolerance</i>	VIF
Age of mother	.939	1.065
Working Status	.741	1.349
Education	.666	1.502
Income	.664	1.507
Number of children	.957	1.045
Gender	.978	1.022
Age of children	.786	1.273
Attending a preschool	.734	1.363
Democratic Parenting	.779	1.283
Authoritarian Parenting	.754	1.326
Overprotective Parenting	.833	1.201
Permissive Parenting	.861	1.161

Note. Dependent Variable: Emotion Regulation/LabilityNegativity

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In the current study, the main aim was to investigate the relationship between Turkish mothers' parenting styles (i.e., democratic, authoritarian, overprotective, and permissive) and emotional regulation skills of preschool children (i.e., emotion regulation and lability/negativity). In order to achieve this goal, first, the findings regarding the relationship between demographics and children's emotion regulation and mothers' parenting styles were elaborated. Lastly, prediction of emotion regulation and lability/negativity were specified by controlling mothers' demographics. Overall, in this chapter, the findings of the current study, which emerged from the results of the analyses, will be discussed in the light of the current literature.

5.1 The comparison of demographics, children's emotion regulation and mother's parenting Styles

The present study demonstrated that there are significant differences and associations between overprotective parenting and demographics. For example, overprotective parenting style scores were significantly different between mothers who had a high school education versus those with university degree and above. These results could be explained by cultural differences as stated in previous studies that in Turkish culture, overprotective parenting is one of the prevalent styles among the parents (Cevher-Kalburan & Ivrendi, 2016). Overprotective parenting is the most powerful parenting styles that is associated with many demographics. It is a well-known fact that one of the main ideas of overprotective parenting style is restriction of the

children's independence to protect them.

In contrast to mothers who are with lower-level education and from rural areas of Turkey, some mothers who are with high level of education and from urban areas may give more importance to supporting autonomy of their kids. Accordingly, in the current study's findings, while mothers with low education and income level more tend to be overprotective parent, while those are more educated and earn higher income are less likely to show overprotective parenting styles. In this sense, one of the explanations of these results could be increasing numbers of well-educated mothers in Turkey. The more educated mothers are, the more they contribute to the family income. In return, they are to be and feel independent. That's why, even being overprotective is a common parenting style, since the participant of this study comprises of mothers who are with high education level and mainly from urban part of Turkey, the results related to overprotective parenting style came out parallel with this characteristic of the sample.

Furthermore, consistent with the findings of the current study, previous research indicated that mothers who have a low degree of education have more overprotective parenting styles than mothers who have a higher education level. It is indicated that higher levels of parental education are related to warmer parent-child relationships (Klebanov, Brooks-Gunn, & Duncan, 1994). Also, according to Coolahan, McWayne, Fantuzzo, and Grim (2002), parents with a low level of education, participated in much more restrictive parenting techniques. Mothers with a low level of education may expect their children to act in accordance with authority and are more likely to punish them. On that note, it could be possible to conclude that mothers who have high level of education are more likely to support children's independency as well as they more tend to create warm relations with their children.

On the other hand, in terms of employment status of mothers and overprotective parenting style it was found two different results; based on differences, it was found that mothers who are working are less likely to show overprotective parenting style, however, based on the associations between working status and overprotective parenting, it was found that working mothers more tend to show overprotective parenting style. The reason of these two inconsistent results could be caused by diverse factors among mothers. The perspective of mothers with regard to overprotective parenting may change between two categories. While some of the mothers could see themselves warm and overprotective, some of them might be evaluated themselves overprotective and cold (Çalışkan, 2015). This variation between overprotective mothers could lead the inconsistent findings. On the other hand, it was claimed that there could be other causes underlying these differences as well namely working hours higher or lower status of occupation, flexibility of working schedule (Augustine, 2014). Furthermore, even though there was not a conclusive conclusion drawn from the previous studies' findings, some research show that working mothers increase their children's independence (Bronfenbrenner & Crouter, 1982).

To conclude, when these two different results are evaluated, both of them could be possible and reasonable. Working mothers may more overprotective if they think they do not spare sufficient time together with their children, thereby evoking them to display more affection to their children. This affection could be turn evolve into overprotective parenting (Cevher-Kalburan & Ivrendi, 2016). On the other hand, working mothers may be less overprotective since they feel more independent by earning money and they may want to encourage their children's independence as well.

Additionally, the results showed significant results related to mothers age and overprotective parenting style. It was found that younger mothers are more likely to show overprotective parenting. It could be explained by having less experience than older mothers. The findings of Lewin and colleagues (2013) showed that younger mothers engaged in more negative parenting behaviors. Moreover, older mothers' age is positively related with warmth and sensitivity for their children, regardless of their socioeconomic characteristics (Bornstein & Cheah, 2006). It is possible that older mothers may also be less protective and have more positive parenting attitudes than younger mothers since they have more experience than younger mothers. Likewise, younger mothers are more likely to have their first children, they may inclined to control their children's behavior more and they may likely to lay less responsibility on their first born child.

Apart from these, it was not found any statistically significant difference and relation between mothers' parenting styles and children's gender. According to the literature, authoritative parenting style is used by mothers with their daughters more than sons (Conrade & Ho, 2001). This suggests that as compared to sons, mothers were more loving, caring, and reasonable with their daughters. Besides these, it is discovered that the authoritarian style was more prevalent with boys (Jabeen et al., 2013). However, the results of the present study about the comparison and relation between parenting styles of mothers and gender of children do not line up with previous studies. One of the reasons of that might be education and income level of mothers. Sunar (2002) suggested that families with higher SES have more equal attributes to their children regarding to gender. The participants of the current study illustrated the similar traits. Since, the participants of the study were mainly from high education and income level, gender may have not showed significant

differences and associations with parenting style of mothers. The other assumption related to inconsistent findings about gender and emotion regulation could be temperamental factors which are unique to every child. Chaplin and colleagues (2005) identified that as gender is a feature which has various outcomes related to each individual's biological features and living context, thus it could be better investigated by observation. That's why, one of the reasons behind this finding could be due to the data gathering method. As the scales were used instead of observation, the differences which may associated with the temperamental factors; thus, gender could not be revealed.

5.2 The relationship between the demographics, children's emotion regulation and mothers' parenting styles

The literature addresses the relationship between children's age and emotion regulation. Given that, it was expected that the data would show a consistent trend; however contrary to expectations, the findings revealed neither differences nor relations between the age and emotion regulation of Turkish children. This finding was unexpected because previous research showed that the emotion regulation skills and strategies of children increase with age (Zimmer-Gembeck & Skinner, 2011). These inconsistent findings may arise from the wide range and ordinal data which was provided from children who were 36 to 72 months old.

The relatively large age range may also cause not being able to recognize the differences and relation between gender and emotion regulation as well. Contradict to previous research, it was not found any relation and differences with regard to emotion regulation between gender. Even though in the previous research it was found that girls are more likely to regulate their feelings than boys, children may

have different repertoire at different ages in terms of emotion regulation. Hence, a wide age range in data may lead to insignificant results of gender, contrary to the previous findings.

The other reason for surprising findings about gender could be the developing liberal perspectives on gender roles in Turkey, particularly with young and educated women (Boratav, 2009). In developing nations with a collectivist cultural background, sociodemographic improvements are frequently followed by alterations that affect the routines of high educated families who live at urban areas differently from less educated families who lives at rural areas (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). Intracultural differences in children's developmental outcomes might be causing this inconsistency. For example, in the current study the majority of mothers had university degrees. This result suggests that because most of the Turkish mothers' education level is high in collected data, their views and reactions may similar or equal to both their sons and daughters for emotion regulation related circumstances. Accordingly, children whose mothers have high level of education tend to have better emotion regulation skills regardless of gender.

Furthermore, in this study, it was revealed that children whose mothers have high education level tend to show more emotion regulation. Accordingly, when the related literature was reviewed, similar results were reported. For instance, according to Arı and Yaban (2016), the education level of mothers and emotion regulation of children are significantly and positively related. Also, Dereli (2016) found that mothers who have a high level of education exhibit more moderate and warm behaviors to their children, and moreover that those attitudes contribute to the emotion regulation and reduce lability /negativity of their children. Additionally, it was identified that education level of mothers is the characteristic that better

represents mothers' attitudes to their children (Bornstein, Hahn, Suwalsky, & Haynes, 2003). One of the possibilities between the relation between education level of mothers and emotion regulation of children might be that well educated Turkish mothers are generally much more open to various emotions (Corapcı et al., 2012). Also, according to Altan-Aytun and colleagues (2013), mothers who have a higher level of education tend to focus on constructive problem-solving ideas and are less likely to show punitive responses.

Similarly, it has been stated that Turkish mothers with high level of education are more focused on to support autonomy while mothers with low education level are more likely to focus on relatedness, obedience and restrictive parenting (Yağmurlu, Çitlak, Dost, & Leyendecker, 2009). Within the previous findings it is obvious that mothers who have low education level more tend to react in punitive ways and their children are more likely to act based on authority rules. These differences might be due to the various repertoire and different kinds of view they have in parallel with their education level. The higher education level may contribute to the emotion regulation of children via greater sense of tolerance and support that mother offer to their children's feelings in different circumstances. In this sense, it is not wrong to state that mothers' low education level is related to low level of emotion regulation, while mothers' high education level is related with high level of emotion regulation in line with the findings of current study and the given literature.

Beyond the education of mothers, age and gender, preschool education also found related to emotion regulation of children. Children who have more experiences in preschool education tend to show more emotion regulation. Previous research stated that student involvement with learning activities in a classroom environment with the teachers and peers significantly related to emotion regulation of children

(Williford, Vick-Whittaker, Vitiello & Downer, 2013). This statement supports the findings of the current study. It might be a reciprocal relation between having emotion regulation skills and preschool education as allowing an environment for children to get the experience of promoting their emotion regulation skills in a non-parental setting. Regarding development of emotion regulation in preschool education, teachers also play a critical role in this because opportunities and learning environment that they create regarding to regulate emotions is highly important. Additionally, since teachers serve as a role-model for children to learn abilities to regulate their feelings and children could benefit from the actions that teachers take. Likewise, in a preschool environment teachers may offer professional guidance to children by assisting them to recognize their feelings and the meanings behind them. Additionally, children get the opportunity to experience a variety of circumstances where they would need regulate their emotions in a preschool setting with their peers. They may learn recognize their peers' feelings or needs and react accordingly. These experiences may contribute to their emotion regulation repertoire.

In addition to these, in the current study, a significant and negative association was found between income level and overprotective parenting style. The findings from the present study indicated that the mothers who have a low range of family income are more overprotective than the mothers who have a higher range of family income. Accordingly, previous studies stated that parenting in low-income families tends to be more punitive (Hoffman, 2003) and to have greater unpredictability in family routines than in higher-income families (Evans, 2004; Fiese, Rhodes, & Beardslee, 2013). Also, it is indicated that children whose family has higher-income had better behavioral, emotional, and cognitive results than children from lower-income families (Phipps, 1999). Likewise, mothers who have

higher income level may be more likely to encourage independence in their children, whereas mothers who have lower income may be not likely to support authority of their children. In the light of some of these findings, the results from the current study which revealed information about the relationship between overprotective parenting and income level of families seem to align well with the past research. It could be possible that since lower socioeconomic level families are under greater pressures and generally have negative life experiences, thereby causing them to restrict their children's independence and hindering development of their emotion regulation abilities.

5.3 The relationship between parenting styles and emotion regulation

This study revealed that emotion regulation skills of children was significantly related with parenting styles of mothers. The bivariate correlation analyses showed that democratic parenting style was positively associated with children's emotion regulation and negatively related with lability/negativity. Additionally, it was found that while democratic parenting style of mothers is indicative of emotion regulation of children, authoritarian parenting style of mothers predictive of lability/negativity of children. This indicates that children whose mothers had democratic parenting styles had better emotion regulation skills and children with authoritarian mothers were more likely to show lability/negativity.

This is consistent with a previous study that found that mother's democratic parenting style predicted a higher level of emotion regulation (Eisenberg et al., 2001). According to the number of studies, positive parenting methods have been related to higher emotion management abilities in children (Morris, Criss, Silk & Houltberg, 2017). These findings overlap with the research conducted by Eisenberg

and colleagues (2001) which shows that responsive attitude of mothers that is an aspect of authoritative or democratic parenting style is related with emotion regulation of children. Similarly, it was claimed that democratic parenting is characterized by warmth and responsiveness, and therefore it provides a sense of security to children and makes negative experiences less scary for them, which in turn contributing to the stronger emotion regulation in children (Davies & Cummings, 1994).

Moreover, findings from Western and Eastern cultures all state that democratic parenting styles shows responsiveness as well as autonomy and reasoning, and therefore predicts higher emotion regulation level in children (Tu & Chou, 2013), while authoritarian parenting predicts lower level of emotion regulation (Chang, Schwartz, Dodge & Mcbridge, 2003). Accordingly, while democratic parenting practices could help to development of emotion regulation, an authoritarian parenting style could predict poor emotional behaviors. In line with the current research findings, it could be possible that the different practices of parents may lead to the different developmental outcomes of children about regulation of their emotions.

Apart from these findings, according to results of the current study, permissive parenting style of mothers was significantly related with lability/negativity of children. The finding shows that the permissive parenting style of mothers may lead to negative outcomes regarding emotion regulation of children. The findings which are identified by Baumrind are parallel with the findings of the current study in relation to the association between parents permissive parenting styles and lability/negativity of children. According to Baumrind (1967), permissive parenting style has been related to children who are dependent and impulsive, as well as poor levels of self-control; these children have difficulties to develop emotional control.

Similarly, Kotaman (2016) stated that permissive parents generally do not impose rules and expectation on their children and they do not control their behaviors either. In another research, permissive parents were found to have few demands and control on their children, but they are also responsive (Walker, 2008). Similarly, Baumrind (1968) claimed that children who have permissive parents are frequently encouraged to govern their own attitudes and emotions from an early age. Consequently, even permissive parents support independency in their children behaviors while being responsive, affectionate, and supportive; they may not guide their children due to their lack of interest with their children. This in turn causes having trouble with controlling emotions for children because they need encouragement and guidance from their parents as well as they need support in order to develop their independence. From the above notes, parents who do successfully manage the balance between meeting their children's needs and leading their children's behavior in supportive way provide children to more tend to demonstrate emotion regulation abilities.

Children's lability/negativity was not only correlated with permissive parenting styles of mothers, but it was also significantly related with overprotective parenting style of mothers. This finding is not surprising because as Rubin, Cheah, and Fox (2001) claimed that overprotective parents take control of the situation and place restrictions on their children's behaviors sometimes in pleasant but entirely forceful manner. As a result of this parenting style, children may be unable to engage in self-initiated coping mechanisms and autonomous activities. For instance, maternal overprotective parenting during play time was significantly and positively predictive of children to feel anxiety as well as having difficulties in problem-solving and create peer relationships (Rubin & Stewart, 1996). Moreover, in line with

previous findings, the children with overprotective mothers exhibited low tolerance for eliciting negative affect of frustrating feelings and a difficult time to be relaxed when they feel emotionally sad (Rubin, Cheah, & Fox, 2001). Similarly, and in line with previous findings, the current study found that overprotective parenting style of mothers is associated with lability/negativity of children, in so far that they struggle responding to emotion eliciting stimuli as well as having trouble recovering from negative emotion responses and behaviors.

5.4 Conclusion

The purpose of the current study was to investigate the relationship between parenting styles of mothers and emotion regulation skills of children. The current study elaborated findings to understand the relationship between parenting styles of mothers, emotion regulation of children, and demographics of both mothers and children through the lens of Turkish culture. Results revealed that there is a significant relationship between demographics, parenting styles of mothers and emotion regulation of children.

The main findings of the study could be summarized as follows, first; although the correlations were low, statistically meaningful relationships could be drawn between demographics, parenting styles, and emotion regulation of children. Secondly, the most remarkable finding was the associations between education of mothers, parenting styles and emotion regulation skills of children. Results indicated that mothers who have higher level education were less likely to show overprotective parenting style and their children tended to show more emotion regulation abilities. The increasing of attention to education of women may underlie these findings. It is a well-known fact that there is a heterogonous social structure in Turkish culture and

education dictates the differences between urban and rural areas. The well-educated mothers may place more importance to independency and encouragement of autonomy, and this provides children to experience regulating their own feelings and behavior by the guidance of their mothers. Also, mothers with high education may have more space to discover and access to the resources that support their children's emotion regulation skills. Related to that, the third and notable finding was significant result in terms of duration of attending a preschool and emotion regulation of children. Children who have more experiences in preschool are more likely to have emotion regulation skills. It is not surprising because as the time children have in an enriched preschool setting with professionals and teachers increases, they have more opportunities to develop their abilities for regulating their feelings with their peers.

The fourth one was that overprotective parenting style seemed to be related with most of the demographics and children's emotion regulation. Since it is one of the common parenting practices in Turkish culture, overprotective parenting revealed consistent results with the education level of mothers. Even though it is a common parenting style, as the sample characteristic mostly comprised of the mothers with high education level, the results came out consistent with this characteristic and created evidence for significance of mothers' education level one more time. The fifth and surprising one was the findings based on the age and emotion regulation of children. Inconsistent with previous findings there was not found any relation between age and emotion regulation of children. The wide data range which includes children who were 36 to 72 months old might be mainly cause these inconsistent findings. The last and the other surprising finding was about the lack of association between gender and emotion regulation of children. In contrast to earlier findings, in

the current study, it was not found any relation between gender and emotion regulation of children. It could be also explained by the education level of mothers. As mothers' education level increase, their perspective about the value of the children become more equal for both genders. Thus, by the transformation of the social circumstances in Turkish culture, the view of parents has changed and the values they place for girls and boys bring more equal treatment and more autonomy for the children in the family context.

In sum, the present study serves to reveal findings related to emotion regulation of children, parenting styles of mothers and demographics which have significant role on these two patterns in Turkish culture. The most remarkable finding was parenting is more important than structural and non-changeable characteristics such as age, working status, income, children's age and gender. Thus, it has a key role on children's emotion regulation skills. The other significant finding was education level of mothers. Results suggested that higher education level of mothers have an important role on both parenting styles of mothers and emotion regulation of children. Also, findings showed that children's year of experience in a preschool education is more important than attending a preschool education. and children. Even having one year in a preschool is highly important for children's development of emotion regulation skills. In brief, it is highly important to investigate emotion regulation of preschool children and parenting styles of mothers for comprehending the elements that related and contribute the emotion regulation abilities of children and parenting practices of mothers. This study may lead a hope to learn more factors and create interventions to support the developing idea about significance of the parenting, education of mothers and duration of attending a preschool for children as well as how to decrease the gap between the rural and

urban part of the Turkey in terms of development of parenting practice and education of both mothers and children.

5.5 Limitations

The sample of the study (N = 408) was large enough to conduct statistical analysis and show the sample's characteristics. However, there still remain a few limitations that future research needs to address and interpret in light of the current studies' findings. First of all, only the mothers were participated as the informant of children's emotion regulation skills. Therefore, findings do not represent the views of fathers. Future research can be conducted to find out thoughts of both fathers and mothers together and separately so as to investigate different and common thoughts of them related to emotion regulation skills of children in the context of Turkish culture.

Additionally, only mothers' parenting styles and demographics were used to assess the emotion regulation skills of children. Fathers' parenting styles, demographics, and its relation to emotion regulation skills of children were not evaluated in the current study. Future studies can be planned to investigate fathers' parenting styles and demographics with mothers' parenting styles and demographics to explore contributions of them to emotion regulation skills of children. Also, studies can be planned to assess various parameters with regard to both mothers' and fathers' parenting styles and demographic variables for understanding the common and different parenting features of Turkish society. Furthermore, the present study used online forms sent to participants electronically, to be completed at home. Future studies can also consider different types of measures such as observations and interviews. It would be easy to control response accuracy and participant bias with such measures in place, since parents' assessment about themselves and their

children may be affected in positive or negative ways. In addition to this, previous old theoretical frameworks must have been elaborated throughout the study since both of the scales which were structured based on these invaluable but somehow outdated frameworks. Because of the fact that there are few contemporary scales in Turkish, only valid and reliable scales had to be used for the studies.

Apart from these, mothers were informed about some of the items in Parenting Attitude Scale referencing child abuse. It was stated in the consent form that any item affirming child abuse will be reported to Provincial Directorates of the Ministry of Family and Social Policies (ASPİM). Therefore, even though it is not a limitation, the statement might have prevented the mothers to show total honesty. Moreover, another limitation is that random sampling could not be used for this research. Convenient sampling was used to access readily available participants so the majority of samples were from families who have high socioeconomic and education levels which could restrict the generalizability of the findings to the whole Turkish community.

Researchers could focus on families who are from various socioeconomic and education levels in the future by conducting longitudinal studies. Besides all of these, results of the current study showed that there was not any statistically significant difference between girls and boys regarding emotion regulation and lability/negativity. Also, a statistically significant difference was not found between girls and boys regarding parenting styles. Therefore, more detailed research containing more participants who are from different backgrounds and using a variety of data collection techniques are suggested.

Although it is not considered as a limitation, one caution has to be made related to the correlations presented in this study. The correlational analysis of this study indicated low correlations with significant levels. A high correlation is defined as one that is greater than 0.8, while a weak correlation is defined as one that is less than 0.5 (Goodwin & Leche, 2006). These numbers may differ depending on the kind of data being analyzed (Goodwin & Leche, 2006). A research based on strict scientific data may necessitate a greater and stronger correlation than one based on social sciences' data. For instance, some studies have found that a correlation coefficient less than .30 is a common value in psychological research (Spencer, 1995). Additionally, if the sample size is large enough, a weak connection might be statistically significant (Samuel & Okey, 2015). Research shows that low correlation with significance depends on the type of data and sample size. For this reason, a low correlation with significance could be possible in the current research since it represents an example of social science data and it has large sample size.

Lastly, this research focused on emotion regulation skills of children, future studies could investigate both emotion regulation and social skills of children including attachment types and parenting styles by focusing on both mothers and fathers. Moreover, researchers also could examine children's emotion regulation and social skills from the view of teachers in the future studies.

5.6 Suggestions

The aim of the current study was to identify, explore and better understand the associations between the parenting styles and children's emotion regulation skills in the light of demographic information on both mothers and children in Turkish cultural context. The revealed findings from the current study suggested empirical

support to clarify the relationship between mothers' parenting styles and emotion regulation skills of preschool children.

According to the findings of the present study, duration of attending a preschool was significantly related with the emotion regulation skills of children. In the light of the current findings and previous studies, policy makers should support and inform families through educational campaigns and programs with the collaboration of local administrations to increase the rate of the children attending to qualified preschool education. In the light of this result, teachers' focusing on the support of emotional understanding in their curriculum and classroom is also suggested. Identifying and accepting emotions are effective to develop emotion regulation skills, social relationships, and socioemotional development for children.

The findings suggested that children whose mothers show democratic parenting styles are more likely to have emotion regulation skills. On the other hand, children of the democratic mothers are less likely to show lability/negativity. Moreover, the findings of the current study revealed that democratic parenting style of mothers is indicative of emotion regulation of children. Family involvement activities and school-based intervention programs should be provided by collaboration of school partners to foster democratic parenting style of mothers and also, fathers. Parents might be encouraged to learn and use more democratic parenting strategies that promote children's emotion regulation abilities through parent engagement activities and school-based intervention programs.

Moreover, the findings suggested that mothers' education level could identify the emotion regulation of children. Accordingly, the findings indicated that children whose mothers have higher education level are more likely to show emotion regulation. Considering these, providing support for women starting from very early

ages to access to education. Equal societies that bring quality services in health and education also guarantee families' and children's well-being. Accordingly, Dereli (2016) found that mothers who have high education level access technology and resources easier than mothers who have low education level. In addition, these mothers show more positive behaviors toward their children, also are more likely to demonstrate positive relationship with their children (Dereli, 2016). Taken these findings into consideration, both employed and unemployed mothers should be supported by arranging opportunities to develop themselves and their parenting skills.

According to previous findings, working hours of employed mothers have an effect on their parenting involvement, motivation, and tendency to participate in fundamental activities that improve children's development (Augustine, 2014). Thus, fair and equal working hours for parents might be suggested to decrease their burden and provide time more time to spend with children. Then, also both parents can contribute to the household equally and provide supportive parenting for their children. On the other hand, local government should work on opening more public preschools to support both unemployed mothers and their children. As number of provided qualified public preschools increase, both employed and unemployed mothers send their children to these schools.

In sum, the results basically revealed the importance of mothers' demographics especially education level and children's preschool education experience on mothers' parenting styles and children's emotion regulation. Based on these results, this study offers some suggestions. Firstly, policies should support children's attending to a qualified preschool education that engage families in good practices. Also, policies should provide opportunities for mothers to support them

improve their education level and participate working life. In respect to practices, comprehensive curriculum which enhance emotional understanding should be provided in schools. In addition to this, family involvement and intervention programs should be promoted to foster democratic parenting style. Regarding further research, more studies are needed to investigate influences of these findings on children social skills including not only mothers but also fathers and teachers as informants.

APPENDIX A

ETHICAL PERMISSION FORM

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 08.05.2021-14000

T.C.
BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER YÜKSEK LİSANS VE DOKTORA TEZLERİ ETİK İNCELEME
KOMİSYONU
TOPLANTI TUTANAĞI

Toplantı Sayısı : 16
Toplantı Tarihi : 06.05.2021
Toplantı Saati : 13:00
Toplantı Yeri : Zoom Sanal Toplantı
Bulunanlar : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin Sohtorik İlkmen, Prof. Dr. Ebru Kaya, Prof. Dr. Fatma Nevra Seggie
Bulunmayanlar :

Leman İşbitiren

Temel Eğitim

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Çocukların Duygu Düzenleme Becerileri ile Sosyal Becerileri Arasındaki İlişkide Annelerin Ebeveynlik Tutumlarının Rolü-The Role of Mothers' Parenting Styles on the Relationship Between Children's Emotional Regulation and Social Skills" başlıklı projeniz ile ilgili olarak yaptığımız SBB-EAK 2021/18 sayılı başvuru komisyonumuz tarafından 6 Mayıs 2021 tarihli toplantıda incelenmiş ve uygun bulunmuştur.

Bu karar tüm üyelerin toplantıya çevrimiçi olarak katılımı ve oybirliği ile alınmıştır. COVID-19 önlemleri kapsamında kurul üyelerinden ıslak imza alınmadığı için bu onam mektubu üye ve raportör olarak Ebru Kaya tarafından bütün üyeler adına e-imzalanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla, bilgilerinizi rica ederiz.

Prof. Dr. Ebru KAYA
ÜYE

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr.Ebru KAYA
Raportör

SOBETİK 16 06.05.2021

Bu belge 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununun 5. Maddesi gereğince güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR MOTHERS (TURKISH)

Katılımcı Anneler için Bilgi ve Onam Formu

Araştırmanın adı: Annelerin Ebeveynlik Tutumları ile Çocukların Duygu Düzenleme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişki-The Relationship Between Parenting Styles of Mothers and Emotional Regulation Skills of Children

Proje Yürütücüsü: Mine Göl-Güven

E-mail adresi:

Telefonu:

Araştırmacının adı: Leman İşbitiren

E-mail adresi:

Telefonu:

Onam Formu

(Çevrimiçi Anket Formunun öncesinde açıklama kısmında bulunur.)

Merhabalar,

Ben, Leman İşbitiren. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erken Çocukluk Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programında öğrenciyim. Sizleri, 3-6 yaş aralığında çocuğu olan annelerin ebeveynlik tutumları ile çocukların duygu düzenleme becerileri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi hedeflediğim yüksek lisans tez çalışmama katılmaya davet ediyorum.

Araştırmaya katılmak isterseniz, üç bölümden oluşan formda sizden öncelikle 1.

bölümde bulunan “Demografik Bilgiler” kısmını doldurmanız; ardından yönlendirileceğiniz 2. bölümde, Duygu Düzenleme Ölçeği sorularını, 3. bölümde ise Ebeveyn Tutum Ölçeği sorularını eksiksiz tamamlamanız beklenmektedir. 3. bölümde bulunan Ebeveyn Tutum Ölçeği sorularını dikkatlice okuyunuz, çocuk istismarı olumlayan bir bildirimde bulunduğunuz takdirde bu durumun Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı’nın İl Müdürlüklerine (ASPİM) bildirileceği bilgisini sizinle paylaşmak isteriz. Üç bölümden oluşan formu cevaplandırmak yaklaşık olarak 20 dakikanızı alacaktır. Formu, içtenlikle doldurmanız araştırma bulgularının güvenilirliği açısından oldukça önemlidir.

Cevaplarınız, araştırma dışında üçüncü kişi ya da kurumlarla kesinlikle paylaşılmayacaktır. Anketi doldurduktan sonra kaydederek çıkış yapabilirsiniz. Araştırmaya devam etmek istemediğiniz takdirde sayfadan çıkış yapabilirsiniz, formu tamamladığınız durumda cevaplarınız kaydedilmeyecektir. Araştırma süresince, paylaştığımız tüm bilgiler gizli tutulup şifreli bulut sisteminde saklanacaktır.

Süreç boyunca, sorularınız için araştırma yürütücüsü Doç. Dr. Mine Göl-Güven’e ve araştırmacı Leman İşbitiren’e ulaşabilirsiniz.

Araştırmanın yapılabilmesi için Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Yüksek Lisansve Doktora Tezleri Etik İnceleme Komisyonu'ndan (SOBETİK) SBB-EAK 2021/18 sayılı başvuru ile onay alınmıştır. Araştırmayla ilgili haklarınız ve olası şikayetleriniz konusunda SOBETİK'e (sbe-ethics@boun.edu.tr) danışabilirsiniz. Araştırmaya katılmanız ve çevrimiçi anket formuna ulaşabilmeniz için aşağıdaki onay kutucuğunu işaretlemeniz gerekmektedir. Katılarımız için teşekkürler.

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR MOTHERS (ENGLISH)

Research Subject: The Relationship Between Parenting Styles of Mothers and Emotion Regulation Skills of Children

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof Mine Göl-Güven

E-mail address:

Phone number:

Name of the researcher: Leman İşbitiren

E-mail address:

Phone number:

Consent form

(It is found in the explanation part before the online questionnaire form.)

Dear Parent,

My name is Leman İşbitiren. I am a student at Boğaziçi University, Institute of Social Science, Early Childhood master's program. I invite you to participate in my study that I aim to investigate the relationship between parenting styles of mothers and emotion regulation of children whose age are between 36 and 72 months old.

If you want to participate in the research, we first ask you to fill in the "Demographic Information Form." In the second part, you will be directed to "Emotion Regulation Checklist". Then, in the third and last part we ask from you to fill out "Parent Attitude Scale". Please read the items of "Parent Attitude Scale" carefully because it includes some items that is referencing child abuse. We would

like to inform you about if any item affirming child abuse will be reported to Provincial Directorates of the Ministry of Family and Social Policies (ASPİM). It will take you approximately 20 minutes to answer the three parts of forms. Please fill out the form sincerely because it is very important for the reliability of the research.

The data will be collected anonymously from the participants and the information will not be shared with anyone. After filling out the form, you can save and exit. Although you agree to participate in the study, you have the right to withdraw from the study at any stage of the study without giving any reason. If you don't complete the form, your answers will not be recorded. During the research, all the information you shared will be kept confidential and stored in an encrypted cloud system.

If you would like to ask additional information about the research project, please contact the researcher, you can contact the research director Assoc. Prof. Mine Göl-Güven and researcher Leman İşbitiren.

In order to carry out the research, approval was received from Boğaziçi University Social and Human Sciences Master's and Doctoral Thesis Ethics Review Committee (SOBETİK) with the application number SBB-/EAK 2021/18. You can consult SOBETİK (sbe-ethics@boun.edu.tr) about your rights and possible complaints regarding the research. In order to participate in the research and access the online questionnaire form, you must tick the checkbox below.

Thanks for your contribution.

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM FOR MOTHERS AND THEIR
CHILDREN (TURKISH)

1	Lütfen kaç çocuğunuz olduğunu belirtiniz.
2	Anketi dolduracağınız çocuğunuzun cinsiyeti nedir? <input type="checkbox"/> Kız <input type="checkbox"/> Oğlan
3	Çocuğunuz kaç yaşındadır? <input type="checkbox"/> 36-47 aylık <input type="checkbox"/> 48-60 aylık <input type="checkbox"/> 61-72 aylık
4	Çocuğunuzun okul/kuva/kreş deneyimi kaç yıldır? <input type="checkbox"/> 1 yıldan az <input type="checkbox"/> 1 yıl <input type="checkbox"/> 1 yıldan fazla
5	Yaşınızı belirtiniz.
6	Eğitim durumunuz nedir? <input type="checkbox"/> İlkokul <input type="checkbox"/> Ortaokul <input type="checkbox"/> Lise <input type="checkbox"/> Ön lisans <input type="checkbox"/> Yüksekokul <input type="checkbox"/> Lisans <input type="checkbox"/> Yüksek Lisans <input type="checkbox"/> Doktora
7	Çalışma durumunuz nedir? <input type="checkbox"/> Çalışıyor <input type="checkbox"/> Çalışmıyor
8	Ailenizin gelir durumu nedir? <input type="checkbox"/> 0 TL-2.500 TL <input type="checkbox"/> 2.501 TL-4.000 TL <input type="checkbox"/> 4.001 TL-6.000 TL <input type="checkbox"/> 6.001 TL-10.000 TL <input type="checkbox"/> 10.001 TL ve üzeri

APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM FOR MOTHERS AND THEIR
CHILDREN (ENGLISH)

1	How many children do you have?
2	What is the gender of your child? <input type="checkbox"/> Girl <input type="checkbox"/> Boy
3	How is your child's age? <input type="checkbox"/> 36-47 months old <input type="checkbox"/> 48-60 months old <input type="checkbox"/> 61-72 months old
4	How many years your children have been attending a preschool? <input type="checkbox"/> Less than one year <input type="checkbox"/> 1 year <input type="checkbox"/> More than one year
5	Please write down your age.
6	What is your education level? <input type="checkbox"/> Primary school <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> High school <input type="checkbox"/> Associate degree program <input type="checkbox"/> Academy program <input type="checkbox"/> University Education <input type="checkbox"/> Master's degree <input type="checkbox"/> PhD degree
7	What is your working status? <input type="checkbox"/> Employed <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed
8	What is your family income? <input type="checkbox"/> 0 TL-2.500 TL <input type="checkbox"/> 2.501 TL-4.000 TL <input type="checkbox"/> 4.001 TL-6.000 TL <input type="checkbox"/> 6.001 TL-10.000 TL <input type="checkbox"/> 10.001 TL ve üzeri

APPENDIX F

EMOTION REGULATION CHECKLIST (ERC) (TURKISH)

	Çocuğunuzda aşağıda belirtilen davranışları ne kadar sıklıkla gözlemlediğinizi belirtiniz.				
	Ölçekteki her madde için; 1: Hiçbir zaman 2: Bazen 3: Sık sık 4: Her zaman olmak üzere 4 seçenek mevcuttur.	HIÇBİR ZAMAN	BAZEN	SIK SIK	HER ZAMAN
	Çocuğunuz için en uygun olanı işaretlemeniz beklenmektedir.				
1	Neşeli bir çocuktur.	1	2	3	4
2	Duygu hali çok değişkendir (Çocuğun duygu durumunu tahmin etmek zordur çünkü neşeli ve mutluyken kolayca üzgünleşebilir).	1	2	3	4
3	Yetişkinlerin arkadaşça ya da sıradan (nötr) yaklaşımlarına olumlu karşılık verir	1	2	3	4
4	Bir faaliyetten diğerine kolayca geçer; kızıp sinirlenmez, endişelenmez (kaygılanmaz), sıkıntı duymaz veya aşırı derecede heyecanlanmaz	1	2	3	4
5	Üzüntüsünü veya sıkıntısını kolayca atlatabilir (örneğin, canını sıkan bir olay sonrasında uzun süre surat asmaz, endişeli veya üzgün durmaz).	1	2	3	4
6	Kolaylıkla hayal kırıklığına uğrayıp sinirlenir (huysuzlaşır, öfkelenir).	1	2	3	4
7	Yaşitlarının arkadaşça ya da sıradan (nötr) yaklaşımlarına olumlu karşılık verir.	1	2	3	4
8	Öfke patlamalarına, huysuzluk nöbetlerine eğilimlidir.	1	2	3	4
9	Hoşuna giden bir şeye ulaşmak için bekleyebilir. (örneğin, şeker almak için sırasını	1	2	3	4

	beklemesi gerektiğinde keyfi kaçmaz veya heyecanını kontrol edebilir).				
10	Başkalarının sıkıntı hissetmesinden keyif duyar (örneğin, biri incindiğinde veya ceza aldığında güler; başkalarıyla alay etmekten zevk alır).	1	2	3	4
11	Heyecanını kontrol edebilir (örneğin, çok hareketli oyunlarda kontrolünü kaybetmez veya uygun olmayan ortamlarda aşırı derecede heyecanlanmaz).	1	2	3	4
12	Mızımsızdır ve yetişkinlerin eteğinin dibinden ayrılmaz.	1	2	3	4
13	Ortalığı karıştırarak çevresine zarar verebilecek enerji patlamaları ve taşkınlıklara eğilimlidir.	1	2	3	4
14	Yetişkinlerin sınır koymalarına sinirlenir.	1	2	3	4
15	Üzüldüğünü, kızıp öfkelenildiğini, veya korktuğunu söyleyebilir.	1	2	3	4
16	Üzgün veya halsiz görünür.	1	2	3	4
17	Oyuna başkalarını katmaya çalışırken aşırı enerjik ve hareketlidir.	1	2	3	4
18	Yüzü ifadesizdir; yüz ifadesinden duyguları anlaşılmaz.	1	2	3	4
19	Yaşlılarının arkadaşça ya da sıradan (nötr) yaklaşımlarına olumsuz karşılık verir (örneğin kızgın bir ses tonuyla konuşabilir ya da ürkek davranabilir).	1	2	3	4
20	Düşünmeden, ani tepkiler verir.	1	2	3	4
21	Kendini başkalarının yerine koyarak onların duygularını anlar; başkaları üzgün ya da sıkıntılı olduğunda onlara ilgi gösterir.	1	2	3	4
22	Başkalarını rahatsız edecek veya etrafa zarar verebilecek kadar aşırı enerjik, hareketli davranır.	1	2	3	4

23	Yaşıtları ona saldırgan davranır ya da zorla işine karışırsa yerinde olumsuz duygular gösterir (örneğin kızgınlık, korku, öfke, sıkıntı).	1	2	3	4
24	Oyuna başkalarını katmaya çalışırken olumsuz duygular gösterir (örneğin, aşırı heyecan, kızgınlık, üzüntü).	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX G

EMOTION REGULATION CHECKLIST (ERC) (ENGLISH)

Please indicate how often you observe the following behaviors in your child.		NEVER	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS
There are four response alternatives for each item;					
1: Never 2: Sometimes 3: Frequently 4: Always					
It is expected from you to mark the most appropriate option for the child.					
1	Is a cheerful child.	1	2	3	4
2	Exhibits wide mood swings (child's emotional state is difficult to anticipate because s/he moves quickly from positive to negative moods).	1	2	3	4
3	Responds positively to neutral or friendly approaches by adults.	1	2	3	4
4	Transitions well from one activity to another; does not become anxious, angry, distressed or overly excited when moving from one activity to another.	1	2	3	4
5	Can recover quickly from episodes of upset or distress (eg. does not pout or remain sullen, anxious or sad after emotionally distressing events).	1	2	3	4
6	Is easily frustrated.	1	2	3	4
7	Responds positively to neutral or friendly approaches by peers.	1	2	3	4
8	Is prone to angry outbursts / tantrums easily.	1	2	3	4
9	Is able to delay gratification (wait for good things).	1	2	3	4

10	Takes pleasure in the distress of others (e.g., laughs when another person gets hurt or punished; enjoy teasing others).	1	2	3	4
11	Can modulate excitement in emotionally arousing situations (e.g., does not get 'carried away' in high-energy situations, or overly excited in inappropriate contexts).	1	2	3	4
12	Is whiny or clingy with adults.	1	2	3	4
13	Is prone to disruptive outbursts of energy and exuberance.	1	2	3	4
14	Responds angrily to limit-setting by adults.	1	2	3	4
15	Can say when s/he is feeling sad, angry or mad, fearful or afraid.	1	2	3	4
16	Seems sad or listless.	1	2	3	4
17	Is overly exuberant when attempting to engage other in play.	1	2	3	4
18	Displays flat affect (expression is vacant and inexpressive; child seems emotionally absent).	1	2	3	4
19	Responds negatively to neutral or friendly approaches by peers (e.g., may speak in an angry tone of voice or respond fearfully).	1	2	3	4
20	Is impulsive.	1	2	3	4
21	Is empathic towards others; shows concern when others are upset or distressed.	1	2	3	4
22	Displays exuberance that others find intrusive or disruptive.	1	2	3	4
23	Displays appropriate negative emotions (anger, fear, frustration, distress) in response to hostile, aggressive or intrusive acts by peers.	1	2	3	4
24	Displays negative emotions when attempting to engage others in play.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX H

PARENTING ATTITUDE SCALE (TURKISH)

Ölçekteki her madde için; 1: Hiçbir zaman böyle değildir. 2: Nadiren böyledir. 3: Bazen böyledir. 4: Çoğu zaman böyledir. 5: Her zaman böyledir.		Hiçbir zaman böyle değildir.	Nadiren böyledir.	Bazen böyledir.	Çoğu zaman böyledir.	Her zaman böyledir.
1	Ben bir başkasıyla konuşurken çocuğumun araya girmesine izin veririm.					
2	Çocuğumun kendine özgü bir bakış açısı olduğunu kabul ederim.					
3	Çocuğumla aynı fikirde olmadığımız zaman, benim fikirlerimi kabul etmesi için onu zorlarım.					
4	Çocuğumu hayatın ufak tefek güçlüklerinden korurum.					
5	Çocuğuma bağımsız olmayı öğrenmesi konusunda yardımcı olurum.					
6	Çocuğuma kurallara neden uyması gerektiğini açıklarım.					
7	Çocuğuma yaptığı şeyin önemli olduğunu hissettiririm.					
8	Çocuğumu kendisi için yorucu olabilecek işlerden korurum.					
9	Çocuğum söz dinlemediğinde ona vururum.					
10	Çocuğumun iyi ve kötü davranışı					

	karşısında neler hissettiğimi ona açıklarım.					
11	Çocuğumu yola getirmek için onu azarlarım.					
12	Çocuğuma karşı koruyucu davranırım.					
13	Çocuğum iyi davrandığında onu överim.					
14	Çocuğumun kişisel görüşlerine saygı gösteririm.					
15	Çocuğumu bir şeyleri kendi başına yapması konusunda cesaretlendiririm.					
16	Arkadaşları çocuğuma sataştığı zaman onu korurum.					
17	Çocuğumun başkaları konuşurken araya girmesine izin veririm.					
18	Çocuğumun cinsel konularda sorduğu soruları anlayacağı bir dilde doğru olarak cevaplarım.					
19	Çocuğum yanlış bir şekilde davrandığında ona bağırırım.					
20	Ebeveynlik konusunda bir yanlış yaptığımda çocuğumdan özür dilerim.					
21	Çocuğumu, kendisi için zor olabilecek işlerden korurum.					
22	Çocuğumun hastalanmasından endişe ederim.					
23	Çocuğumun duygularını serbestçe ifade etmesine izin veririm.					

24	Çocuğumun istediği saatte uyumasına izin veririm.					
25	Çocuğum yanlış davrandığında, bunun neden yanlış olduğunu açıklarım.					
26	Çocuğuma kızdığımda çocuğumu cezalandırırım.					
27	Fiziksel cezayı, çocuğumu disipline sokmanın bir yolu olarak kullanırım.					
28	Çocuğumun hayal kırıklığına uğramaması için elimden geleni yaparım.					
29	Çocuğumun büyüdükçe yeni şeyler denemeyi göze alması gerektiğine inanırım.					
30	Çocuğumun her şeyi yapmasına izin veririm.					
31	Çocuğumun yanlış davranışını görmezden gelirim.					
32	Çocuğumu başka çocuklarla kıyaslarım.					
33	Çocuğumun şımarıklıklarına göz yumarım.					
34	Çocuğumu şımartırım.					
35	Çocuğuma karşı çabuk öfkelenirim.					
36	Çocuğum bana bir şey anlatırken sözünü kesmeden dinlerim.					
37	Çocuğuma bir şey alırken onun da fikrini alırım.					
38	Çocuğumla her konuyu konuşabilirim.					
39	Çocuğuma karşı sabırsızım.					

40	En ufak bir hatasında, çocuğumu cezalandırırım.					
41	Çocuğum için hemen hemen bütün eğlencelerimden fedakârlık ederim.					
42	Çocuğumun kendi başına becerebileceği şeyleri denemesi için ona fırsat tanırım.					
43	Çocuğuma bana sormaksızın şahsi eşyalarımın herhangi birini alıp kullanmasına izin veririm.					
44	Evimizde hangi televizyon programının izleneceği, çocuğumun isteğine göre belirlenir.					
45	Çocuğumu yapabileceğinden fazlasını yapması için zorlarım.					
46	Çocuğumu, onun cesaretini kırabilecek zor işlerden uzak tutarım.					

APPENDIX I

PARENTING ATTITUDE SCALE (ENGLISH)

There are five response alternatives for each item;						
1: Never 2: Rarely 3: Sometimes 4: Usually 5: Always		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1	I allow my child to interrupt when I am talking to someone else.					
2	I accept that my child has a unique point of view.					
3	When we disagree with my child, I force him to accept my ideas.					
4	I protect my child from the little difficulties of life.					
5	I help my child learn to be independent.					
6	I explain to my child why he or she must follow the rules.					
7	I make my child feel that what he is doing is important.					
8	I protect my child from work that may be tiring for him.					
9	When my child disobeys, I hit him.					
10	I explain how I feel about my child's positive and negative behavior.					
11	I reprimand my child for correcting him. I respect my child's personal views.					
12	I act protective of my child.					

13	I praise my child when s/he behaves well.					
14	I respect my child's personal views.					
15	I encourage my child to do things by herself/himself.					
16	When his friends pick on my child, I protect her/him.					
17	I allow my child to interrupt when others are talking.					
18	I correctly answer questions my child asks about sexual matters in a language they understand.					
19	I yell at my child when s/he misbehaves.					
20	I apologize to my child when I make a mistake in parenting.					
21	I protect my child from work that may be difficult for her/him.					
22	I worry about my child getting sick.					
23	I allow my child to freely express her/his feelings.					
24	I let my child sleep whenever s/he wants.					
25	When my child misbehaves, I explain why it is wrong.					
26	When I get angry with my child, I punish my child.					
27	I use physical punishment as a way to discipline my child.					

28	I do my best to ensure that my child is not disappointed.					
29	I believe that my child should be willing to try new things as s/he gets older.					
30	I let my child do anything.					
31	I ignore my child's misbehavior.					
32	I compare my child with other children.					
33	I turn a blind eye to my child's naughtiness.					
34	I spoil my child.					
35	I get angry quickly with my child.					
36	When my child is telling me something, I listen without interrupting.					
37	When I buy something for my child, I also get her/his opinion.					
38	I can talk to my child about anything.					
39	I am impatient with my child.					
40	For the slightest mistake, I punish my child.					
41	I would sacrifice almost all my entertainment for my child.					
42	I give my child the opportunity to try things s/he can do on his own.					
43	I allow my child to take and use any of my personal belongings without asking me.					
44	A television program to watch in our house					

	is determined according to my child's wishes.					
45	I force my child to do more than they can.					
46	I keep my child away from hard work that might discourage her/him.					

REFERENCES

- Acar, İbrahim H.; Veziroğlu-Çelik, M., Çelebi, Ş., Ingeç, D., Kuzgun, S., (2019). Parenting styles and Turkish children's emotion regulation: The mediating role of parent-teacher relationships. *Current Psychology*, 40(9), 4427-4437 doi:10.1007/s12144-019-00390-y
- Ackerman, B. P., Brown, E., & Izard, C. E. (2004). The relations between contextual risk, earned income, and the school adjustment of children from economically disadvantaged families. *Developmental Psychology*, 40, 204–216.
- Ahmetoğlu, E., İlhan İldiz, G., Acar, I. H., & Encinger, A. (2017). Children's emotion regulation and attachment to parents: Parental emotion socialization as moderator. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 46(6), 969–984. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6795>.
- Altan-Aytun, Ö., Yağmurlu, B., & Yavuz, H. M. (2013). Turkish mothers' coping with children's negative emotions: A brief report. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 22(3), 437-443.
- Aksoy, P., & Baran, G. (2010). Review of studies aimed at bringing social skills for children in preschool period. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 663–669. 2010.12.214
- Alisinanoğlu, F. ve Özbey, S. (2009). Anaokulu ve anasınıfı davranış ölçeği'nin geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Mesleki Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 173-198.
- Altan, Ö. (2006). *The effects of maternal socialization and temperament on children's emotion regulation* (Unpublished master thesis). Koç Üniversitesi, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Amorim, K. S., & Rossetti-Ferreira, M. C. (2004). Ethnotheories and childrearing practices: Some constraints on their investigation, *Culture Psychology*, 10(3), 337–351.
- Anolli, L., Duncan Jr, S., & Magnússon, M. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The hidden structure of interaction: from neurons to culture patterns* (Vol. 7). Ios Press.
- Arı, M. & Yaban, H. (2016). Okulöncesi dönemdeki çocukların sosyal davranışları: mizaç ve duygu düzenlemenin rolü. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(1), 125- 141.
- Arslan, E., Durmuşoğlu-Saltali, N., & Yılmaz, H. (2011). Social skills and emotional and behavioral traits of preschool children. *Social behavior and personality: An International Journal*, 39(9), 1281–1287. doi:10.2224/sbp.2011.39.9.1281
- Avcioğlu, H. (2005). *Social skills training with activities* [In Turkish]. Ankara: Kök.

- Ataca, B., Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Diri, A. (2005). The Turkish family and the value of children: Trends overtime. *The value of children in cross-cultural perspective. Case studies from eight societies*, 91-119.
- Augustine, J. M. (2014). Mothers' employment, education, and parenting. *Work and Occupations*, 41(2), 237–270. doi:10.1177/0730888413501342
- Aunola, K., Stattin H., Nurmi J.E. (2000). *Parenting styles and adolescents' achievement strategies*. 23(2), 0–222. doi:10.1006/jado.2000.0308
- Bano, S. & Vyas, K. (2016). Child's gender and parenting styles. *Delhi Psychiatric Society*, 19(2), 289-293
- Barrett, L. F., Gross, J., Christensen, T. C., & Benvenuto, M. (2001). Knowing what you're feeling and knowing what to do about it: Mapping the relation between emotion differentiation and emotion regulation. *Cognition & Emotion*, 15(6), 713–724. doi:10.1080/02699930143000239
- Baumrind, D. (1968). *Manual for the preschool behaviour Q sort*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Childcare practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behaviour. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75, 43–48.
- Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R. E., & Owens, E. B. (2010). Effects of preschool parents' power assertive patterns and practices on adolescent development. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 10(3), 157–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295190903290790>
- Bell, K., & Calkins, S. (2000). Relationships as inputs and outputs of emotion regulation. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(3), 160-163. Retrieved June 13, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1449794>
- Berry, D., & O'Connor, E. (2010). Behavioral risk, teacher–child relationships, and social skill development across middle childhood: A child-by-environment analysis of change. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 31(1), 1–14. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2009.05.001
- Bornstein, M. H. (2002). *Handbook of parenting* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bornstein, M. H., Hahn, C.-S., Suwalsky, J. T. D., & Haynes, O. M. (2003). Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development: The Hollingshead Four Factor Index of Social Status and The Socioeconomic Index of Occupations. In M. H. Bornstein & R. H. Bradley (Eds.), *Monographs in parenting series. Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development* (pp. 29-82). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bornstein, M. H., & Cheah, C. S. L. (2006). The place of “culture and parenting” in the ecological contextual perspective on developmental science. In K. H. Rubin & O. B. Chung (Eds.), *Parenting beliefs, behaviors, and parent-child relations: A cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 3–33). Psychology Press.

- Bornstein, M. H., & Cote, L. R (Eds.). (2006). *Acculturation and parent-child relationships: Measurement and development*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bornstein, M. H. (2012). *Cultural approaches to Parenting*. *Parenting*, 12(2-3), 212–221. doi:10.1080/15295192.2012.683359
- Boo, G. M., & Kolk, A. M. (2007). Ethnic and gender differences in temperament, and the relationship between temperament and depressive and aggressive mood. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 1756- 1766.
- Boratav, H. (2009). Values and attitudes of young people in urban Turkey: A further test of Schwartz's theory of values and Kağıtçıbaşı's model of family change. In S. Bekman, & A. Aksu-Koc, *Perspectives on human development, family and culture* (263–283). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511720437.011
- Bozkurt Yükçü, S., Demircioğlu H. (2017). Okul öncesi dönem çocukların duygu düzenleme becerilerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 44, 442-466.
- Bradley, R. H., Corwyn, R. F., McAdoo, H. P., & Coll, C. G. (2001). The home environments of children in the United States: I. Variations by age, ethnicity, and poverty status. *Child Development*, 72, 1844–1867.
- Bridges, M., Cohen, S. R., & Fuller, B. (2012). *Abriendo Puertas: Opening doors to opportunity—A National Evaluation of Second-generation Trainers*. Institute of Human Development.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Crouter, A. C. (1982). Work and family through time and space. In S. Kamerman & C. Hayes (Eds.), *Families that work: Children in a changing world* (pp. 39- 83). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Brownell, C. A., Kopp, C. B., (2007). *Transitions in toddler socioemotional development*. *Socioemotional development in the toddler years: Transitions and transformations*, 1-40.
- Bugental, D. B., & Grusec, J. E. (2006). Socialization processes. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp.366–428). John Wiley & Sons, Inc..
- Calkins, S., & Hill, A. (2007) Caregiver influences on emerging emotion regulation: biological and environmental transactions in early development. In: Gross, J.J., Ed., *Handbook of Emotion Regulation*, Guilford Press, New York, 229-248.
- Calkins, S. D., & Fox, N. A. (2002). Self-regulatory processes in early personality development: A multilevel approach to the study of childhood social withdrawal and aggression. *Development and psychopathology*, 14(03), 477-498.

- Carapito, E., Ribeiro, M. T., Pereira, A. I., & Roberto, M. S. (2018). Parenting stress and preschoolers' socio-emotional adjustment: the mediating role of parenting styles in parent–child dyads. *Journal of Family Studies*, 1–17. doi:10.1080/13229400.2018.1442737
- Carlson, S. M. (2005). Developmentally sensitive measures of executive function in preschool children. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 28, 595–616. doi:10.1207/s15326942dn2802_3
- Cassidy, J., Parke, R. D., Butkovsky, L., & Braungart, J. M. (1992). Peer-family connections: The role of emotional expressiveness within the family and children's understanding of emotions. *Child Development*, 63(3), 603–618.
- Cevher-Kalburan, N., & Ivrendi, A. (2016). Risky play and parenting styles. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(2), 355-366.
- Chang, L., Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., & Mcbride, C. (2003). Harsh parenting in relation to child emotion regulation and aggression. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17, 598–606.
- Chaplin, T. M., Casey, J., Sinha, R., & Mayes, L. C. (2010). Gender differences in caregiver emotionsocialization of low- income toddlers. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 2010(128), 11-27.
- Chaplin, T. M., & Aldao, A. (2013). Gender differences in emotion expression in children: a meta-analyticreview. *Psychological bulletin*, 139(4), 735.
- Chen, X., Chang, L., & He, Y. (2003). The peer group as a context: mediating and moderating effects on relations between academic achievement and social functioning in Chinese children. *Child Development*, 74(3), 710–727. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00564
- Cicchetti, D., Ackerman B., Izard C. (1995). Emotions and emotion regulation in developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7:1–10.
- Cicchetti, D., Ganiban, J., & Barnett, D. (1991). Contributions from the study of high-risk populations to understanding the development of emotion regulation. In J. Garber & K. A. Dodge (Eds.), *Cambridge studies in social and emotional development. The development of emotion regulation and dysregulation* (p. 15–48). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511663963.003
- Çimen, N. (2009). *Actualization level of six-year-old children's social skills in the preschool curriculum*. Unpublished master's thesis, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey.
- Cole, P., Martin, S.E., Dennis, T.A. (2004). Emotion regulation as a scientific construct: Methodological challenges and directions for child developmental research. *Child Development*, 75, 317– 333.

- Cole, P. M., Michel, M. K., & Teti, L. O. (1994). The development of emotion regulation and dysregulation: A clinical perspective. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(2-3), 73–100, 250–283. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1166139>
- Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., & Martin, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic status, family processes, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 685–704. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x
- Conrade, G. & Ho, R. (2001). *Differential parenting styles for fathers and mothers.*, 53(1), 29– 35. doi:10.1080/00049530108255119
- Coolahan, K., McWayne, C., Fantuzzo, J., & Grim, S. (2002). Validation of multidimensional assessment of parenting styles for low-income African-American families with preschool children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 17(3), 356–373. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006\(02\)00169-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006(02)00169-2)
- Craig, G., & Dunn, W. (2007). *Understanding human development*. New Jersey: Pearson, PrenticeHall.
- Curtis, E.A; Comiskey, C.; Dempsey, O. (2016). *Importance and use of correlational research*. *Nurse Researcher*, 23(6), 20–25. doi:10.7748/nr.2016.e1382
- Cohen, J. (1968). *Multiple regression as a general data-analytic system*. *Psychological Bulletin*.70(6): Part 1, 426-443.
- Curran, Patrick J.; West, Stephen G.; Finch, John F. (1996). *The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis*,1(1), 16–29. doi:10.1037/1082-989x.1.1.16
- Çalışkan, A. (2015). The Relationship between mothers' parenting styles and emotion understanding of children through the mediator role of children's perceived parenting styles of their mothers [M.S. - Master of Science]. Middle East Technical University.
- Çorapçı F., Aksan N., Yağmurlu B. (2012). Socialization of Turkish children's emotions: do different emotions elicit different responses? *Global Studies of Childhood*, 2(2), 106-116. doi:10.2304/gsch.2012.2.2.106
- Demir, E. K. & Şendil, G. (2008). Ebeveyn tutum ölçeği (ETÖ). *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları Dergisi*, 11(21), 15-25.
- Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (1994). Marital conflict and child adjustment: An emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 387-411. doi: 10.1037/0033- 2909.116.3.387.
- Denham, S. A. (1993). Maternal emotional responsiveness and toddlers' social-emotional competence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 34(5), 715–728.

- Denham, S. A., & Kochanoff, A. T. (2002). Parental contributions to preschoolers' understanding of emotion. *Marriage and Family Review*, 34, 311-342. doi:10.1300/J002v34n03_06
- Denham, S.A., Renwick S.M., & Holt, R. W. (1991). Working and playing together: Prediction of preschool social-emotional competence from mother-child interaction. *Child Development*, 62, 242-249.
- Denham, S. A., Blair, K. A., DeMulder, E., Levitas, J., Sawyer, K., Auerbach-Major, S., & Queenan, P. (2003). Preschool emotional competence: Pathway to social competence? *Child Development*, 74(1), 238–256. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00533
- Dennis, T. (2006). Emotional self-regulation in preschoolers: The interplay of child approach reactivity, parenting, and control capacities. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(1), 84–97.
- Dereli, E. (2016). Prediction of emotional understanding and emotion regulation skills of 4-5 age group children with parent-child relations. *Journal of education and practice*, 7(21), 42-54
- Diener, M. L., Mangelsdorf, S. C., McHale, J. L., & Frosch, C. A. (2002). Infants' behavioral strategies for emotion regulation with fathers and mothers: Associations with emotional expressions and attachment quality. *Infancy*, 3(2), 153–174. doi:10.1207/s15327078in0302_3
- Dobbins, N., Higgins, K., Pierce, T., Tandy, R. D., & Tincani, M. (2009). An analysis of social skills instruction provided in teacher education and in-service training programs for general and special educators. *Remedial and Special Education*, 31(5), 358–367. doi:10.1177/0741932509338363
- Duncan, G. J., Lee, K. T. H., Rosales-Rueda, M., & Kalil, A. (2018). Maternal age and child development. *Demography*. doi:10.1007/s13524-018-0730-3
- Duncan, G. J., & Magnuson, K. A. (2003). Off with Hollingshead: Socioeconomic resources, parenting, and child development. In M. H. Bornstein & R. H. Bradley (Eds.), *Monographs in parenting series. Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development* (p. 83–106). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Duncan, G. J., Dowsett, C. J., Claessens, A., Magnuson, K., Huston, A. C., Klebanov, P., Pagani, L. S., Feinstein, L., Engel, M., Brooks-Gunn, J., Sexton, H., Duckworth, K., Japel, C. (2007). School readiness and later achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(6), 1428–1446. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1428
- Eisenberg, N., Losoya, S., Fabes, R. A., Guthrie, I. K., Reiser, M., Murphy, B., & Padgett, S. J. (2001). Parental socialization of children's dysregulated expression of emotion and externalizing problems. *Journal of family Psychology*, 15(2), 183.

- Eisenberg, N., Smith, C. L., & Spinrad, T. L. (2011). Effortful control: Relations with emotion regulation, adjustment, and socialization in childhood. In K. D. Vohs & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 263–283). Guilford Press.
- Eisenberg, N., Gershoff, E. T., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Cumberland, A. J., Losoya, S. H., Guthrie, I. K., Murphy, B. C. (2001). Mother's emotional expressivity and children's behavior problems and social competence: Mediation through children's regulation. *Developmental Psychology*, 37(4), 475–490. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.37.4.475
- Eisenberg N., Spinrad T. L. (2004). *Emotion-Related Regulation: Sharpening the Definition*. 75(2), 334–339. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00674.x
- Evans, Gary W. (2004). The Environment of Childhood Poverty. *American Psychologist*, 59(2), 77–92. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.77
- Evans, G. W.; Pilyoung K. (2013). Childhood Poverty, Chronic Stress, Self-Regulation, and Coping. *Child Development Perspectives*, 7(1), 43–48. doi:10.1111/cdep.12013
- Fabes, R. A., Hanish, L. D., & Martin, C. L. (2002). Young children's negative emotionality and social isolation: A latent growth curve analysis. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 48, 284–307.
- Fiese, B. H.; Rhodes, H. G.; Beardslee, W. R. (2013). Rapid changes in American family Life: consequences for child health and pediatric practice. *Pediatrics*, 132(3), 552–559. doi:10.1542/peds.2013-0349
- Fox, N. A. (Ed.). (1994). The development of emotion regulation: Biological and behavioral considerations. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59, (2-3, Serial No. 240).
- Garner P. W., Spears F. M. (2000). *Emotion Regulation in Low-income Preschoolers*, 9(2), 246–264. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00122
- Garner, P. W., & Estep, K. M. (2001). Emotional competence, emotion socialization, and young children's peer-related social competence. *Early education and development*, 12, 29-48. doi: 10.1207/s15566935eed1201_3
- Gennetian, L., & Miller, C. (2002). Children and welfare reform: A view from an experimental welfare program in Minnesota. *Child Development*, 73, 601–620.
- Goertzen, M. J. (2017). Introduction to quantitative research and data. *Library Technology Reports*, 53(4), pp. 12-18.
- Goodwin, L. D., & Leech, N. L. (2006). Understanding correlation: Factors that affect the size of r. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 74(3), 251–266. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.74.3.249-266>

- Gouley, K. K., Brotman, L. M., Huang, K.-Y., & Shrout, P. E. (2008). *Construct validation of the social competence scale in preschool-age children. Social Development, 17*(2), 380–398. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00430.x
- Gross, J. J. (1998b). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology, 2*(3), 271–299. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 348-362.
- Gülseven, Z., Kumru, A., Carlo, G., Palermo, F., Selcuk, B., & Sayil, M. (2018). The mediational roles of harsh and responsive parenting in the longitudinal relations between socioeconomic status and Turkish children's emotional development. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 42*(6), 563-573.
- Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. (2002). Culture and parenting. *Handbook of parenting, 2*(2), 253-280.
- Haslam D., Poniman C., Filus A., Sumargi A. & Boediman L. (2020): Parenting style, child emotion regulation and behavioral problems: The moderating role of cultural values in Australia and Indonesia, *Marriage & Family Review*, doi: 10.1080/01494929.2020.1712573
- Hay, D. F., Payne, A., & Chadwick, A. (2004). Peer relations in childhood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45*(1), 84–108. doi:10.1046/j.0021-9630.2003.00308.x
- Hoffman, L. 2003. Mothers' ambivalence with their babies and toddlers. *Journal of American Psychoanalytic Association, 51*(4), 1219–40. doi:10.1177/00030651030510040901.
- Hosokawa, R., & Katsura, T. (2017). A longitudinal study of socioeconomic status, family processes, and child adjustment from preschool until early elementary school: the role of social competence. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health, 11*(1). doi:10.1186/s13034-017-0206-z
- Hosokawa, R., & Katsura, T. (2017). Marital relationship, parenting practices, and social skills development in preschool children. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health, 11*(1). doi:10.1186/s13034-016-0139-y
- Huang, G. & Gove, M. (2015). Asian parenting styles and academic achievement: views from eastern and western perspectives, *135*(3), pp. 389-397(9). Project Innovation.
- Huaqing Qi, C., & Kaiser, A. P. (2003). Behavior Problems of Preschool Children From Low- Income Families. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 23*(4), 188–216. doi:10.1177/02711214030230040201

- Huston, A. C., Duncan, G. J., Granger, R., Bos, J., McLoyd, V. C., Mistry, R., Crosby, D., Gibson, C., Magnuson, K., Romich, J., & Ventura, A. (2001). Work-based anti-poverty programs for parents can enhance the school performance and social behavior of children. *Child Development, 72*, 318–336.
- Huston, A.C.; Aronson, SR (2005). Mothers' time with infant and time in employment as Predictors of mother–child relationships and children's early development, *76*(2), 467–482. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00857.x
- Jabeen, F., Anisul-Haque, M., & Riaz, M. N. (2013). Parenting styles as predictors of emotion regulation among adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 28*(1), 85– 105.
- Jenkins, J. M., & Oatley, K. (2000). Psychopathology and short-term emotion: The balance of affects. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 41*, 463–472.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. & Sunar, D. (1992). *Family and socialization in Turkey*. In J. L.
- 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. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theories and applications* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). *Self, family, and human development: Cultural psychology*. Istanbul: Koç University Publishing, 171.
- Kitayama, S. (2002). Culture and basic psychological processes--Toward a system view of culture: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(1), 89–96.
- Klebanov, P. K., Brooks-Gunn, J., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & Gordon, R. A. (1997). Are neighborhood effects on young children mediated by features of the home environment? J. Brooks-Gunn, G. J. Duncan, & J.L. Aber (Der.), *Neighborhood poverty: Vol I. Context and consequences for children* (119-145). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kramer, T. J., Caldarella, P., Christensen, L., & Shatzer, R. H. (2009). Social and emotional learning in the kindergarten classroom: Evaluation of the strong start curriculum. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 37*(4), 303–309. doi:10.1007/s10643-009-0354-8
- Kochanska, G., Murray, K. T., & Harlan, E. T. (2000). Effortful control in early childhood: Continuity and change, antecedents, and implications for social development. *Developmental Psychology, 36*(2), 220–232. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.36.2.220>
- Kopp, C. B. (1989). Regulation of distress and negative emotions: A developmental view. *Developmental psychology, 25*(3), 343-354. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.25.3.343>

- Kotaman, H. (2016). Turkish prospective early childhood teachers' emotional intelligence level and its relationship to their parents' parenting styles. *Teacher Development, 20*(1), 106–122. doi:10.1080/13664530.2015.1101391
- Leedy, P.D., Ormrod, J.E. (2010). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Ninth edition. Pearson Education, Harlow-Lefrancois, G. R. (2001). *Of children: An introduction to child and adolescent development* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Leigh, A., & Gong, X. (2010). Does maternal age affect children's test scores? *Australian Economic Review, 43*(1), 12–27. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8462.2009.00573.x
- Lewin, K. (2013). *A dynamic theory of personality-selected papers*. Read Books Ltd.
- Lincoln, C. R., Russell, B. S., Donohue, E. B., & Racine, L. E. (2016). Mother-child interactions and preschoolers' emotion regulation outcomes: Nurturing Autonomous Emotion Regulation. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 26*(2), 559–573. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0561-z
- Lucas-Thompson, R. G., Goldberg, W. A., & Prause, J. (2010). Maternal work early in the lives of children and its distal associations with achievement and behavior problems: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(6), 915–942. doi:10.1037/a0020875
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4: Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp. 1–101). New York: Wiley.
- Macklem, G. L. (2007). *Practitioner's guide to emotion regulation in school-aged children*. USA: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Macklem G.L. (2008) Parenting and emotion regulation. In: *Practitioner's guide to emotion regulation in school-aged children*. (pp. 49-62) Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-73851-2_5
- Maleki, M., Mardani, A., Mitra Chehrzad, M., Dianatinasab, M., & Vaismoradi, M. (2019). Social skills in children at home and in preschool. *Behavioral Sciences, 9*(7), 74. doi:10.3390/bs9070074
- Mayer, B., Albert, I., Trommsdorff, G. & Schwarz, B. (2005). Value of children in Germany: Dimensions, comparison of generations, and relevance for parenting. In G. Trommsdorff, & B. Nauck (Eds.), *The value of children: Case studies from eight societies* (pp. 43–66). Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.
- McClelland, M. M., & Cameron, C. E. (2012). Self-regulation in early childhood: Improving conceptual clarity and developing ecologically valid measures. *Child Development Perspectives, 6*(2), 136–142.

- Mischel, W., Ayduk, O., Berman, M. G., Casey, B. J., Gotlib, I.H., Jonides, J., Shoda, Y. (2011). 'Willpower' over the life span: Decomposing self-regulation. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 6(2), 252–256.
- Miller, A. L., & Olson, S. L. (2000). Emotional expressiveness during peer conflicts: A predictor of social maladjustment among high-risk preschoolers. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 28, 339–352.
- Moore, J. E., Cooper, B. R., Domitrovich, C. E., Morgan, N. R., Cleveland, M. J., Shah, H., Greenberg, M. T. (2015). The effects of exposure to an enhanced preschool program on the social-emotional functioning of at-risk children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 32, 127–138.
doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2015.03.004
- Morris, A. S., Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., Myers, S. S., & Robinson, L. R. (2007). The Role of the Family Context in the Development of Emotion Regulation. *Social Development*, 16(2), 361–388. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00389.x
- Morris, A. S., Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., Sessa, F. M., Avenevoli, S., & Essex, M. J. (2002). Temperamental vulnerability and negative parenting as interacting predictors of child adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 461–471.
- Morris, A. S., Criss, M. M., Silk, J. S., & Houlberg, B. J. (2017). The impact of parenting on emotion regulation during childhood and adolescence. *Child Development Perspectives*, 11(4), 233–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12238>
- Myers, S. S., & Pianta, R. C. (2008). Developmental Commentary: Individual and Contextual Influences on Student–Teacher Relationships and Children's Early Problem Behaviors. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 37(3), 600–608. doi:10.1080/15374410802148160
- Norwood, S.L. (2010). *Research essentials: Foundations for evidence-based practice*. Pearson Education, Harlow.
- Ocakçı, A., Ayyıldız, T., & Kulakçı, H. (2006). Zonguldak il merkezinde 0-6 yaş çocuğu olan annelerin sosyoekonomik düzeylerinin çocuk yetiştirme tutumları üzerine etkisi. Retrieved July 15, 2007, from <http://www.millipediatri.org.tr/bildiriler/HP06.htm>
- Ömerođlu, F. (1996). *Okul öncesi dönemde çocuđun terbiyesinde annenin rolü ve annelerin çocuk yetiştirme tutumları (Anne tutumlarının demografik bilgilere göre farklılaşp farklılaşmadığına ilişkin bir araştırma)*, (Unpublished PhD thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Palut, B. (2010). A review on parenting in the mediterranean countries. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 33(2), 242-247 . Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/cumusosbil/issue/4341/59338>

- Persson, G. E. B. (2005). Developmental perspectives on prosocial and aggressive motives in preschoolers' peer interactions. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29(1),80–91. doi:10.1080/01650250444000423
- Phipps, S.A. (1999). An International comparison of policies and outcomes for young children. *Canadian Policy Research Network Study No. F-05*.
- Prevoo, M. J. L., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2017). Parenting and globalization in western countries: Explaining differences in parent–child interactions. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 15, 33–39.
- Qui, C. & Shum, K. K. (2021). Relations between caregivers' emotion regulation strategies, parenting styles, and preschoolers' emotional competence in Chinese parenting and grandparenting. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 59, 121-133
- Repetti, R. L., Taylor, S. E., & Seeman, T. E. (2002). Risky families: Family social environments and the mental and physical health of offspring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 330–366.
- Rinaldi, C. M., & Howe, N. (2012). Mothers' and fathers' parenting styles and associations with toddlers' externalizing, internalizing, and adaptive behaviors. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 27(2), 266–273.
- Rodriguez M. M., Donovanick, M. R., Crowley, S.L. (2009). *Parenting styles in cultural context: Observations of “protective parenting” in first-generation latinos.*, 48(2), 195-210.
- Rubin, K. H., & Stewart, S. L. (1996). Social withdrawal. In E. Mash & R. Barkley (Eds.). *Child Psychopathology*. (pp. 277-307). New York: Guilford.
- Rubin, K. H.; Cheah, S.L.; Fox, N. (2001). Emotion regulation, parenting and display of social reticence in preschoolers. *Early Education & Development*, 12(1), 97–115. doi:10.1207/s15566935eed1201_6
- Rudy, D., & Grusec, J. E. (2001). Correlates of authoritarian parenting in individualist and collectivist cultures and implications for understanding the transmission of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(2), 202-212.
- Rydell, A., Berlin, L. & Bohlin, G. (2003). Emotionality, emotion regulation, and adaptation on 5-to 8-year-old children. *Emotion*, 3(1), 30–47.
- Sabol, T. J., & Pianta, R. C. (2012). Recent trends in research on teacher–child relationships. *Attachment & human development*, 14(3), 213-231.
- Sala, M. N., Pons, F., & Molina, P. (2014). Emotion regulation strategies in preschool children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 32(4), 440–453. doi:10.1111/bjdp.12055

- Samuel, M., & Okey, L. E. (2015). The relevance and significance of correlation in social science research. *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology Research*, 1(3), 22-28.
- Sassler, S., Cunningham, A., & Lichter, D. T. (2009). Intergenerational patterns of union formation and relationship quality. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30(6), 757-786.
- Schlesier, J., Roden, I., & Moschner, B. (2019). Emotion regulation in primary school children: A systematic review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 100, 239-257.
- Séguin, D. G., & MacDonald, B., (2018). The role of emotion regulation and temperament in the prediction of the quality of social relationships in early childhood, *Early Child Development and Care*, 188(8), 1147-1163, doi: 10.1080/03004430.2016.1251678
- Sen, H., Yavuz-Muren, H.M., Yağmurlu, B. (2014). Parenting: The Turkish context. In: Selin, H. (eds) *Parenting across cultures. Science across cultures: The history of non-western science*, vol 7. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7503-9_13
- Shahim, S. (2004). *Reliability of the social skills rating system for preschool children in Iran*. *Psychol. Educ.* 11, 176–186.
- Sheeber, L., Davis, B., & Hops, H. (2002). Gender-specific vulnerability to depression in children of depressed mothers. In S. H. Goodman, & I. H. Gotlib (Eds.), *Children of depressed parents: Mechanisms of risk and implications for treatment* (pp. 253–274). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Shields, A., Dickstein, S., Seifer, R., Giusti, L., Magee, K. D., & Spritz, B. (2001). Emotional competence and early school adjustment: A study of preschoolers at risk. *Early Education and Development*, 12, 73–96.
- Shields, A., & Cicchetti, D. (1997). Emotion regulation and autonomy: The development and validation of two new criterion Q-sort scales. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 906–916.
- Shields, A., & Cicchetti, D. (1997). Emotion regulation among school-age children: The development and validation of a new criterion Q-sort scale. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(6), 906–916.
- Skinner, E. A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2011). Perceived control and the development of coping. In S. Folkman (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of stress, health, and coping* (pp. 35–59). Oxford University Press.
- Smith, J. R., Brooks-Gunn, J., Klebanov, P., & Lee, K. (2000). Welfare and work: Complementary strategies for low-income women? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 808–822.

- Smith, J. R., Brooks-Gunn, J., Kohen, D., & McCarton, C. (2001). Transitions on and off AFDC: Implications for parenting and children's cognitive development. *Child Development, 72*, 1512–1533.
- Spencer, B. (1995). Correlations, sample size, and practical significance: A comparison of selected psychological and medical investigations. *The Journal of Psychology, 129*(4), 469–475. doi:10.1080/00223980.1995.9914982
- Sukamolson, S. (2007). Fundamentals of quantitative research. Bangkok, Thailand: EJTR. URL: <http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/Research/e-Journal/bod/Suphat%20Sukamolson.pdf>
- Sunar, D. (2002). Change and continuity in the Turkish middle-class family. Autonomy and dependence in family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective, *11*, 217-238.
- Sunar, D., and Fisek, G. (2005). "Contemporary Turkish families," in families in global perspective, eds U. Gielen and J. Roopnarine (Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon), 169–183.
- Sutcliffe, A. G., Barnes, J., Belsky, J., Gardiner, J., & Melhuish, E. (2012). The health and development of children born to older mothers in the United Kingdom: observational study using longitudinal cohort data. *BMJ, 345*doi:10.1136/bmj.e5116
- Thompson, R. A., & Meyer, S. (2007). Socialization of Emotion Regulation in the Family. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 249–268). The Guilford Press.
- Trommsdorff, G., and Rothbaum, F. (2008). "Development of emotion regulation in cultural context," in regulating emotions: Culture, social necessity, and biological inheritance, eds M. Vandekerckhove, C. v. Scheve, S. Ismer, S. Jung, and S. Kronast (Oxford: Blackwell), 85–120.
- Tu, Y. & Chou, M. (2013). Interrelationships between Parenting Styles and Teachers Involvement: From Children's Emotion Regulation Competence Perspective. *Journal of Applied Sciences, 13*: 1066-1072.
- Walker, J. M. (2008). Looking at teacher practices through the lens of parenting style. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 76*(2), 218-240.
- Williford, A. P., Vick Whittaker, J. E., Vitiello, V. E., & Downer, J. T. (2013). Children's engagement within the preschool classroom and their development of self-regulation. *Early Education & Development, 24*(2), 162-187.
- Wischerth, G. A.; Mulvaney, M. K., Brackett, M. A., Perkins, D. (2016). The adverse influence of permissive parenting on personal growth and the mediating role of emotional intelligence. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 177*(5), 185–189. doi:10.1080/00221325.2016.1224223

- Yağmurlu, B., & Altan, Ö. (2010). Maternal socialization and child temperament as predictors of emotion regulation in Turkish preschoolers. *Infant and Child Development, 19*(3), 275– 296.
- Yağmurlu, B., Çitlak, B., Dost, A., & Leyendecker, B. (2009). Türk annelerin çocuk sosyalleştirme hedeflerinde eğitime bağlı olarak gözlemlenen farklılıklar. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 24*(63), 1-15.
- Yağmurlu, B., & Sanson, A. (2009). Acculturation attitudes and parenting in Turkish-Australian mothers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 40*, 361–380.
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Skinner, E. A. (2011). The development of coping across childhood and adolescence: An integrative review and critique of research. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 35*(1), 1-17.