

PREDICTING CHILD SOCIOEMOTIONAL COMPETENCE:
THE ROLE OF DIFFERENT FORMS OF PARENTAL CONTROL
AND WARMTH

BEYZA ÖZYOL

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2023

PREDICTING CHILD SOCIOEMOTIONAL COMPETENCE:
THE ROLE OF DIFFERENT FORMS OF PARENTAL CONTROL
AND WARMTH

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

Psychology

by

Beyza Özyol

Boğaziçi University

2023

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Beyza Özyol, 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

Predicting Child Socioemotional Competence:

The Role of Different Forms of Parental Control and Warmth

The current study focuses on the role of parental control and warmth on child socioemotional competence. Therefore, this study examined how maternal control (i.e., parental monitoring, structuring, psychological control, and culturally valued parental control) and warmth relate to school age children's social and emotional functioning based on self-report from a sample of Turkish mothers. Participants were 213 mothers of children (112 girls and 101 boys) between 7-18 years. Participants were administered a battery that consist of a demographics form and various scales regarding parenting practices and child outcomes. Data was analyzed using principal component analysis, bivariate correlation, and hierarchical multiple regression. Findings revealed that maternal psychological control was related to lower prosocial behaviors and higher child internalizing symptoms; however, it was not associated with child externalizing problems. Parental structuring was only found to be positively related to higher prosocial behaviors. Parental monitoring was linked to lower child internalizing problems and higher prosocial behaviors; however, it was not related to child externalizing problems. Culturally valued parental control was associated with higher child internalizing, externalizing problems, and lower prosocial behaviors, addressing the importance of examining culture-specific parental practices. Lastly, parental warmth was only associated with higher prosocial behaviors.

ÖZET

Çocuğun Sosyo-duygusal Uyumunda

Farklı Ebeveyn Kontrol Uygulamalarının ve Sıcaklığın Rolü

Bu çalışma, çocuğun sosyo-duygusal uyumunda ebeveyn kontrolü ve sıcaklığının rolüne odaklanmakla birlikte Türk kültürüne özgü ebeveyn kontrol davranışlarını incelemektedir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma, anne kontrolü ve sıcaklığının okul çağındaki çocukların içselleştirme, dışsallaştırma ve prososyal davranışlarıyla nasıl ilişkili olduğunu araştırmaktadır. Araştırmaya 7-18 yaş arası çocukların (112 kız ve 101 erkek) anneleri katılmıştır. Katılımcılara ebeveynlik ve çocuk sonuçlarına ilişkin demografik bilgiler ve ölçeklerden oluşan bir batarya uygulanmıştır. Veriler temel bileşenler analizi, korelasyon ve hiyerarşik çoklu regresyon kullanılarak analiz edildi. Bulgular, psikolojik kontrolün çocuklarda daha fazla içselleştirme problemleri ve daha az prososyal davranışla ilişkili olduğunu ortaya koydu. Ebeveynin sınır koyma davranışlarının ise çocuklarda sadece daha fazla prososyal davranışlarla da ilişkili olduğu gözlemlendi. Diğer bir yandan, annelerin çocuğu izleme davranışları çocuklarda daha fazla içselleştirme ve daha az prososyal davranışlarla bağlantılı bulunurken; çocuğun dışsallaştırma problemleriyle alakalı olmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Kültürel olarak değer verilen ebeveyn kontrolünün ise, araştırmadaki diğer ebeveyn kontrol uygulamalarının (yani, psikolojik kontrol, yapılandırma ve izleme) ötesinde bir role sahip olarak daha fazla çocuk içselleştirme ve dışsallaştırma problemleri ile ilişkili olduğu; fakat, daha az prososyal davranışı öngördüğü bulunmuştur. Son olarak, ebeveyn sıcaklığının ise sadece çocuğun prososyal davranışları ile olumlu yönde ilişki gösterdiği gözlemlenmiştir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my advisor Prof. Feyza orapı for her support and guidance through this research journey. I am very grateful to her for always listening to me patiently and helping me overcome the difficulties in this process. I sincerely would like to thank to Prof. Nebi Smer for his precious and constructive feedbacks. This project would be impossible without their encouragement. I am also grateful to Assist. Prof. Nihal Yeniad, my committee member, for her valuable and inspiring comments.

This study was conducted as a part of a TUBITAK research project (118K31). Special thanks to the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK), for their financial assistance towards my education and our research.

Last but not least, I would like to thank especially my siblings Yasemin and Ahmet zyol for always supporting me during this difficult, long but exciting journey, comforting me by meeting all my emotional turbulences and making me become more positive. They always teach me that all stressful times can be overcome with love, compassion, and humor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1 Definitions of parental control practices.....	3
2.2 The relationship between parental control practices and socioemotional competence	4
2.3 The role of culture on the link between parental control and child socioemotional competence.....	8
2.4 Parental control in Turkey	17
2.5 The present study	23
CHAPTER 3: METHOD	26
3.1 Participants	26
3.2 Measures	27
3.3 Procedure	33
3.4 Data Analysis	33
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	36
4.1 Principal component analysis	36
4.2 Correlation analysis	38
4.3 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis	41
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	49
5.1 Developing a culturally appropriate parental control scale	49
5.2 Maternal control / warmth and child internalizing problems	50
5.3 Maternal control / warmth and child externalizing problems	52
5.4 Maternal control / warmth and child prosocial behaviors	53

5.5 Limitations and future directions	53
5.6 Conclusion.....	55
APPENDIX A: ETHICAL PERMISSION FORM	56
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT (TURKISH)	57
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT (ENGLISH)	59
APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHIC FORM (TURKISH)	61
APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHIC FORM (ENGLISH)	66
APPENDIX F: PARENTAL MONITORING SCALE (TURKISH)	71
APPENDIX G: PARENTAL MONITORING SCALE (ENGLISH)	72
APPENDIX H: PARENTAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL SCALE (TURKISH)	73
APPENDIX I: PARENTAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL SCALE (ENGLISH)	74
APPENDIX J: BEHAVIORAL CONTROL ITEMS DEVELOPED FROM THE QUALITATIVE DATA (TURKISH)	75
APPENDIX K: BEHAVIORAL CONTROL ITEMS DEVELOPED FROM THE QUALITATIVE DATA (ENGLISH)	77
APPENDIX L: PARENTAL WARMTH SCALE (TURKISH)	79
APPENDIX M: PARENTAL WARMTH SCALE (ENGLISH)	80
APPENDIX N: STRENGTH AND DIFFICULTIES QUESTIONNAIRE (TURKISH).....	81
APPENDIX O: STRENGTH AND DIFFICULTIES QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH)	82
APPENDIX P: ITEM LOADINGS IN PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS (TURKISH)	83
APPENDIX R: ITEM LOADINGS IN PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS	

(ENGLISH)	85
REFERENCES	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Findings of the Sample	27
Table 2. Eigenvalues, Total Variances and Cumulative Variances of Components ..	38
Table 3. Pearson Correlation Analysis Between the Demographics, Research Predictors and Child Outcomes	40
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of the Predictor and Outcome Variables	41
Table 5. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Internalizing Problems ...	43
Table 6. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Externalizing Problems ..	45
Table 7. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Prosocial Behaviors	48

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Socioemotional adjustment is defined as the set of skills characterized by effective interaction with others and the ability to regulate emotions (LeBuffe, Ross, Fleming & Naglieri, 2013). Children and youth with better socio emotional adjustment are more likely to attain academic and occupational success, and earnings (National Center for Education Statistics 2021). Moreover, socioemotional adjustment protects individuals against developing mental health problems such as depression, anxiety, externalizing problems as well as physical health problems (e.g., Burt & Roisman, 2010; Mikolajczak, Avalosse, Vancorenland, van Broeck, Fantini-Hauwel & Mierop, 2015). In addition to preventing negative consequences, socioemotional adjustment promotes prosocial behaviors such as being cooperative and helping others who are in need (Garrett-Peters, Castro & Halberstadt, 2016; Schonert-Reichl, Smith, Zaidman-Zait & Hertzman, 2011). Socioemotional adjustment tasks are of particular importance in middle childhood (7-12 years) and adolescence (12-18 years) as children establish not only intimate same- but also opposite-sex peer relations, learn socially appropriate behaviors, self-regulation and lay the foundations for academic achievement (Jones, Greenberg, & Crowley, 2015).

It is well documented that parental behaviors have a significant influence on child socioemotional competence (e.g., Amato & Fowler, 2002; Deater-Deckard, 2000; Morris, Silk, Steinberg, Sessa, Avenevoli & Essex, 2002). Parenting has been commonly conceptualized as consisting of two dimensions which are responsiveness and demandingness (Baumrind, 1966; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Responsiveness corresponds to the parental behaviors that include showing warmth and affection to the child, being sensitive and supportive for the child's needs, unconditional

acceptance and being involved in the parent-child relationship; whereas demandingness dimension refers to the parental behaviors that attempt to control the acts of the child through limit setting, monitoring, manipulating the child's thought and emotions (i.e., psychological control) and harsh control (Baumrind, 1991; Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009).

The present study focuses on three main objectives shaped around parental control in Turkish culture. First, the predictive role of different forms of parental control practices and warmth on child socioemotional competence were examined. Different forms of control included structuring, monitoring, psychological control and culturally valued parental control. It is important to note that "Culturally valued parental control" were identified after a qualitative analysis conducted within the scope of the current study.

Studies on culturally valued parental control practices are sparse. Commonly used measures may not capture culture-specific parental control behaviors. Also, there are mixed findings about the role of parental psychological control on children's psychological adjustment in more collectivistic cultures. Moreover, research with respect to parental control, particularly psychological control placed more emphasis on adolescence period; however, the present study will examine those practices during middle childhood beside adolescence. Therefore, this study aims to fill these gaps in the literature regarding culture and parental control.

In the following sections, different forms of parental control and warmth were described. Next, the associations between those parental control practices and child socioemotional adjustment were delineated. Third, the role of culture on child socioemotional competence was discussed. Finally, the hypothesis of the study was presented.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Definitions of parental control practices: structuring, monitoring, psychological control

Structuring: Parental control is a quite comprehensive concept that usually leads to confusion in the parenting literature (Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009). Multiple-forms approach indicated that there are different forms of parental control, which either correspond to intrusive type of control (e.g., power assertion, psychological control) or pertain supervision and guidance of children's acts (e.g., behavioral control). To resolve this complexity, Grolnick and Pomerantz (2009) suggested that parental behaviors characterized by intrusion, dominance and pressure must be acknowledged as parental control as these behaviors basically prioritize parents' views instead of the child. On the other hand, parental restrictions to supervise child behaviors by taking the child's perspective was referred to as structuring. Grolnick and Pomerantz pointed out (2009) that structuring involves open communication of parental expectations, setting consistent rules and giving clear feedbacks to the child with the goal of promoting competence (Farkas & Grolnick, 2008; Grolnick, Deci & Ryan, 1997).

Parental monitoring: Parental monitoring was primarily described as "a set of correlated parenting behaviors involving attention to and tracking of the child's whereabouts, activities and adaptations" (Dishion & McMahon, 1998, p. 61). However, this definition was criticized and reinterpreted by Stattin and Kerr (2000). According to them, the primary definition emphasizes only the parental knowledge without addressing the source of knowledge. They pointed out that parents can get

knowledge about their children's lives in three ways which are child disclosure, solicitation (i.e., active knowledge acquisition by asking directly to the child or his/her close ones) and using control practices. They suggest that if parents learn their children's whereabouts through asking children's friends and imposing restrictions rather than voluntary child disclosure, those parental behaviors should not be considered as monitoring. That is to say, parental monitoring must be based on open parent-child communication and rapport instead of tracking and surveillance (i.e., solicitation).

Psychological control: One relatively recent control that Barber (1996) has described is parental psychological control (PPC) conceptualized as a form of manipulative control to make child conform parental demands by withdrawing love, inducing guilt, invalidating feelings, shaming and intrusiveness. PPC is generally perceived as violating the autonomy and attachment security (Barber & Harmon, 2002; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Scharf & Goldner, 2018; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010).

2.2 The relationship between parental control practices and child socioemotional competence

It is well acknowledged in the literature that structuring and monitoring have been found to promote positive child and adolescent outcomes such as prosocial behaviors, higher self-esteem, and academic achievements (e.g., Bean, Bush, McKenry & Wilson, 2003; van der Bruggen, Stams & Bögels, 2008). However, regarding parental psychological control, a bulk of research highlighted that it is more commonly linked to child maladjustment in terms of psychological, behavioral, and social domains (Barber, 1996).

Most of the research investigating the relationship between parenting and child-adolescent adjustment have addressed parental control practices, without distinguishing them. For instance, in a review that focused on the relation of child rearing practices with internalizing problems, Rapee (1997) grouped parental practices based on the previous studies into two factors, namely rejection and control. In his study, rejection was measured on a continuum involving acceptance/warmth on one side and criticism/hostility on the other side. Parental control was measured based on parental overprotection and the level of autonomy granting, which resembles a component of PPC characterized by parental intrusiveness and overinvolvement. According to the main findings in the reviewed studies, it was concluded that parental control behaviors involving overprotection and a lack of autonomy support were more closely linked to offspring anxiety, whereas parental rejection was more related to depression. Also, this association was stronger for clinical samples compared to non-clinical samples.

Similarly, a meta-analysis including 47 studies examined the relation of parental rejection and control with child anxiety (McLeod, Wood, & Weisz, 2007). Parental withdrawal, aversiveness and warmth were measured for rejection dimension; overinvolvement and autonomy granting were measured for control dimension. The study samples included both diagnosed and non-diagnosed children between the ages of 2 and 18.8 years. A small but significant association was found between parenting and child anxiety. Higher levels of parental overinvolvement and lower levels of autonomy granting indicated stronger association with anxiety than parental rejection, like the findings by Rapee (1997) suggested. The strongest association was found between autonomy granting and child anxiety such that higher

levels of autonomy granting and lower levels of overinvolvement were related to lower levels of childhood anxiety (McLeod et al., 2007).

More recently, Piquart (2017) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis involving 1435 studies regarding the relation of five parenting dimensions, namely parental responsiveness/warmth, behavioral control, harsh control, psychological control and autonomy granting with child-adolescent externalizing behaviors. It has been revealed that warmth, structuring and autonomy granting showed negative associations of small magnitude of with externalizing behaviors. On the other hand, harsh and psychological control were significantly and positively related to those behaviors. Additionally, these associations were longitudinal, meaning that high levels of warmth, autonomy support, regulating child behaviors by supervision and guidance predicted fewer externalizing problems, whereas psychological and harsh control predicted increasing levels of externalizing behaviors over time, although these relations were small in magnitude. Moreover, the link between childrearing practices and externalizing problems were stronger as children moved toward adolescence. A recent review by Yan, Zhang, Ran, Li & Niu (2020) also pointed out the role of child age in this relation, suggesting that psychological control was a stronger predictor of internalizing and externalizing symptoms as well as substance use during adolescence compared to younger ages.

Due to the increased importance of the youth's independence from parents, parental monitoring has been most frequently studied with samples of adolescents. Although relatively few studies examined the role of parental monitoring during middle childhood, studies mostly reported a positive relation between monitoring and better child adjustment in the realm of emotional, social, and academic aspects (e.g., Dishion & McMahon, 1998). For instance, Bumpus and Hill (2008) investigated the

reciprocal relations among child secrecy, parent-child communication, parental knowledge, and child adjustment during middle childhood. In this one-year longitudinal study, third and fourth graders reported their parents' knowledge about their lives, parent-child communication, parental solicitation and lastly the secrecy in their relationship. Also, teachers rated children's adjustment by considering their overt aggression, relational aggression, and social competence. The findings of the study indicated that child secrecy at year 1 was positively related to child overt aggression and oppositional behaviors, whereas it was negatively related to child social competence at year 2. On the other hand, children who reported higher parental knowledge at year 1 were perceived more socially competent by their teachers at year 2. In line with this view, Stattin and Kerr (2000) revealed in their study with 14-year-old adolescents that low levels of child disclosure, but not parental control or solicitation, was the strongest predictor of adolescent norm breaking behaviors. In other words, high levels of disclosure were related to less norm breaking behaviors.

When the third component of socioemotional competence, namely prosocial behavior, is taken into consideration, it is worth to note that a wealth of literature accentuated that several parenting practices may play a crucial role on child prosocial behaviors (see Spinrad & Gal, 2018 for a review). Prosocial behaviors consist of showing cooperation, responsibility, empathy, assertion, and self-control that (Gresham & Elliot, 1990; Gryczkowski, Jordan & Mercer, 2017). Gryczkowski et al. (2017) examined the predictive role of several parental practices, namely positive parenting (e.g., praise, reward), involvement, poor monitoring/supervision, inconsistent discipline, and corporal punishment on prosocial behaviors among the children between the ages of 6-17 years. The findings demonstrated that positive

parenting was related to increased prosocial behaviors, whereas corporal punishment was related to decreased prosocial behaviors among girls only. Additionally, for young and middle-aged children, but not adolescents, both maternal and paternal involvement, (i.e., nurturing, supportive behaviors) predicted higher levels of prosocial behaviors. This relationship was stronger for the youngest age groups. On the other hand, inconsistent discipline shown by both parents was a significant predictor of less prosocial behavior when child age and sex were controlled.

In a similar vein, a longitudinal study involving children, both parents and teachers examined the relation between parental sensitivity and child prosocial behaviors when children were 54 months, third, fifth and sixth graders (Newton, Laible, Carlo, Steele, & McGinley, 2014). Parental sensitivity which consists of two dimensions, namely respecting autonomy, and supportive presence, was measured via structured observations during various structured tasks. It was found that both maternal and paternal sensitivity at 54 months predicted higher levels of prosocial behaviors during middle childhood, suggesting that parents who act in a warm and supportive way act to foster prosociality in their children.

2.3 The role of culture on the link between parental control and child socioemotional competence

Culture might have an impact on how children are influenced by parental control in two ways. First, cultures can involve idiosyncratic ways of controlling behaviors that may not be captured by the commonly used parenting measures. For instance, Chao (1994) introduced a Chinese term named “guan” to define a culturally valued parenting style, particularly observed among Asian parents. Guan was translated to

English as “to govern” and “training” (Tobin, Wu & Davidson, 1989). Besides conveying a restricting meaning, *guan* also refer to loving and caring attitude while training the child for appropriate behaviors and acting as a role model. In addition, filial piety which refers to the respect for elders and the hierarchy in the family, is an important parental goal among Chinese parents. This goal, in return, increases parental anticipation of compliant behaviors from children in the Chinese culture (Chan, Bowes & Wyner, 2007). In line with this view, Chan and colleagues emphasized that although Asian parents were commonly categorized as authoritarian and punitive according to the Western-based parenting measures, they were mainly found as authoritative yet psychologically controlling when indigenous parental behaviors were taken into consideration.

In their studies including parents from Hong-Kong and Taiwan, Lieber, Fung and Wing-Leung Leung (2006) created an indigenous parenting scale that consists of shame and training subscales along with commonly used subscales in Western societies such as authoritative. They highlighted that shame is highly valued in the Chinese culture. It is deemed as parents’ responsibility and social obligation to socialize their children to be ashamed to raise a moral and socially sensitive child. Likewise, Camras, Sun, Li and Wright (2012) introduced a specific parental control scale named critical comparison shaming (CCS) based on the Chinese culture, which corresponds to shaming the child by comparing him/her with peers. CCS was more commonly reported by Chinese children compared to American children. Moreover, findings revealed that in both cultures CCS was related to poorer psychosocial and academic functioning among children.

Shek (2007) has also presented a scale measuring indigenous parental control behaviors that were depicted from the traditional Chinese parenting practices among

Hong-Kong Chinese parents of early adolescents. This scale consisted of several items regarding parental control behaviors such as “When I do something wrong, my father requires me to have self-reflection”, “My father expects me to have good behavior so that I will not bring dishonor to the family” and “My father expects me to interact with older people with respect and courtesy”. Emphasis was placed on several themes in this parental control scale such as being an obedient child, having a good virtue, avoiding bringing dishonor to the family and teaching responsibility of parents. In their research, those parental control behaviors were not necessarily found detrimental for adolescents’ relationship quality with parents and for their psychological well-being (i.e., life satisfaction, self-esteem, sense of control and hopelessness). However, when the Western-based psychological control behaviors (i.e., invalidating feelings, personal attack, love withdrawal, constraining verbal expression and excessive control) were low, Chinese parental control was positively related with adolescents’ positive outcomes. On the other hand, Chinese parental control had negative influence on adolescent well-being when psychological control behaviors defined by Western literature was also high.

In parallel with the interest of the present research, a qualitative study was conducted to identify culturally valued parental control behaviors in Turkey. This study pointed to three parental practices, namely manipulative control, conditional perfectionism, and threat of social exclusion (Tümer, 2021). Manipulative control was defined as a form of psychological control referring to direct the child’s behaviors by lying or deceiving the child. Conditional perfectionism included parental warnings of how current disobedience may lead to later harmful consequences. Lastly, threat of social exclusion corresponded to parental threats that

child misconduct would result in exclusion from the social environment such as friends.

A review on the relation of parenting and culture revealed that parenting includes both similarities and differences within and between countries (Lansford, 2021). Similarities in parenting are mostly around the universal needs of children such as physical and psychological needs involving feeding, protection, love, and acceptance, while differences in the manifestation of these parenting behaviors may result from the prevailing family type, values, belief systems, affordances, and constraints in a specific culture. Variability in parental practices were specifically observed in physical caregiving, cognitive stimulation, discipline, and monitoring. Lansford (2002) argued that the cultural context might influence the child's perception of parents' controlling behaviors, which in return may accentuate or attenuate the level of children's internalizing or externalizing problems. Indeed, the link between parental control and child outcomes has yielded inconsistent findings across cultures. In her review, Lansford (2021) introduced two potential moderators, namely normativeness and legitimacy of parental authority which shed light on why these differences might occur. Lansford concluded that these moderators have an influence on how children interpret several parenting practices and in turn, be affected by that behavior. In cultures where the exertion of parental authority is commonly observed and viewed as accepted as the legitimate right of parents, children and adolescents may not perceive those behaviors as intrusive. But still, even in cultures where spanking is seen as normative, there is a positive relation between spanking and child aggression, albeit weak (see review, Lansford, 2021).

Several studies conducted in East Asia indicated that parental control is perceived as a part of 'good parenting' and was not necessarily combined with

parental negative affect (Grusec, Rudy & Martini, 1997; Pomerantz & Wang, 2009). Therefore, a controlling behavior that has negative impact on children living in Western societies might not have a harmful influence on children from non-Western societies or vice versa, since that behavior is seen as appropriate and consistent with the beliefs and values about child rearing in that culture. On the contrary, other researchers who relied on the premises of the Self-Determination Theory pointed out that autonomy is a universal need and any behavior which limits and violates the individuals' self-endorsement will be detrimental regardless of the culture (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2000).

To illustrate, the study of Olsen et al. (2002) revealed that the relationship between psychological control and children's behavioral problems was moderated by culture. Although the study focused on the preschool period, psychological control exerted by mothers was associated with both internalizing problems and externalizing problems in the U.S. sample. While psychological control was associated with externalizing problems only in the Russian sample, no association was detected in the Chinese sample.

Similarly, another study (Fung & Lau, 2012) has investigated psychological control as divided into two types as (1) hostile (i.e., constraining verbal expression, invalidating feelings, personal attack, and emotional erratic behavior) and (2) relational (i.e., guilt induction, reciprocity, love withdrawal and social comparison). Hostile psychological control was associated with negative outcomes in both Hong Kong (HK) and European American (EA) samples of children aged 7-10, while the relational induction predicted child maladjustment only in the European American sample, but not in Hong Kong sample, (Fung & Lau, 2012). Moreover, relational

induction was perceived as more positively related to parental rejection in the EA sample than in the HK sample.

Parallel to these findings, Dwairy and Achoul (2009) found that parental control characterized by power assertion and authoritarianism was positively associated with psychological mental health problems in adolescents living in Western societies. The researchers also added that despite parental control was reported more frequently in Eastern societies, the negative relationship between controlling parenting (i.e., power assertion and authoritarianism) and child psychological health was not observed among adolescents living in these societies.

Chao and Aque (2009) also placed an emphasis on the variability of perception and judgements of regarding parental control behaviors depending on the cultures. They investigated the moderating role of adolescents' affective interpretations on the relation between parental structuring, psychological control, and behavioral adjustment. This study involved European Americans (EA) and three Asian immigrant groups (i.e., Chinese, Korean, Filipino). It was concluded that EA adolescents felt angrier in response to their parents' controlling behaviors as compared to Asian immigrants, and the feeling of anger reduced the detrimental impacts of psychological control among EA adolescents; however, those adolescents took less advantage from the beneficial outcomes of structuring as their anger increased. This kind of association was not observed among immigrant participants. These results suggested that the experience of anger played a protective role for EA participants. It is possible that the experience and expression of anger revealed their psychological rejection of parental control, which consequently might attenuate the role of parental control on internalizing and externalizing behaviors. Overall, these studies point to the important role of perception of cultural

normativeness when investigating the relation between parental control and child psychological adjustment.

Regarding prosocial behaviors, a group of studies indicated that parental behaviors that facilitate prosocial behaviors among children may differ across cultures. According to a study with Australian and Turkish immigrant mothers of preschoolers, Yağmurlu and Sanson (2009) reported that inductive reasoning and warmth were predictors of prosocial behaviors in the Australian sample, whereas obedience-demanding controlling parenting behavior was a stronger predictor of prosocial behaviors in the Turkish sample. Studies also referred to the two facets of culture impacting the prosocial behaviors of children, which are cultural orientation and culture-specific values (see review, Guzman, Do & Kok, 2014). It is suggested that maternal involvement (i.e., warmth and responsiveness) endorses other-oriented behaviors among adolescents such as helping an individual in social group, through fostering collectivistic values on them (Davis, Streit, Carlo and Schwartz, 2017). Given the role of culture-specific values on prosocial behaviors, several research supported that parents' endorsing of familism "characterized by supporting the family members emotionally, physically and financially; having a sense of obligation toward the family; and cooperating with family members" encourages Mexican American adolescents to be more prosocial in general (Calderon & Carlo, 2011, p.98); although, it is not positively related to all prosocial behavior forms such as altruistic (Streit, Carlo, Knight, White & Maiya, 2021). Streit et al. (2021) also underscored the role of parenting practices on prosocial behaviors. In their study, it has been found that while parental acceptance was positively linked to adolescents' prosocial behaviors, harsh parenting was also positively related to prosocial

behaviors among Latino adolescents. Yet, paternal harsh control was only predicting public, but not altruistic prosocial behaviors, which includes selfish motivations.

On the other hand, scholars with universalist view argue against the variance of the effects of parental control on children across different cultures. Pomerantz and Wang (2009) concluded in their review that parental control characterized by intrusion, pressuring and domination may have deleterious impact on child and adolescent psychological functioning in both Western and Eastern cultures, along with stronger association in Western culture when parents fail to reduce this kind of parental control as their children move toward adolescence. Similarly, Scharf and Goldner (2018) highlighted that PPC was detrimental for both Eastern and Western cultures, but the effects were more salient among Western countries in terms of internalizing and externalizing problems according to their review. Another empirical study that examined PPC regarding relational and achievement domains revealed findings supporting the universalist view of self-determination theory, suggesting that one of the most basic human motivations is experiencing autonomy in his acts and this psychological need does not change across cultures (Soenens, Park, Vansteenkiste & Mauratidis, 2012). In that study, Koreans perceived their parents as using slightly more dependency oriented PPC (i.e., pressure for close physical and emotional proximity) and achievement oriented PPC (i.e., pressure for higher achievement in performance-relevant situations). Yet, higher levels of depressive symptoms were seen in relation to both types of PPC among both Korean and Belgian adolescents.

Likewise, Helwig, To, Wang, Liu and Yang (2013) examined how children between 7-14 years make attributions regarding their mothers' induction/reasoning and three sub-dimensions of psychological control, namely love withdrawal, shaming

and social comparison shaming in rural-urban China and Canada. Participants from both cultures reported that they perceived induction as a good way to discipline their behaviors; however, love withdrawal and shaming were more negatively evaluated in Canada, followed by urban, and then rural China. Besides, detrimental consequences were least attributed to measured psychological control dimension in rural China. Although parental discipline characterized by shaming or love withdrawal was being perceived as more prevailing in China than in Canada, it was increasingly negatively evaluated and considered to have harmful impacts on children's self-esteem and psychological well-being as children get older in China.

The conclusion of a very recent meta-analysis (Chyung, Ae Lee, Ahn & Bang, 2021) including 95 studies on the link between PPC and child-adolescent psychological distress was in line with the assertion of the universalist view as well. The researchers argue that for both individualistic and collectivistic cultures, psychological control was found to be related with high depression and anxiety among children and youth. However, child age was a moderator such that the strongest association was detected during early adolescence period. As opposed to the findings of the previously mentioned studies, the relation between PPC and children's internalizing symptoms was higher in collectivistic cultures, suggesting that living in a culture where being a part of a group is valued and boundaries between individuals are unclear might be related to more psychological distress when psychological control is shown by parents.

A recent longitudinal study conducted by Rothenberg and colleagues (2020) demonstrated that the effects of parental control characterized by power assertion (e.g., parents insist child do exactly as told) on externalizing problems (e.g., aggression and rule-breaking behavior) among early adolescents did not vary across

twelve cultures including both individualistic and collectivistic cultures. That is, power assertion was found to be related to subsequent child aggression and rule-breaking behaviors around age 10; despite the effect of parental warmth on these child outcomes varied across cultures.

When parental monitoring is taken into consideration in the aspect of culture, existing literature does not address much variability across cultures as compared to other parental control forms. Lee and Randolph (2015) revealed negative relation between parental monitoring and aggressive behavior among 10th grade students for both US and South Korea. The only difference between these cultures was that parental monitoring had an indirect effect on adolescent aggression through smoking, alcohol use and lowered self-esteem in South Korea, whereas for US direct relation is found. Besides, some studies refer to changes in the amount of parental monitoring among different ethnicities. For instance, Romero and Ruiz (2007) explained that familism leads parents to monitor their adolescent children more in Mexican parents residing in US which resulting in less risky behaviors (e.g., substance use) for coping with stress.

2.4 Parental control in Turkey

Religious, moral, and social values are crucial for parental socialization since they shape parents' beliefs and goals for child rearing (e.g., Emmen, Malda, Mesman, Ekmekçi & van IJendoorn, 2012). Scholars emphasized that parents in collectivistic cultures may socialize their children to have more altruistic tendencies such as prioritizing others' interests, perspective taking and empathic concern to maintain group harmony (Chopik, O'Brien & Konrath, 2017; Knight & Carlo, 2012; Zhang, Anderson, Dong, Nguyen-Jahiel, Li, Lin & Miller, 2013).

Additionally, Çatay, Allen and Samstag (2008) examined the maternal regulation strategies of both American and Turkish mothers through interviewing with the mothers regarding eight hypothetical vignettes about children's misbehaviors. The most obvious distinction between American and Turkish mothers was that American mothers were more likely to use direct controlling behaviors such as setting clear rules, using rewards and punishments, whereas Turkish mothers employed indirect regulation strategies such as appealing to other authority figures' approval, appealing to other's feelings and modeling that are related to moral training and conforming social expectations. Appeals to consequences were also common among both Turkish and American mothers which is associated to reasoning. What is more, higher SES Turkish mothers differed from low SES Turkish mothers in terms of employing negotiation that is characterized by offering alternatives to children and paying attention to their desires. These findings seem in accordance with the view suggested by Kağıtçıbaşı, Sunar and Bekman (1988). According to this view, preventing children's undesired conduct by relying on external reasons (e.g., emphasizing religious/moral values, authority figures) and by inducing anxiety and shame is common among Turkish families, particularly among the traditional ones. Despite these findings, most of the parental control measures do not include such items. In addition to culturally valued parental control practices delineated above, parenting in Turkey has evolved over time through modernization and urbanization. According to the family change model introduced by Kağıtçıbaşı (2005), parents' expectations and goals from their children changed as families in Turkey switched from the interdependent model to the psychological interdependence model, in other words, from relatedness orientation to autonomous-related orientation through rapid economic growth and social change. With the influence of urbanization and

modernization in Turkey, parents aim to socialize their children for being more assertive and self-initiated due to its adaptive role in a more competitive environment, while anticipating them to protect the close bonds with their family members as well which is also adaptive for a collectivistic-based culture (Kagitcibasi, 2007). This socialization process manifests itself in the expectations from children such that they are expected to be compliant but self-reliant at the same time. Thus, obedience-demanding, and punitive behaviors to control children/adolescent are more frequently observed among Turkish parents, particularly among families from low SES and in rural areas, than individualistic cultures; although these power-assertive controlling behaviors replaced by more autonomy supportive behaviors among middle-upper class and educated Turkish parents in the last decades (see Sen, Yavuz-Müren & Yağmurlu, 2013 for a review).

There are limited studies describing parental control in Turkey based on different cohorts. For instance, a recent study comparing four cultures suggested that Chinese, Korean and Turkish mothers of preschool-aged children differ from European American mothers as these mothers emphasize both relatedness and autonomy; whereas European American mothers focus more on child individuality and agency (Cho, Cheah, Vu, Selçuk, Yavuz, Sen & Park, 2021). Furthermore, Turkish mothers reported using less physical punishment and verbal control (i.e., threatening, warning, and scolding) compared to Chinese and Korean mothers. On the other hand, Turkish mothers reported using psychological control more than Korean and European American mothers for the endorsement of obedience. Complementary evidence supported this finding by revealing that parental psychological control was rated more by Turkish university student in than US university student (Dinn & Sunar, 2017). Additionally, a within culture qualitative

research (Tümer, 2021) demonstrated that two forms of psychological control which are overprotection and invalidating feelings were found to be more common in compared to other PPC forms among Turkish parents of school aged children. A cross-cultural study involving eight countries (i.e., Argentina, France, Germany, Greece, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, and Turkey) also added that Turkey was among the highest countries in which adolescents reported anxious parental monitoring (Weitkamp & Seiffge-Krenke, 2018).

Another study examining maternal regulatory behaviors in response to toddlers' difficult emotions among four cultures (i.e., Turkey, US, Romania, Israel) in a delay of gratification task revealed four response profiles of mothers (Friedlmeier, Çorapçı, Susa & Benga, 2019). These profiles included different combinations of distraction, positive control or in other words behavioral control (i.e., stating rules, prohibitions, explanations), negative control (i.e., scolding, punishment), physical warmth and verbal comforting. While mothers from US, Israel and Romania were represented mostly in the profiles including distraction accompanied by some degree of positive control and physical warmth, Turkish mothers were represented in the control/verbal comfort profile, that included maternal behaviors of positive control and warmth, highlighting the commonality of maternal control in Turkey.

When the predictive role of parental control behaviors on children's psychological adjustment is taken into consideration, the comprehensive review by Sümer, Gündoğdu Aktürk and Helvacı (2010) regarding Turkish parents' behaviors of school-aged children revealed a similar relationship pattern to the Western societies. This review revealed that democratic parenting characterized by high warmth and control (i.e., disciplining and rule setting) was related to positive child

and adolescent outcomes such as high self-esteem, academic competence, and secure attachment as well as fewer internalizing and externalizing problems. On the other hand, authoritarian, permissive, and neglecting parenting which in general consist of unbalanced combinations of warmth and control predicted worse outcomes such as negative self-view, substance use and psychopathology. On the other hand, this review also suggested that parental control behaviors, except excessive forms, were not perceived as distinct from parental warmth and acceptance by Turkish child and adolescents.

The relation between psychological control and child/adolescent outcomes has been documented in several studies. Consistent with the previous studies conducted in Turkey, a study Erzi and Ekşi (2021) suggested that both maternal and paternal structuring defined as behavioral control in their study was negatively correlated with Turkish adolescents' relational aggression through their emotion regulation skills. On the other hand, relational aggression was more prevalent among adolescents whose parents control them psychologically. One-year longitudinal study including early adolescents and their mothers revealed that maternal psychological control reported more commonly by male adolescents, whereas behavioral control was more common by female adolescents (Sönmez, 2011). In general, behavioral control of mothers was found to be a predictor of more positive developmental outcomes such as decrease in negative friendship quality for both genders and less aggressiveness for females. However, although psychological control was not related to one year later negative friendship quality, it was associated with increased aggressiveness for both genders.

Likewise, Kındap Tepe and Sayıl (2012) revealed that more psychological control was perceived from both parents by male adolescents compared to female adolescents, while higher levels of behavioral control was perceived by female adolescents compared to males. Along with highlighting the negative role of psychological control on relational aggression as found in the previous study, Kındap Tepe and her colleague (2012; 2019) also indicated that for male adolescents, high psychological control predicted loneliness through their increased relational aggression and high psychological control and low monitoring of parents predicted peer victimization for female adolescents.

Psychological control was also found to be negatively related to maternal knowledge (i.e., monitoring) such that as mothers reported more intrusion and disrespect for their adolescent children' individuality and privacy; adolescents shared less knowledge with them about their whereabouts and friendships (Mouratidis, Sayıl, Kumru, Selçuk & Soenens, 2019). Mouratidis et al. also presented longitudinal evidence that low maternal knowledge and high psychological control predicted increased antisocial behaviors Turkish adolescents in their study. The relation between psychological control and child/adolescent outcomes has been documented in a number of studies.

Yet, a group of studies in Turkey pointed out the moderating role of parental warmth in the association between parental control and child adjustment with very young children (e.g., Akçınar & Baydar, 2014). It was claimed that parental warmth may alleviate or exacerbate the detrimental influence of parental behavioral and psychological control. Also, Kurt, Sayıl and Kındap Tepe (2013) suggested that Turkish adolescents who were relatively securely attached to their parents were less affected by Parental Psychological Control. Likewise, Acar, Uçuş and Yıldız (2017)

indicated that parental acceptance/warmth plays a moderating role in the relation between parenting and child socioemotional adjustment such that high authoritarian parenting combined with low parental warmth was the strongest predictor of child externalizing behaviors. On the other hand, Selçuk et al. (2021) indicated that high maternal warmth may compensate the deleterious impact of psychological control on adolescent adjustment when psychological control is not frequent; however, adjustment problems increases when both psychological control and maternal warmth is showed by parents often, since this pattern appears to establish an enmeshed parent-child relationship. It suggests that protective role of parental warmth may occur only when the level of a negatively attributed parental behavior was low.

2.5 The present study

The current research was carried out as a sub-project of a more comprehensive main project carried out within the scope of TÜBİTAK, using the pilot data of the main project.

This project entitled “Socio-Cultural and Psychological Antecedents and Consequences of Child-Rearing Styles Across Generations and Developmental Stages in Turkey (#18K030)” was carried out between September 2019 and November 2022 with the cooperation of four universities in Turkey. The goal of this Project was to examine the cultural origins and consequences of child-rearing attitudes and behaviors in Turkey, using qualitative data, comprehensive pilot studies, and representative quantitative data from Turkey. The present study used the data of the second phase (e.g., comprehensive pilot studies) of this TÜBİTAK project. Prior to the pilot study, a qualitative study was conducted within the scope

of the Project through interviews with mothers as well as fathers. Open-ended questions were asked about the child's positive and negative characteristics, parents' child-rearing goals and beliefs, their child rearing practices, perceptions of their parenting experience, and intergenerational parenting comparisons. After the deciphering process of the interviews, The MAXQDA program was used for the systematic analysis of this qualitative data. The common parental reports identified in the qualitative study were integrated to available scales regarding parental control practices and warmth in order to develop more comprehensive measurement tools to be used in the pilot study phase of the project.

The aim of the current study was to shed light on whether parental control behaviors and warmth predict psychological adjustment among children in a non-Western culture in the same way as with Western cultures. This study will also further expand on previous research findings by investigating culturally valued parental control practices that have been identified from the qualitative study described above in addition to examining other commonly used parenting measures. Those culturally valued practices mainly consisted of controlling behaviors related to parental use of religious/moral values and social norms in the service of controlling children's conduct.

Three research hypotheses were examined in this study. In the previously conducted qualitative study, parents reported several practices commonly encountered in Turkish culture (e.g., virtue, familial values, morality) that do not usually exist in Western-based parenting scales. It was hypothesized that those practices would exemplify a culturally valued component in the parenting scale items of the current study.

It was also expected that while parental structuring and monitoring would enhance children's psychosocial adjustment. In other words, higher levels of structuring and monitoring were expected to predict lower levels of internalizing and externalizing symptoms as well as higher prosocial behaviors. On the other hand, it was hypothesized that parental psychological control would predict higher child internalizing and externalizing problems, but lower prosocial behaviors. We explored the role of culturally valued parental control on child adjustment outcomes.

Lastly, parental warmth was expected to predict higher prosocial behaviors and lower child internalizing and externalizing behaviors. Finally, it was explored whether culturally valued parental control practices would predict Turkish children's prosocial behaviors, internalizing and externalizing symptoms above and beyond other parental control practices (i.e., structuring, monitoring, and psychological control).

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.1 Participants

Participants were 213 mothers of children between 7 and 18 years of age (mean age = 45, min. = 34, max. = 66, $SD = 3.81$, 112 girls and 101 boys). With respect of the educational status of the mother's, 16% of them ($N= 16$) graduated from primary school or elementary school, 34% of them ($N= 72$) graduated from high school, 50% of them ($N= 107$) graduated from university or master's or PhD program and lastly, 13% of the mothers ($N= 27$) graduated from a master's of PhD program. As for the marital status, 87% of the mothers ($N= 185$) married, 11% of them ($N= 24$) divorced, 1% ($N=1$) single and 1% ($N=1$) widow. With respect of the educational status of the spouses, it was reported that the 27% of them ($N= 50$) graduated from primary school or elementary school, 46% of them ($N= 25$) graduated from high school, 48% of them ($N= 89$) graduated from university or master's or PhD program. Lastly, for the work status of the participants 6% of them ($N=12$) work full time on her own account, 2% of them ($N=5$) work part time on her own account, 38% of them work full time as paid, %4 of them ($N=8$) work part time as paid and last, 50 of the mothers ($N=107$) not working.

Parents were reached using the convenient sampling method. To facilitate recruitment, a cooperation protocol was signed with Beşiktaş District Directorate of National Education. Teachers from the public schools in Beşiktaş district notified parents about the research project and shared the online link to the parent battery. The research project staff also shared the link on social media outlets. Mothers who

have at least a child between the ages of 7-18 and live in İstanbul were accepted as eligible to be involved.

Table 1. Descriptive Findings of the Sample

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Educational status		
Primary or elementary school graduate	34	16
High school graduate	72	34
Graduated from a university or master's / PhD	107	50
Marital status		
Married	185	87
Divorced	24	11
Single	1	1
Widow	3	1
Work status		
Full time	93	44
Part time	13	6
Not working	107	50
Spouse's educational status		
Primary or elementary school graduate	50	27
High school graduate	46	25
Graduated from a university or master's / PhD	89	48
Mother age	45±6	34-66
Child age	11±2	7-18

3.2 Measures

3.2.1 Demographics

Parents were reached using the convenient sampling method. To facilitate recruitment, a cooperation protocol was signed with Beşiktaş District Directorate of National Education. Teachers from the public schools in Beşiktaş district notified parents about the research project and shared the online link to the parent battery. The research project staff also shared the link on social media outlets. Mothers who have at least a child between the ages of 7-18 and live in İstanbul were accepted as eligible to be involved.

3.2.2 Psychological control

An 18-item scale was created by using mixed method to measure parental psychological control. In addition to seven items created from the qualitative data, eight items from Barber's Psychological Control scale (Barber, 1996) and two items from the EMBU scale (Perris et al., 1980) were used. Those items that came from the qualitative data were the following: I tell my child how hard I worked and worked for her/him, I tell my child that I will not forgive her when she/he does something wrong, I make her/him feel guilty by saying that you upset and disappointed me, I tell her/him that she/he should be ashamed when she/he makes a mistake, I check my child's bag, room or phone to understand what my child is doing, I do not allow my child to spend time with friends away from home, I get offended by my child.

Those items that came from the EMBU scale were the following: I do not let my child do some of the things her/his friends do for fear something will happen to her/him, I dress my child in layers for fear of getting cold.

One item ("I do not allow my child to make friends outside of school for fear of what will happen to him") was created based on parental reports in the qualitative data and a similar item in the EMBU scale.

Barber's Psychological Control scale is a valid and reliable scale frequently used in the literature. A sample item is: "I change the subject when my child is saying something". The adolescent form of the Psychological Control Scale is also a widely used measure in studies with Turkish samples. It was adapted into Turkish by Sayil and Kindap (2010). Participants in the present study were asked to evaluate each item on a 6-point Likert scale (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes,

4=Occasionally 5=Often, 6=Always). The internal consistency value of the scale was.89.

3.2.3 Behavioral control items developed from the qualitative data

The first step of the main TÜBİTAK Project, namely the qualitative research step helped to identify parental child rearing practices labeled as “behavioral control”. Using this qualitative data, a 21-item scale was developed to measure behavioral control in the pilot study quantitatively in a systematic way. In the qualitative study, parental expressions that referred to parental control practices such as explaining rules to child, giving moral lessons (e.g., preaching about not lying), explaining the causes and consequences of inappropriate behaviors, warning, limit setting and distracting child.

Three groups of items were created based on factor analysis. Three factors were emerged. These factors explained 43.6% of the total variance. The eigenvalue of the first factor is 5.3 and the variance it explains is 25.3%. The eigenvalue of the second factor is 2.11 and the variance it explains is 10.04%. The eigenvalue of the third factor was 1.74 and the variance explained was 8.30%.

The first factor named as “moral-based control” referred to warning the child to avoid behaviors that will leave a bad impression on the family. This first factor consisted of seven items (5,6,7,8,9,10,15). An example item is “If my child is disrespectful to an adult, I ask whether my child would like it if your mother/father was disrespected the same?”. The second factor named as “indirect control” corresponded to setting limits without an open conflict with the child (e.g., removing an unwanted toy). This factor included six items (1,2,3,4,20,21). However, for this current study, the items regarding indirect control were not analyzed due to their

irrelevance for middle childhood and adolescence. Lastly, the third factor “discipline-based control” involved parental practices aiming setting limits for the child’s behaviors. One of the example items is “Instead of imposing bans on my child, I set certain limits”. This third factor consisted of five items (11,12,13,14,17). Participants were asked to rate each item on a 6-point Likert scale (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Occasionally, 5=Often, 6=Always). The item 18 was not used because it was inconsistent with the factor it was loaded on, the item 16 was not used since it had insufficient loading, and the item 19 were not used due to loading on more than one factor. The internal consistency values of the factors were measured as .82, .73, and .65 respectively.

3.2.4 Parental monitoring

Monitoring represents the positive control behaviors of parents such as observing children without interfering, getting information about their whereabouts through providing a secure environment for them to open themselves. The Monitoring Scale in the battery consisted of nine items. This scale was created by including 8 items from the Kerr and Stattin’s (2000) study and one item obtained from the qualitative study. As a result of the factor analysis for the Monitoring Scale, two factors were determined. These factors were named as “Parental Knowledge” and “Child Disclosure”.

Two factors explained 54.76% of the total variance. The eigenvalue of the first factor was 3.26, and the variance it explained was 40.82%. The eigenvalue of the second factor was 1.12, and the variance it explained was 13.94%.

Parental knowledge was represented by 4 items (1,2,8,9) and child disclosure factor was represented by 4 items (4,5R,6,7). Item 3 was not used because it did not explain enough variance and was loaded on both factors.

One example item of the Parental knowledge subscale is “I know how my child spends his/her free time”. An example item of the adolescent disclosure subscale is “My child tells me how his/her lessons went at school, how his day was”.

Furthermore, since there were parental statements regarding the monitoring of technology in the qualitative data, an additional item related to technology monitoring was added to the Monitoring subscale (I monitor my child's non-educational technology use).

Participants were asked to evaluate each item on a 6-point Likert scale (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Occasionally, 5=Often, 6=Always). The alpha value of these two factors is at an acceptable level. The alpha value of the first factor is .71. The alpha value of the second factor is .70.

3.2.5 Parental warmth

Parental reports characterized by the attempts to understand the needs of the child, responding to those needs in a timely and proper manner, showing verbal or non-verbal warmth, were coded as items reflecting parental warmth in the qualitative research of the main project. Based on these reports, four items were created. These four items are “I encourage my child to open up to me when they have a problem, I listen to my child when she/he has a problem, I joke with my child, and I support my child if she/he is having difficulties”. Also, five items have been added to the warmth subscale from the EMBU Parent Form (Perris, Jacobsson, Linndström, von Knorring & Perris, 1980), a widely used scale with a Turkish version (Sümer et al. 2009). An example item from the EMBU Warmth scale is “I understand my child’s distress

before he/she says it". Participants were asked to evaluate each item on a 6-point Likert scale (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Occasionally 5=Often, 6=Always). The internal consistency of this scale was .77.

3.2.6 Socioemotional competence

The Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire, developed by Goodman (2007) and adapted into Turkish by Güvenir et al. (2008) was used to measure child/adolescent psychological adjustment. This 25-items questionnaire consisted of five subscales: hyperactivity, emotional symptoms, behavioral problems, prosocial behavior and lastly peer conflict, each containing five items. A factor analysis was performed from the items of the Strength and Difficulties scale. As a result of this factor analysis, four factors were determined. These factors were labeled as internalizing problems, prosocial behaviors, hyperactivity, and externalizing problems.

Four factors explained 45.7% of the total variance. The eigenvalue of the first factor is 5.9 and the variance it explains is 23.6 %. The eigenvalue of the second factor is 2.41 and the variance it explains is 9.6 %. The eigenvalue of the third factor is 1.72 and the variance it explains is 6.87 %. Also, the eigenvalue of the fourth factor is 1.39, the variance it explains is 5.6 %.

The factors labeled as "hyperactivity" and "externalizing problems" were combined due to containing few items and having high item-total correlations. As a result, this new factor called as "hyperactivity-externalizing problems". The alpha value of these three factors were acceptable; it was .79 for internalizing behaviors, .74 for prosocial behaviors, and .69 for hyperactivity- externalizing behaviors. Internalizing problems consisted of 8 items (3,5,6,8,13,16,19,24), prosocial behaviors included 6 items (1,4,9,14,17,20), and lastly hyperactivity-externalizing problems

consisted of 8 items (2,7,10, 12,15,18,21,25). Items 11, 22 and 23 were not used due to insufficient factor loadings.

Example items regarding subscales are “S/he easily distracted, has difficulty concentrating”, “S/he has a lot of anxiety and often seems worried”, “S/he often lies or cheats”, “S/he frequently willing to help others” and lastly “other kids tease her/him or make fun of her/him” respectively. Responses to the scale items were evaluated with a 3-point Likert scale (1= not correct, 2= partially correct, 3= completely correct).

3.3 Procedure

Mothers completed an online survey including the demographic form and the parenting scales. The survey started with a consent form explaining the voluntary and anonymous characteristics of the study along with the study objectives.

Participants who agreed to participate in the study completed the online questionnaire about their child-rearing practices, family experiences, relationships, and development of their children. The completion of the survey lasted on average 35 minutes.

3.4 Data analysis

In the current study, all statistical analyses were conducted through the 25th version of Statistical Package for Social Sciences -SPSS ©.

First, principal component analysis was conducted to see the factor structure of items in the newly adapted scales for psychological control and behavioral control. Based on this principal component analysis, various composite scores regarding the emerged components were created. Next, bivariate correlations were conducted

among all study variables. Furthermore, a series of hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted in prediction of internalizing, externalizing problems, and prosocial behaviors of children; parental control practices and warmth as predictor variables. Demographic variables which were highly correlated with child outcome variables were entered at stage-one in the regression model as control variable to eliminate the confounding effect of it in the aim of predicting child outcomes. Parental control scales were entered at Step 2, followed by culturally valued parental control scale entered at Step 3, and finally parental warmth scale was entered at Step 4.

The order of the predictor variables was decided to be entered for observing the predictive role of culturally valued parental control behaviors beyond other parental control practices which are highly mentioned and examined in the Western literature. Parental warmth was also entered in the last step to see the predictor role of parental control behaviors in the existence of parental warmth. Since the focus of this current study is parental control, parental warmth was entered in the last step of the hierarchical regression analysis. In addition, highly correlated demographic variables were entered as control variables in the first step of the regression. Prior to conducting hierarchical multiple regression, the assumptions of statistical analyses were evaluated out before the hypothesis tests. In this framework, normality analyzes, reliability analyzes, multicollinearity assumptions are discussed. Primarily, a sample size of 213 was deemed adequate given five predictor variables to be involved in the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The singularity assumption was obtained as the predictor variables (i.e., parental control and warmth scales) were not a combination of other predictor variables. Also, correlation between predictor variables revealed that they are not highly correlated except child age and child internalizing problems.

Yet, the collinearity statistics which are Tolerance and VIF values were all within accepted limits meeting the assumption of multicollinearity (Field, 2013). An examination of the multivariate outliers regarding Mahalanobis distance scores pointed out several multivariate outliers; however, it is deemed to have been met the relevant assumptions since the number of multivariate outliers are less than 5 % of the sample size as Field (2013) suggested. Lastly, the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were seemed to be all satisfied when the residual and scatter plots are taken into consideration. Within the scope of the multicollinearity assumption, it was seen that the relationship between any of the variables was $>.7$ (Mansfield & Helms, 1982) and it was determined that there was no multicollinearity between the measurement tools and so we assumed none of the predictors was multicollinear.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Principal component analysis

Mothers in this study were asked to complete thirty-nine questions regarding their psychological control practices and parental practices that are commonly perceived in previously conducted qualitative study. However, only thirty questions were analyzed in the principal component analysis. Four items were excluded due to their irrelevance for child age that was targeted in this study (i.e., indirect parental control items: I remove the things I don't want my child to play/use/eat so as not to conflict with my child, I tell little lies if necessary so that my child does not become stubborn, If something that my child wants doesn't happen, I draw my child's attention to a different place and try to make her/his forget, To get my word, I say that someone she/he is afraid of will be angry with my child).

Two items from the parental psychological control scale were also excluded due to their high skewness (I tell my child that I will not forgive her when she does something wrong, I blame my child for problems experienced by family members).

Finally, three items developed by using the qualitative data were excluded because of their insufficient loadings (If s/he persists despite my warnings, I'll let her/him do whatever s/he wants so that s/he learns from the outcome, I adjust my schedule according to my child and I expect her/him to follow it).

Remained thirty items were factor analyzed using the principal component analysis with Varimax rotation to determine if aspects of parental control from both universally used measure (i.e., Barber's Psychological Control Scale) and the parental practices derived from the qualitative study were distinguishable from one

another (see Appendix R). In addition, .40 was considered as a cut-off point. This analysis yielded three factors with Eigenvalues above 1.0 and explaining a total of 36.80 % of the variance for the entire set of variables (See Table 2).

Factor 1 was labeled as “culturally valued parental control practices” due to the high loadings by the items coming from the qualitative research conducted in the first step of the project. This factor mainly delineated what sort of distinct controlling behaviors were endorsed among Turkish parents such as overprotection, telling children to behave compatible with religious and social norms. In addition to items with factor loadings lower than .40, two more items regarding inducing empathy in the child were not included to the first factor as these items were not meaningfully relevant to the rest of the items. Therefore, this factor was comprised of 11 items reported on a 5-point Likert scale, i.e., 10 items from the qualitative study and one item from the Barber’s psychological control scale. Overall, this first factor explained 20.27 % of the variance and the factor loadings of the items ranged from .41 to .75. The second factor was named as “structuring”. This factor was labeled as such due to the high loadings of items describing parental control practices based on limit setting and disciplining. It was comprised of six items after the exclusion of four items loading below .40, and all these items were from the qualitative data. The variance explained by this component was 10.39 % and the factor loadings of items ranged from .46 to .75. The third factor was named as “parental psychological control” since most of the items of this factor were from the Barber’s Psychological Control scale . Only one item was from the qualitative data. As a result, this factor consisted of six items, explaining 6.14 % of the variance, and the factor loadings of the items ranged from .55 to .69.

Reliability analyses indicated adequate reliability for all the factors. Internal consistency values (Cronbach's alpha) were .81, .82 and .71 for the culturally valued parental control practices, structuring and parental psychological control factors, respectively.

Table 2. Eigenvalues, Total Variances and Cumulative Variances of Components

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of variance	Cumulative %
1	6.487	20.272	20.272
2	3.325	10.392	30.664
3	1.966	6.144	36.808

4.2 Correlation analyses

Table 4 shows the Pearson correlation coefficients to assess the relationship between demographic variables, parental control practices, parental warmth, and child outcomes (i.e., internalizing symptoms, externalizing symptoms, and prosocial behaviors). According to the results, there was a significant and negative correlation between child age and monitoring, and a significant and positive correlation between child age and internalizing problems. Also, there was a significant and negative correlation between the family SES and culturally valued control. Additionally, a significant and negative correlation was found between maternal monitoring and child age. There was also a positive correlation between maternal monitoring and warmth.

On the other hand, culturally valued parental control was significantly and negatively correlated with family SES, maternal education, spouses' educational status and maternal warmth. Parental structuring was also significantly and negatively correlated with family SES and maternal education. Parental structuring

was significantly and positively correlated with parental monitoring, parental warmth and culturally valued parental control. There were also significant and negative correlations between parental psychological control and parental monitoring and parental warmth. In contrast, psychological control was significantly and positively correlated with culturally valued parental control.

With respect to child outcomes, there were significant and positive correlations between child externalizing problems and culturally valued parental control and parental structuring. There were also significant and positive correlations between child internalizing behaviors and culturally valued parental control and psychological control. However, child internalizing problems behaviors were significantly and negatively correlated with parental monitoring and warmth. Child prosocial behavior was significantly and positively correlated with parental monitoring, warmth, and structuring; whereas significantly and negatively correlated with parental psychological control and child internalizing problems.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Analysis Between the Demographics, Research Predictors and Child Outcomes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Mother's age	-												
2. Child's age	.170*	-											
3. Family SES	0.065	-0.036	-										
4. Educational status	0.007	-0.002	.905**	-									
5. Spouse's educational status	0.073	-0.065	.884**	.730**	-								
6. Monitoring	-0.046	-.187**	-0.010	0.024	0.016	-							
7. Warmth	-0.064	-0.049	0.039	0.062	0.034	.524**	-						
8. Culturally valued control	0.072	0.079	-.419**	-.422**	-.344**	0.002	-.169*	-					
9. Structuring	-0.091	-0.023	-.161*	-.141*	-0.119	.336**	.261**	.435**	-				
10. Psychological control	0.056	0.113	-0.066	-0.069	-0.061	-.208**	-.379**	.332**	0.014	-			
11. Externalizing problems	0.021	-0.047	-0.085	-0.052	0.007	0.052	-0.054	.201**	.185**	0.020	-		
12. Internalizing problems	0.073	.143*	-0.057	-0.050	-0.081	-.240**	-.278**	.258**	0.083	.221**	.232**	-	
13. Prosocial behavior	-0.010	-0.082	-0.013	-0.060	0.024	.409**	.438**	-0.100	.228**	-.252**	0.035	-.401**	-

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

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of the Predictor and Outcome Variables

	M ± Std	Min-Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Monitoring	4.8±0.5	2.9-6	-0.997	1.235
Culturally valued control	36.4±10.7	15-68	-1.528	2.832
Structuring	43.6±8.2	21-60	0.267	-0.549
Psychological control	1.9±0.6	1-4.17	-0.343	-0.273
Warmth	5.5±0.4	3.7-6	0.705	0.161
Externalizing problems	14.1±1.7	10-19	0.309	0.174
Internalizing problems	11.2±3.0	8-21	1.250	1.157
Prosocial behavior	15.4±2.1	9-18	-0.497	-0.509

** = $p < 0,01$, * = $p < 0,05$

4.3 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis

4.3.1 Predicting internalizing problems from parental control practices and warmth

A four-step hierarchical multiple regression was carried out to examine the predictive role of parental control practices and parental warmth (see Table 5).

Maternal age, child age and maternal education were entered at Step 1 in the regression model as control variables. The predictors (i.e., psychological control, structuring and monitoring) were entered at Step 2, and culturally valued parental control was entered at Step 3, followed by maternal warmth entered at Step 4.

According to the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis, none of the demographic variables significantly predicted child internalizing problems. At Step 2, with the entrance of psychological control, structuring, and monitoring, model explained %12 of the total variance and the change in R^2 was .08 ($\Delta R^2 = .08$, $F(3, 214) = 4.89$, $p < .01$). Parental psychological control predicted higher child internalizing problems ($\beta = .15$, $t = 2.26$, $p < .05$); and this prediction was significant. On the other hand, maternal structuring was not a significant predictor of child internalizing problems, although it predicted higher internalizing symptoms. In

addition, parental monitoring was significant predictor of child internalizing problems such that higher levels of maternal monitoring predicted lower child internalizing problems ($\beta = -.23, t = -3.152, p < .05$). This suggested that children of mothers who psychologically control them were at higher risk to develop internalizing problems. On the other hand, children whose mothers engaged in monitoring their children's acts more often were at lower risk for internalizing problems.

When culturally valued parental control was entered in Step 3, this step explained %14 of the total variance, and the change in R^2 was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .02, F(3, 208) = 6.56, p < .05$). At Step 3, demographics, parental psychological control, and structuring were not the significant predictors of child internalizing problems. Only parental monitoring and culturally valued parental control predicted child internalizing problems significantly. Parental monitoring predicted lower child internalizing symptoms ($\beta = .22, t = -3.02, p < .01$), while culturally valued parental control predicted higher child internalizing symptoms ($\beta = .20, t = 2.43, p < .05$).

Finally, the addition of parental warmth to the regression, the model explained an additional %1 variance with the total of %16, and this change was not significant ($\Delta R^2 = .01, F(1, 206) = 2.949, p > .05$). In this model, parental monitoring ($\beta = -.17, t = 2.101, p < .05$) predicted lower child internalizing behaviors. On the other hand, culturally valued parental control still remained a significant predictor of higher levels of child internalizing behaviors ($\beta = .18, t = 2.162, p < .05$). However, parental warmth did not significantly predict child internalizing problems.

Table 5. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Internalizing Problems

Variable	B	95% CI for B		SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2
		LL	UL				
Step 1						.04	.04*
Constant	9.79	6.85	12.72	1.49			
Mother age	0.83	-0.00	1.67	0.42	0.13		
Child age	0.15	-0.03	0.33	0.09	0.12		
Education status	-0.15	-0.53	0.24	0.2	-0.05		
Step 2						.12	.08**
Constant							
Mother age	0.74	-0.08	1.55	0.41	0.12		
Child age	0.09	-0.08	0.26	0.09	0.07		
Education status	-0.09	-0.47	0.28	0.2	-0.03		
Psychological control	0.69	0.09	1.29	0.31	0.15*		
Structuring	0.52	-0.01	1.04	0.27	0.14		
Monitoring	-1.2	-1.94	-0.45	0.38	-0.23**		
Step 3						.15	.02*
Constant							
Mother age	0.77	-0.03	1.57	0.41	0.12		
Child age	0.08	-0.09	0.25	0.09	0.06		
Education status	0.14	-0.28	0.55	0.21	0.05		
Psychological control	0.45	-0.18	1.07	0.32	0.10		
Structuring	0.27	-0.29	0.83	0.28	0.07		
Monitoring	-1.13	-1.87	-0.39	0.37	-0.22**		
Culturally valued control	0.68	0.13	1.22	0.28	0.20*		
Step 4						.16	.01
Constant							
Mother age	0.8	-0.00	1.6	0.13	0.13		
Child age	0.09	-0.1	0.26	0.07	0.07		
Education status	0.14	-0.27	0.55	0.05	0.05		
Psychological control	0.25	-0.41	0.92	0.05	0.05		
Structuring	0.39	-0.18	0.96	0.1	0.1		
Monitoring	-0.86	-1.66	-0.05	-0.17	-0.17*		
Culturally valued control	0.6	0.05	1.16	0.18	0.18*		
Warmth	-0.9	-1.85	0.13	-0.14	-0.14		

** = p<0,01, * = p<0,05

4.3.2 Predicting externalizing problems from parental control practices and warmth

In Table 6 below, a four-step hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with child externalizing problems as the dependent variable. In Step 1, child age, mother age and maternal education status were added into the model. These demographics variables did not predict child externalizing problems significantly. Moreover, including the predictors of psychological control, structuring, and monitoring into Step 2 did not add incremental explanation. Therefore, the change in R^2 was not significant ($\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F(3, 211) = 4.887$, $p > .05$), and none of the predictors predicted externalizing problems significantly. At Step 3, culturally valued parental control explained an incremental variance of 4%, and this change was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, $F(1, 207) = 8.795$, $p < .01$). In this step, culturally valued parental control predicted higher child externalizing behaviors ($\beta = .25$, $t = 2.966$, $p < .01$).

Finally, with inclusion of parental warmth in the last step did not explain any incremental variance in externalizing problems ($\Delta R^2 = .003$, $F(1, 206) = .586$, $p > .05$). Yet, culturally valued parental control significantly predicted child externalizing problems ($\beta = .24$, $t = 2.81$, $p < .05$), suggesting that as mothers control their children by considering social, moral and religious values, children tend to demonstrate externalizing problems.

Table 6. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Externalizing Problems

Variable	B	95% CI for B		SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2
		LL	UL				
Step 1						.01	.01
Constant	14.84	13.15	16.54	0.86			
Mother age	-0.25	-0.73	0.24	0.24	-0.07		
Child age	-0.02	-0.12	0.08	0.05	-0.03		
Education status	-0.06	-0.28	0.16	0.11	-0.04		
Step 2						.02	.01
Constant	13.57	10.56	16.59	1.53			
Mother age	-0.2	-0.68	0.29	0.25	-0.06		
Child age	-0.02	-0.12	0.08	0.05	-0.06		
Education status	-0.07	-0.29	0.16	0.11	-0.04		
Psychological control	0.05	-0.31	0.41	0.18	0.02		
Structuring	0.24	-0.07	0.56	0.16	0.11		
Monitoring	0.01	-0.44	0.45	0.23	0.00		
Step 3						.06	.04*
Constant	12.33	9.26	15.41	1.56			
Mother age	-0.17	-0.65	0.31	0.24	-0.05		
Child age	-0.03	-0.13	0.07	0.05	-0.04		
Education status	0.10	-0.14	0.35	0.12	0.06		
Psychological control	-0.13	-0.5	0.24	0.19	-0.05		
Structuring	0.06	-0.27	0.39	0.17	0.03		
Monitoring	0.05	-0.39	0.49	0.22	0.02		
Culturally valued control	0.49	0.16	0.82	0.17	0.25**		
Step 4						.06	.003
Constant	13.2	9.4	17.0	1.93			
Mother age	-0.16	-0.64	0.31	0.24	-0.05		
Child age	-0.02	-0.13	0.08	0.05	-0.03		
Education status	0.1	-0.14	0.35	0.12	0.06		
Psychological control	-0.18	-0.58	0.28	0.2	-0.07		
Structuring	0.09	-0.25	0.43	0.17	0.04		
Monitoring	0.12	-0.36	0.6	0.24	0.04		
Culturally valued control	0.47	0.14	0.8	0.17	0.24**		
Warmth	-0.23	-0.82	0.36	0.3	-0.07		

** = p<0,01, * = p<0,05

4.3.3 Predicting prosocial behaviors from parental control practices and warmth

Table 7 presents a four-step hierarchical multiple regression with child prosocial behavior as the dependent variable. At Step 1, mother age, child age and maternal education were entered. At Step 2, parental psychological control, structuring, and monitoring were entered as predictor variables, while culturally valued parental control was entered at Step 3, and parental warmth was entered at Step 4.

None of demographic variables were statistically significant predictor of prosocial behavior in Step 1. Adding psychological control, structuring, and monitoring in Step 2 explained an incremental variance of %23.2, and this change was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .23$, $F(3, 208) = 22.21$, $p < .01$). In Step 2, psychological control ($\beta = -.21$, $t = -3.48$, $p < .01$) predicted lower levels of child prosocial behavior. On the other hand, maternal age ($\beta = .15$, $t = 2.385$, $p < .05$), structuring ($\beta = .17$, $t = 2.512$, $p < .05$) and monitoring ($\beta = .32$, $t = 4.791$, $p < .01$) predicted higher levels of prosocial behaviors among children according to the reports of mothers in this study. It means that as maternal age increases and mothers exert limit setting and monitoring more, children have tendency to show prosocial behaviors.

At Step 3, when culturally valued parental control was entered, this model explained %25 of the total variance, and this change was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F(1, 207) = 5.078$, $p < .05$). Regarding demographic variables, only maternal age ($\beta = .14$, $t = 2.327$, $p < .05$) and maternal education ($\beta = -.15$, $t = -2.283$, $p < .05$) were significant predictors of child prosocial behavior. It reveals that as maternal age increases, children are prone to show higher levels of prosocial behaviors. However, when maternal education is high, it has been found that children demonstrate fewer prosocial behaviors. Furthermore, both psychological control ($\beta = -.17$, $t = -2.261$,

$p < .05$) and culturally valued control ($\beta = -.17, t = -2.25, p < .05$) predicted lower levels of child prosocial behavior. Whereas structuring ($\beta = .22, t = 3.178, p < .05$) and monitoring ($\beta = .31, t = 4.682, p < .01$) predicted higher levels of prosocial behavior among children in this study.

Finally, parental warmth added into step four. This model explained %29 of the total variance, and this change was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .04, F(1, 206) = 11.02, p < .01$). In this model, maternal age predicted higher child prosocial behavior ($\beta = .14, t = 2.254, p < 0.05$). Maternal education status predicted lower child prosocial behavior ($\beta = -.15, t = -2.34, p < .05$). In this final step, structuring ($\beta = .17, t = 2.387, p < .05$) and monitoring ($\beta = .22, t = 3.069, p < .05$) and warmth ($\beta = .25, t = 3.320, p < 0.01$) were each significant positive predictors of higher child prosocial behaviors. Psychological control and culturally valued parental control predicted lower child prosocial behaviors, although they were not statistically significant.

Table 7. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Prosocial Behavior

Variable	B	95% CI for B		SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2
		LL	UL				
Step 1						.01	.01
Constant	16.76	14.7	18.81	1.04			
Mother age	0.34	-0.29	0.92	0.3	0.08		
Child age	-0.09	-0.21	0.03	0.06	-0.10		
Education status	-0.09	-0.4	0.18	0.14	-0.04		
Step 2						.23	.23**
Constant	9.9	6.7	13.11	1.63			
Mother age	0.63	0.11	1.14	0.26	0.15*		
Child age	-0.02	-0.11	0.09	0.06	-0.02		
Education status	-0.17	-0.41	0.07	0.12	-0.08		
Psychological control	-0.68	-1.06	-0.29	0.2	-0.22**		
Structuring	0.43	0.09	0.76	0.17	0.16*		
Monitoring	1.16	0.68	1.63	0.24	0.32**		
Step 3						.25	.02*
Constant	10.91	7.62	14.21	1.67			
Mother age	0.61	0.09	1.12	0.3	0.14*		
Child age	-0.02	-0.12	0.1	0.05	-0.01		
Education status	-0.31	-0.57	-0.04	0.13	-0.15*		
Psychological control	-0.53	-0.93	-0.13	0.2	-0.17*		
Structuring	0.57	0.22	0.93	0.18	0.22*		
Monitoring	1.12	0.65	1.59	0.24	0.32**		
Culturally valued control	-0.4	-0.75	-0.05	0.18	-0.17*		
Step 4						.28	.04**
Constant	6.98	2.3	10.95	2.02			
Mother age	0.57	0.1	1.07	0.25	0.14*		
Child age	-0.03	-0.13	0.08	0.05	-0.03		
Education status	-0.31	-0.56	-0.05	0.13	-0.15*		
Psychological control	-0.3	-0.71	0.12	0.21	-0.09		
Structuring	0.43	0.07	0.8	0.18	0.17*		
Monitoring	0.78	0.3	1.29	0.25	0.22*		
Culturally Valued control	-0.31	-0.7	0.03	0.17	-0.13		
Warmth	1.04	0.42	1.66	0.31	0.25**		

** = p<0,01, * = p<0,05

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In the current study, the first aim was to examine whether the statements that parents endorsed in the qualitative study would uniquely constitute a parenting approach shaped by the cultural parenting values. The second main aim was to investigate the degree to which different forms of parental control (i.e., psychological control, structuring, monitoring and culturally valued control) would independently predict child socioemotional adjustment (i.e., internalizing symptoms, externalizing symptoms, and prosocial behaviors). The third aim was to examine the contribution of warmth and culturally valued parental control practices over and above the other parental control practices on child socioemotional competence in Turkish culture. To achieve these goals, the findings regarding the relation between parental behaviors, parental warmth and child outcomes were delineated.

5.1 Developing a culturally appropriate parental control scale

The first hypothesis of this study was that the items developed through the qualitative study would constitute a separate component when evaluated together with the parental psychological control items. As expected, the items created from the qualitative study formed two separate factors. The first of these components included the limit setting behaviors of parents (i.e., structuring) which are mostly considered as positive discipline or behavioral control in the existing literature. The other factor included items about social and religious values that parents in Turkey often use to guide child behavior (e.g., warnings to be decent, reminders about not to bring bad

reputation to the family, describing wrong behavior as sin), named as culturally valued parental control in this current study. Also as expected, the last component consisted mostly of psychological control scale items developed by Barber (1996). This finding is essential to inform future studies to include an indigenous scale besides widely used parenting scales to fully understand the socialization forces of children's socioemotional competence.

5.2 Maternal control/warmth and child internalizing problems

Based on past research and theory, we expected that parental psychological control would predict worse child socioemotional adjustment (i.e., higher internalizing problems and externalizing problems, lower prosocial behaviors), whereas structuring and monitoring would predict better child socioemotional adjustment (i.e., lower internalizing problems and externalizing problems, higher prosocial behaviors). We explored the role of culturally valued control practices.

As expected, parental monitoring was negatively associated with child internalizing problems, suggesting that as mothers get knowledge about their children's whereabouts through child disclosure and active examination, children were at lower risk for internalizing problems (e.g., Fowler, Toro, Tompsett & Baltes, 2009). Concordantly with our hypothesis, maternal psychological control was a significant predictor of child internalizing problems, such that when maternal PPC was high, child internalizing symptoms were also at higher levels.

Unexpectedly, structuring was also positively related to child internalizing problems, although it was not statistically significant. In our sample, mothers' limit setting and disciplining behaviors did not reduce child internalizing problems contrary to the existing literature (e.g., Serbin, Kingdon, Ruttle, & Stack, 2015). At

this point, it might be important to remind that our parental structuring scale was developed by the reports of parents coming from the qualitative study. This might imply that statements of mothers in our study that were intended for limit setting and disciplining might be perceived as restricting their autonomy, which might result in increased child anxiety and depression (Charlot Colomès, Duchesne & Boisclair Châteauvert, 2021). In support of the study hypothesis, culturally valued parental control have an additional predictive role on child internalizing behaviors.

When culturally valued parental control was entered to the hierarchical regression analysis, the change in the model was significant and the predictive role of other parental control behaviors were changed. In the third step of the regression analysis, when culturally valued control was entered, monitoring still remained a significant predictor, whereas maternal psychological control became a non-significant predictor. It is important to highlight that culturally valued parental control emerged as an independent predictor of child internalizing problems when considered with all other parental control. Higher levels of culturally valued control predicted higher levels of internalizing problems. In other words, shaping children's manners by addressing religious rules and social norms predicted more internalizing symptoms among Turkish children.

Contrary to our expectations and past research (Rothenberg, Lansford, J. E., Bornstein, Chang, Deater-Deckard, Di Giunta, & Bacchini, 2020) was in relation to maternal warmth. Although bivariate correlations have shown an inverse association between maternal warmth and internalizing symptoms, there was no predictive relation of maternal warmth when considered together with all control practices. This finding reveals that warmth does not act as an independent predictor of child internalizing problems when considered together with parental control practices.

5.3 Maternal control/warmth and child externalizing problems

In the realm of child externalizing problems, it was expected that parental monitoring and structuring would predict lower child externalizing problems; whereas PPC and culturally valued parental control would predict higher child externalizing problems.

Unexpectedly, in the second step of the regression analysis, parental structuring predicted child externalizing problems in the negative direction, meaning that as mothers controlled their children's manner by limit setting, disciplining, their children were more likely to be perceived as having more externalizing problems such as aggression. Given the concurrent relation between parental practices and child outcome, it is not possible to make causal inferences about the direction of this relation. Yet, it is plausible that children with higher levels of externalizing problems might be eliciting more structuring from their mothers, who are highly educated.

Finally, in line with our hypothesis, culturally valued parental control was an independent and significant predictor of child externalizing problems. When holding all other control practices constant, higher levels of emphasis on moral values predicted higher levels of externalizing problems. Again, it is impossible to make a definitive statement about the direction of this relation. Finally, parental warmth was not a significant predictor of child externalizing problems in the current sample. Findings demonstrated that the only variable predicting child externalizing behaviors was culturally valued parental control practices. This finding highlights the importance of parental control behaviors shaped by cultural values on child psychological adjustment.

5.4 Maternal control/warmth and child prosocial behaviors

Our hypothesis regarding prosocial behaviors was partially supported by our findings. Psychological control was negatively associated with child prosocial behaviors as in parallel with previous research (e.g., Pastorelli, Lansford, Luengo Kanacri, Malone, Di Giunta, Bacchini, & Sorbring, 2016). That is to say, when mothers control their children' conduct by love withdrawal, intrusiveness and invalidating feelings, their children are less likely to help others and act in cooperation. When the role of culturally valued parental control was taken into consideration, findings revealed that it predicts lower levels of child prosocial behaviors. Also as expected, parental structuring, monitoring and parental warmth were found to be independent predictors of child prosocial behaviors, predicting higher level of prosocial behaviors.

Despite the significant role of psychological control and culturally valued control on child prosocial behavior, when maternal warmth was involved in the regression equation, only maternal monitoring, structuring, and warmth remained as significant predictors, suggesting that parental warmth may play a buffering role against the negative effects of psychological control in predicting the child's prosocial behavior. Taken all together, this may imply that positive parental behaviors characterized by affection, disciplining and monitoring are more crucial when predicting child prosocial behaviors as compared to parental control practices which usually creating a negative environment in a family and restricting child's autonomy (Fu, Pan, Zhang & Zhang, 2022).

5.5 Limitations and future directions

There were a number of limitations that future research needs to address. At first, the present study was based only on maternal self-report. This may increase social

desirability and cause common method variance. Also, many studies have shown that multiple informants can produce more reliable results (e.g., Gresham, Elliott, Metallo, Byrd,

Wilson, & Cassidy, 2018; Guo, Tang, Marsh, Parker, Basarkod, Sahdra, & SalmelaAro, 2023). Future studies may combine data from parents and children and use methods other than self-report measures such as observation. Furthermore, parent data only came from mothers. Existing literature points to the significant role of fathers on children's socio-emotional competence; both unique roles as different from mothers and combined role when interpreted together with maternal parental control and warmth. To illustrate, the study conducted by Laible and Carlo (2004) revealed that although maternal warmth and rigid control seem to be more related to adolescents' socioemotional competence, paternal warmth and low rigid control were found to play a buffering role against low socioemotional adjustment and low self-esteem when maternal warmth was low and maternal rigid control was high.

Another limitation of the study was that most of the participating mothers had a high level of education. This may cause the study sample to be non-homogeneous and therefore attenuate the magnitude of the relations as well as reduce the ecological validity of the study. For the next study, using random sampling instead of convenient sampling can provide a much more homogeneous sample.

Finally, the magnitude of the relations between the predictor variables (i.e., parental control and warmth) and child outcome variables (e.g., internalizing problems, externalizing problems, and prosocial behaviors) was low. Several previous studies have emphasized the role of temperament in socioemotional competence. For instance, it has been found that resilient (i.e., high extraversion, high self-regulation, and low negative emotionality) and reserved type (i.e., high self-regulation and low extraversion, openness and negative emotionality) in

temperament is associated with lower emotional symptoms, conduct and hyperactivity problems among early adolescents (Hirvonen, Väänänen, Aunola, Ahonen, & Kiuru, 2018). Apart from these, peer relationships can have a great impact on the child's internalizing problems and externalizing problems and prosocial behaviors, especially during adolescence. Good social skills and social acceptance were consistently found as associated with better social and emotional competence during both middle childhood and adolescence (Brown & Larson, 2009). Finally, this research was done cross-sectional rather than longitudinally. Hence, it is impossible to make causal statements when interpreting the results.

5.6 Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to reveal the role of culture, parental psychological control, structuring, monitoring, and warmth on predicting child and adolescent socioemotional adjustment. The most remarkable finding of this current study was revealing the role of culturally valued parental control on child internalizing, externalizing and prosocial problems. This finding demonstrates the importance of considering indigenous parental behaviors when investigating the effect of parenting on child psychosocial adjustment. A unique finding of the study was that high levels of culturally valued parental control predicted higher levels of internalizing problems and externalizing problems and lower levels of prosocial behaviors among children between the ages of 7-18. Our findings also showed that parent structuring was related to higher internalizing problems in the child, unlike the general findings in the literature. This might be a concern for further investigation of parents' limit-setting behaviors in Turkish culture in future research.

APPENDIX A

ETHICAL PERMISSION FORM

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 04.06.2022-69055

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

Toplantı Sayısı : 32
Toplantı Tarihi : 26.05.2022
Toplantı Saati : 10:00
Toplantı Yeri : Zoom Sanal Toplantı
Bulunanlar : Prof. Dr. Ebru Kaya, Prof. Dr. Feyza Çorapçı, Doç. Dr. Arhan S. Ertan, Doç. Dr. Senem Yıldız,
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin Sohtorik İlkmen
Bulunmayanlar :

Beyza Özyol
Psikoloji

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Predicting Child Psychological Adjustment: The Role of Different Forms of Control and Autonomy Support" başlıklı projeniz ile ilgili olarak yaptığımız SBB-EAK 2022/64 sayılı başvuru komisyonumuz tarafından 26 Mayıs 2022 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 onay mektubu üye ve raportör olarak Yasemin Sohtorik İlkmen tarafından bütün üyeler adına e-imzalanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla, bilgilerinizi rica ederiz.

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin
SOHTORİK İLKMEN
ÜYE

e-imzalıdır
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin Sohtorik
İlkmen
Öğretim Üyesi
Raportör

SOBETİK 32 26.05.2022

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT (TURKISH)

Değerli Ebeveynler,

TÜBİTAK'ın ülkemizin öncelikli konularında çağrılı araştırmaları kapsamında dört üniversitenin ortaklığı ile yürüttüğümüz araştırma projemiz (TÜBİTAK-1003-118K050) için yardımınıza ihtiyacımız var. Çalışmanın temel amacı Türkiye'deki çocuk yetiştirme tutum ve davranışlarını incelemektir. Bu araştırmaya aşağıdaki bağlantıdan katılarak görüş ve deneyimlerinizi paylaşırsanız çok memnun oluruz. Çalışmaya katılım tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Cevaplama hızına göre bir saate yakın sürebilmektedir. Konunun geniş kapsamı nedeniyle anket görece uzun olmasına karşın, ebeveynlere kendi davranış ve tecrübelerini değerlendirme ve gözden geçirme fırsatı vermesi bakımından çok faydalı olabilmektedir. Bir defada hepsini tamamlamak zorunda değilsiniz, her girdiğinizde sistem sizi kaldığınız yerden başlatacaktır. Anketin tamamlanması bu çalışma bakımından çok önemlidir. Bu bakımdan sonuna kadar tamamlamanızı rica ediyoruz. Anketi cep telefonundan doldurabilirsiniz ancak bilgisayar üzerinden doldurursanız daha rahat ve hızlı cevap verebilirsiniz.

Anketteki hiçbir sorunun doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Araştırma sonuçlarının yansız olması ve çocukların sağlıklı gelişimini etkileyen faktörlerin doğru saptanması için vereceğiniz bilgilerin sizin gerçek duygu ve düşüncelerinizi yansıtması çok önemlidir. Cevaplamak istemediğiniz ya da durumunuza uymayan soruları geçebilirsiniz.

Sizden kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak, sadece arařtırmacılar tarafından deęerlendirilecektir. Arařtırmayla ilgili sorularınızı ařaęıdaki e-posta adresini kullanarak arařtırma yrtclerine yneltebilirsiniz.

alıřmamıza katıldıęınız iin řimdiden teřekkr ederiz.

Proje Yrtcleri:

Prof. Dr. Nebi Smer (Sabancı niversitesi, nebi.sumer@sabanciuniv.edu)

Prof. Dr. Feyza orapı (Boęazii niversitesi, feyza.corapci@boun.edu.tr)

Prof. Dr. Zeynep Cemalcılar (Ko niversitesi, zcemalcilar@ku.edu.tr)

Prof. Dr. Kezban elik (TED niversitesi, kezban.celik@tedu.edu.tr)

* Ltfen cevabınızdan sonra saę alt kşedeki oka basarak ilerleyiniz.

Bu alıřmaya katılmayı;

Kabul Ediyorum

Kabul Etmiyorum

APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT (ENGLISH)

Dear Parents,

We need your help for our research project (TÜBİTAK-1003-118K050), which we carry out in partnership with four universities within the scope of TÜBİTAK's invited research on our country's priority issues. The main purpose of the study is to examine child-rearing attitudes and behaviors in Turkey. We would be very pleased if you would share your views and experiences by participating in this research via the link below. Participation in the study is completely voluntary.

Depending on the response speed, it may take up to an hour. Although the questionnaire is relatively long due to the wide scope of the subject, it can be very useful in terms of giving parents the opportunity to evaluate and review their own behaviors and experiences. You don't have to complete them all at once, the system will pick you up from where you left off each time you enter. The completion of the questionnaire is very important for this study. Therefore, we ask you to complete it to the end.

You can fill out the survey on your mobile phone, but if you fill it out on a computer, you can answer more easily and quickly. There is no right or wrong answer to any question in the survey. It is very important that the information you provide reflects your true feelings and thoughts for the research results to be unbiased and for the correct determination of the factors affecting the healthy development of children. You can skip questions that you don't want to answer or that don't fit your situation.

No identifying information is requested from you. Your answers will be kept completely confidential and will be evaluated only by the researchers. You can direct your questions about the research to the research coordinators using the e-mail address below.

Thank you in advance for your participation in our work.

Project Coordinators:

prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer (Sabancı University, nebi.sumer@sabanciuniv.edu)

prof. Dr. Feyza Çorapçı (Bogazici University, feyza.corapci@boun.edu.tr)

prof. Dr. Zeynep Cemalcılar (Koç University, zcemalcilar@ku.edu.tr)

prof. Dr. Kezban Çelik (TED University, kesban.celik@tedu.edu.tr)

* Please proceed by pressing the arrow in the lower right corner after your answer.

To participate in this study;

I accept

I do not accept

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC FORM (TURKISH)

Cinsiyet

- Kadın
- Erkek

Doğum Yılıınız:

Eğitim Durumunuz

- Okuryazar değil
- Diplomasız okur
- İlkokul mezunu
- İlköğretim/ortaokul mezunu
- Lise mezunu
- Üniversite mezunu
- Yüksek lisans/ doktora

Medeni Durumunuz

- Evli
- Boşanmış
- Bekar
- Dul

Hanede Yaşayan Kişi Sayısı (Tüm Yetişkin ve Çocuklar):

Kalıcı ve sürekli tedavi gördüğünüz bir sağlık sorununuz var mı? Varsa, nedir?

- Hayır
- Evet (Lütfen aşağıya yazınız.)

Kaç çocuđunuz var?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 veya daha fazla

Okula başlamamış çocuđunuz var mı?

- Evet
- Hayır

Kaç tane okula başlamamış çocuđunuz var?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Çocuđunuza kim bakıyor? Aşağıda uygun olanları seçiniz:

- Anne
- Baba
- Büyükanne
- Büyükbaba
- Bakıcı
- Kreş

Okula giden çocuklarınız özel okula mı devlet okuluna mı gidiyor?

- Devlet

- Özel
- Okula giden çocuğum yok.

Doğduğunuz yerde mi yaşıyorsunuz?

- Evet
- Hayır

Nerede doğdunuz:

Şu an nerede yaşıyorsunuz:

Göç etme nedeniniz nedir:

- İş
- Eğitim
- Evlilik Nedeniyle
- Sağlık
- Ailem göç ettiği için
- Diğer (belirtiniz):

Şu an yaşadığınız yere göç ettiğinizde kaç yaşındaydınız?

Şu an yaşadığınız yere göç ettiğinizde evli miydiniz?

- Evet
- Hayır

Şu an yaşadığınız yere göç ettiğinizde çocuğunuz var mıydı?

- Evet
- Hayır

Şu an yaşadığınız yere geldiğinizde çocuğunuzun yaşı kaçtı?

Hayatınızda toplam kaç kere şehir değiştirdiniz?

Evde konuştuğunuz dil:

Çalışma Durumunuz

- Kendi hesabıma tam zamanlı çalışıyorum
- Kendi hesabıma yarı zamanlı çalışıyorum
- Ücretli tam zamanlı çalışıyorum
- Ücretli yarı zamanlı çalışıyorum
- Çalışmıyorum

COVID-19 salgını nedeniyle evden çalışma zorunluluğu dışında, çalışma durumunuzda bir değişiklik oldu mu?

- Evet
- Hayır

Konut sahibi misiniz?

- Evet
- Hayır

Aylık hane geliri:

- 2850 TL'den az (asgari ücret altı)
- 2850 TL (asgari ücret civarında)
- 2580 TL-6000TL
- 6001 TL-8000 TL
- 8001 TL-10000 TL
- 10001 TL-15000 TL
- 15 000TL ve üzeri

COVID-19 salgını sonrası eve giren gelir durumunuz değişti mi?

- Değişmedi
- Yarıya yakın azaldı
- Arttı

Kendinizi hangi sınıfta görüyorsunuz?

- Alt gelir
- Orta gelir
- Orta-üst gelir
- Üst gelir

Siz veya ailenizden birine COVID-19 teşhisi konuldu mu?

- Hayır
- Evet (Lütfen yakınlığını belirtiniz)

COVID-19 nedeniyle ailenizden hayatını kaybeden oldu mu?

- Hayır
- Evet

Bu anket kapsamında çocuğunuz ya da çocuklarınızdan biri hakkında bilgi almak istiyoruz. Birden fazla çocuğunuz varsa velisi olduğunuz bir çocuğunuzu seçerek soruları cevaplayınız. Şimdi seçtiğiniz çocuğunuzun cinsiyeti ve doğum yılını aşağıda belirtilen yerlere yazınız.

Bu ankette bundan sonraki bütün soruları doğum yılını ve cinsiyetini belirttiğiniz okula giden bu çocuğunuzu dikkate alarak cevaplayınız.

Tüm Sorular Cevaplanırken Dikkate Alınacak Çocuğun Cinsiyeti

- Kız
- Erkek

Tüm soruları cevaplarken dikkate alacağınız çocuğunuzun doğum yılını aşağıdan seçiniz.

Tüm soruları cevaplarken dikkate alacağınız çocuğunuzun doğduğu ayı aşağıdan seçiniz.

APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC FORM (ENGLISH)

Gender

- Female
- Male

Year of Birth:

Education Status

- Not literate
- literate without diploma
- Primary school graduate
- Secondary school graduate
- High school graduate
- Graduated from a University
- Master's / PhD degree

Marital status

- Married
- Divorced
- Single
- Widow

Number of People Living in the Household (All Adults and Children):

Do you have a health problem that you are receiving permanent and continuous treatment? If yes, what is it?

- No
- Yes (Please write below.)

How many children do you have?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more

Do you have a child who has not started school?

- Yes
- No

How many unschooled children do you have?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Who is looking after your child? Please select the appropriate ones below:

- Mom
- Father
- Grandma
- Grandfather
- Carer
- Kindergarten

Do your children go to private or public school?

- State

- Special

- I have no children going to school.

Do you live where you were born?

- Yes

- No

Where were you born:

Where do you currently live:

What is your reason for migrating:

- Work

- Education

- Due to Marriage

- Health

- Because my family immigrated

- Other (specify):

How old were you when you migrated to where you live now?

Were you married when you immigrated to where you live now?

- Yes

- No

Did you have children when you migrated to where you live now?

- Yes

- No

How old was your child when you arrived where you live now?

How many times have you changed cities in your life?

Language you speak at home:

Working Status

- I work full time on my own account
- I work part time on my own account
- I work full time paid
- I work paid part time
- I am not working

Apart from the obligation to work from home due to the COVID-19 pandemic, has your working status changed?

- Yes
- No

Do you own a home?

- Yes
- No

Monthly household income:

- Less than 2850 TL (below the minimum wage)
- 2850 TL (around minimum wage)
- 2580 TL-6000TL
- 6001 TL-8000 TL
- 8001 TL-10000 TL
- 10001 TL-15000 TL
- 15000 TL and above

Has your income status changed after the COVID-19 outbreak?

- Unchanged
- Decreased nearly half
- It increased

What class do you see yourself in?

- Lower income
- Middle income
- Upper-middle income
- Top income

Have you or someone in your family been diagnosed with COVID-19?

- No
- Yes (Please indicate proximity)

Has anyone in your family died due to COVID-19?

- No
- Yes

As part of this survey, we would like to receive information about your child or one of your children. If you have more than one child, choose one of your parents and answer the questions. Now write down the gender and birth year of your chosen child in the places given below.

Answer all the following questions in this questionnaire, taking into account this child who goes to the school where you specify the year of birth and gender.

Gender of the Child to be Considered When Answering All Questions

- Girl
- Male

Please select your child's birth year below, which you will consider when answering all the questions.

Please select the month of birth of your child, which you will consider when answering all the questions below.

APPENDIX F

PARENTAL MONITORING (TURKISH)

ÖNEMLİ NOT: İçinde bulunduğumuz salgın dönemi ebeveynlerin çocukları ile olan ilişkisini doğal olarak etkilemiştir. Bundan sonraki soruları salgın dönemine göre değil, sizin genel olarak tutum ve davranışlarınızı dikkate alarak cevaplayınız.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6
Hiçbir zaman Nadiren Bazen Ara sıra Sık sık Her zaman

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Çocuğumun boş zamanlarını nasıl geçirdiğini bilirim.						
2.Çocuğumun ödevlerini takip eder, farklı derslerdeki durumunu bilirim.						
3.Çocuğumun okuldan sonra nereye gittiğini bilirim.						
4.Çocuğum okulda derslerinin nasıl gittiğini, gününün nasıl geçtiğini bana anlatır.						
5.Çocuğum boş zamanlarında neler yaptığından bahsetmez.						
6.Çocuğum arkadaşlarıyla neler yaptığını bana anlatır.						
7.Çocuğumun arkadaşları geldiğinde onlarla sohbet ederim						
8.Çocuğuma okulda gününün nasıl geçtiğine ilişkin sorular sorarım						
9.Çocuğumun eğitim dışı teknoloji kullanımını takip ederim						

APPENDIX G

PARENTAL MONITORING (ENGLISH)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. I know how my child spends his free time.						
2. I follow my child's homework and know his/her status in different lessons.						
3. I know where my child is going after school.						
4. My child tells me how his lessons went at school and how his day was.						
5. My child does not talk about what he does in his spare time.						
6. My child tells me what he does with his friends.						
7. When my child's friends come, I chat with them.						
8. I ask my child questions about how his day was at school.						
9. I follow my child's non-educational technology use.						

APPENDIX H

PARENTAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL (TURKISH)

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

APPENDIX I

PARENTAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL (ENGLISH)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. I change the subject when my child is saying something.						
2. When my child is talking, I complete the sentence without waiting for him to finish.						
3. I interrupt when my child is talking.						
4. I don't ask what my child is feeling, what he thinks, I already know.						
5. I tell my child what to think and how to feel about most issues.						
6. I try to change my child's feelings and thoughts on some issues.						
7. I blame my child for the difficulties/problems experienced by family members.						
8. When criticizing my child, I remind him of his past mistakes.						
9. I make me feel guilty by saying that it upsets and disappoints me.						
10. I tell my child how hard I worked for him.						
11. I tell my child that I will not forgive him when he does something wrong.						
12. I tell him he should be ashamed when he makes a mistake.						
13. I don't let my friends do some of the things they do for fear that something will happen to them.						
14. I do not allow him to make friends outside of school for fear that something will happen to him.						
15. I check my child's bag, room or phone to understand what he or she is doing.						
16. I do not allow my child to spend time with friends away from home.						
17. I dress my child in layers for fear of getting cold.						
18. I get offended by my child.						

APPENDIX J

BEHAVIORAL CONTROL ITEMS DEVELOPED FROM THE QUALITATIVE
DATA (TURKISH)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Çocuğumla çatışmamak için oynamasını/kullanmasını/yemesini istemediğim şeyleri ortadan kaldırırım.						
2.Çocuğumun inatlaşmaması için gerekirse küçük yalanlar söylerim (örneğin, evde çikolata kalmadı).						
3.İstediği bir şey olmuyorsa, çocuğumun dikkatini farklı yere çeker, unutturmaya çalışırım.						
4.Sözümü dinletmek için, çekindiği birinin çocuğuma kızacağını söylerim (örneğin, yanımızdaki amca kızacak gibi).						
5.Ailemize laf getirecek davranışlardan kaçınması için çocuğumu uyarırım.						
6.Yanlış bir davranışını gördüğümde bunun ayıp olduğunu söylerim.						
7.Yanlış bir davranışta bulunduğu anda bunun dinimize uygun olmadığını hatta günah olduğunu söylerim.						
8.Yanlış bir davranışta bulunduğu anda çocuğumu karşısındaki kişinin duygularını anlaması için uyarırım (örneğin, düşünmeden konuşursa arkadaşının üzüleceğini söylerim).						
9.Çocuğum bir yetişkine saygısız davranırsa “aynı saygısızlık annene/babana yapılırsa senin hoşuna gider miydi?” diye sorarım.						
10. Kötü örneklerin, yanlış davranışlarda bulunanların çevreden nasıl tepkiler aldığını anlatırım.						
11. Çocuğuma yasaklar getirmek yerine belli sınırlamalar koyarım.						
12. Kurallara uyması için olumsuz davranışının sonuçlarını hatırlatırım.						
13. Konulan kuralları zamanında hatırlatırım (örneğin, uyku zamanı).						
14. Çocuğumu çalışması ve başarılı olması için uyarırım.						
15. Çocuğumu terbiyeli olması konusunda uyarırım.						

16. Uyarılarına rağmen ısrar ederse, sonucundan ders alması için istediğini yapmasına izin veririm.						
17. Çocuğum ne kadar tutturursa tuttursun, kurallarımı bozmam.						
18. Çocuğumu iyi davranışlarından sonra takdir ederim veya onun sevdiği bir şeyi yaparım/veririm.						
19. Programımı çocuğuma göre ayarlar, onun da buna uymasını beklerim.						
20. Çocuğuma yapması gerekenleri defalarca hatırlatırım.						
21. İstedigimi yapması için sevdiği bir şeyi önceden verdiğim olmuştur.						

APPENDIX K

BEHAVIORAL CONTROL ITEMS DEVELOPED FROM THE QUALITATIVE
DATA (ENGLISH)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. I remove the things that I do not want my child to play / use / eat in order not to conflict with my child.						
2. I tell little lies if necessary (for example, there is no chocolate left in the house) so that my child does not become stubborn.						
3. If something he wants doesn't happen, I draw my child's attention to a different place and try to make him forget.						
4. To get my word to be heard, I say that someone he is afraid of will be angry with my child (for example, the uncle next to us will be angry).						
5. I warn my child to avoid behaviors that will bring insults to our family.						
6. When I see a wrong behavior, I say it is shameful.						
7. When he does something wrong, I say that it is not in accordance with our religion and even that it is a sin.						
8. I warn my child to understand the feelings of the other person when he/she does something wrong (for example, I say that his friend will be upset if he speaks without thinking).						
9. If my child is disrespectful to an adult, "Would you like it if the same disrespect was done to your mother/father?" I ask.						
10. I tell bad examples and how those who act wrongly get reactions from the environment.						
11. Instead of imposing prohibitions on my child, I set certain limitations.						
12. I remind him of the consequences of his negative behavior to comply with the rules.						
13. I remind the rules in time (for example, bedtime).						
14. I encourage my child to study and be successful.						

15. I warn my child to behave well.						
16. If he persists despite my warnings, I let him do what he wants so that he can learn from the result.						
17. I don't break my rules, no matter how hard my child sticks.						
18. I appreciate my child for good behavior or do/give something he/she likes.						
19. I adjust my schedule according to my child, and I expect him to follow it.						
20. I repeatedly remind my child of what to do.						
21. There have been times when I have already given something he loves to do what I want.						

APPENDIX L

PARENTAL WARMTH (TURKISH)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Çocuğumun sıkıntılı olduğunu o söylemeden anlarım						
2.Başladığı bir işi başardığında çocuğumla gurur duyarım.						
3.Çocuğumu takdir eder överim.						
4.Çocuğumla aramda sıcaklık ve sevecenlik vardır.						
5.Sözlerim ve hareketlerimle çocuğumu sevdiğimi gösteririm.						
6.Bir sorunu olduğunda bana açılması için çocuğumu cesaretlendiririm.						
7.Bir sorunu olduğunda çocuğumu can kulağıyla dinlerim						
8.Bir zorluk yaşıyorsa çocuğuma destek olurum.						
9.Çocuğumla şakalaşırız.						

APPENDIX M

PARENTAL WARMTH (ENGLISH)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. I understand that my child is distressed without telling them						
2. I am proud of my child when he succeeds in a job he started.						
3. I appreciate and praise my child.						
4. There is warmth and affection between me and my child.						
5. I show that I love my child with my words and actions.						
6. I encourage my child to open up to me when they have a problem.						
7. I listen to my child when he has a problem						
8. I support my child if he/she is experiencing difficulties.						
9. We joke with my child.						

APPENDIX N

STRENGTH AND DIFFICULTIES QUESTIONNAIRE (TURKISH)

	Doğru Değil	Kısmen Doğru	Tamamen Doğru
1.Diğer insanların duygularını önemser.			
2. Huzursuz ve aşırı hareketlidir.			
3. Sıkça baş ağrısı, karın ağrısı ve bulantı şikayetleri olur.			
4. Diğer çocuklarla paylaşır (yiyecek, oyuncak vs)			
5. Sıkça öfke nöbetleri olur ya da aşırı sinirlidir.			
6. Daha çok tek başınadır, yalnız oynama eğilimindedir.			
7. Genellikle söz dinler, büyüklerin isteklerini yapar.			
8. Birçok kaygısı vardır, sıkça endişeli görünür.			
9. Kendini kötü hisseden birine yardımcı olur.			
10. Sürekli elleri ayakları kıpır kıpırdır ya da oturduğu yerde kıpırdanıp durur.			
11. En az bir yakın arkadaşı vardır.			
12.Sıkça diğer çocuklarla kavga eder ya da onlarla alay eder.			
13.Sıkça mutsuz, üzgün ya da ağlamaktadır.			
14.Genellikle diğer çocuklar tarafından sevilir.			
15.Dikkati kolayca dağılır, dikkatini toplamakta güçlük çeker.			
16.Yeni ortamlarda gergindir, anne/babasına yapışır, kendini kolayca güvende hissetmez.			
17.Kendinden küçüklere iyi davranır.			
18.Sıkça yalan söyler ya da hile yapar.			
19.Diğer çocuklar ona takarlar ya da onunla alay ederler.			
20.Sıkça başkalarına (anne, baba, öğretmen, diğer çocuklar) yardım etmeye istekli olur.			
21.Bir şeyi yapmadan önce düşünür.			
22.Ev okul ya da başka yerlerden bazı şeyleri aşırır.			
23.Büyüklerle çocuklarla anlaştığından daha iyi anlaşır.			
24.Pek çok korkusu var, kolayca ürker.			
25.Başladığı işi bitirir, dikkat süresi iyidir.			

APPENDIX O

STRENGTH AND DIFFICULTIES QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH)

Please tick one of the options "Not True", "Partly True", "Completely True" for each statement below, considering your child's behavior in the last 6 months.

	Not True	Partially True	Completely True
1.Considerate of other peoples' feelings			
2. Restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long			
3. Often complains of headache, stomach-aches, and sickness			
4. Shares readily with other children (treats, toys, pencils etc.)			
5. Often has temper tantrums or hot tempers			
6. Rather solitary, tends to play alone			
7. Generally obedient, usually does what adults request			
8. Many worries, often seems worried			
9. Helpful if someone is hurt, upset, or feeling ill			
10. Constantly fidgeting or squirming			
11. Has at least one good friend			
12. Often fights with other children or bullies them			
13. Often unhappy, downhearted, or tearful			
14. Generally liked by other children			
15. Easily distracted, concentration wanders			
16. Nervous or clingy in new situations, easily loses confidence			
17. Kind to younger children			
18. Often lies or cheats			
19. Picked on or bullied by other children			
20. Often volunteers to help others (parents, teachers, other children)			
21. Thinks thing out before acting			
22. Steals from home, school or from elsewhere			
23. Gets on better adults than with other children			
24. Many fears, easily scared			
25. Sees tasks through to the end, good attention span			

APPENDIX P

ITEM LOADINGS IN PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS (TURKISH)

PCAT Item	Factor Loading		
	1	2	3
Component 1. Culturally Valued Parental Control Practices			
Yanlış bir davranışta bulunduğunda bunun dinimize uygun olmadığını hatta günah olduğunu söylerim.	.75		
Ailemize laf getirecek davranışlardan kaçınması için çocuğumu uyarırım.	.70		
Yanlış bir davranışını gördüğümde bunun ayıp olduğunu söylerim.	.67		
Çocuğum bir yetişkine saygısız davranırsa “aynı saygısızlık annene/babana yapılsa senin hoşuna gider miydi?” diye sorarım.	.63		
Kötü örneklerin, yanlış davranışlarda bulunanların çevreden nasıl tepkiler aldığını anlatırım	.58		
Hata yaptığında utanması gerektiğini söylerim.	.58		
Çocuğumu terbiyeli olması konusunda uyarırım.	.54		
İstediğimi yapması için sevdiği bir şeyi önceden verdiğim olmuştur. (R)	.48		
Çocuğumun çoğu konuda ne düşüneceğini, nasıl hissetmesi gerektiğini söylerim.	.48		
Çocuğuma bir yanlış yaptığında onu affetmeyeceğimi söylerim.-	.44		
Çocuğumun ne yaptığını anlamak için çantasını, odasını ya da telefonunu kontrol ederim.	.42		
Çocuğuma onun için ne kadar çok çalışıp emek harcadığımı söylerim.	.42		
Başına bir şey gelecek korkusuyla okul dışında arkadaşlık kurmasına izin vermem	.41		
Çocuğumun evden uzakta arkadaşları ile vakit geçirmesine izin vermem.	.37		
Çocuğumun ne hissettiğini ne düşündüğünü sormam, zaten bilirim.	.34		
Component 2. Structuring			
Kurallara uyması için olumsuz davranışının sonuçlarını hatırlatırım.		.75	
Konulan kuralları zamanında hatırlatırım.			

		.72	
Çocuğuma yasaklar getirmek yerine belli sınırlamalar koyarım.		.64	
Çocuğumu çalışması ve başarılı olması için uyarırım.		.63	
Yanlış bir davranışta bulunduğunda çocuğumu karşısındaki kişinin duygularını anlaması için uyarırım.		.57	
Çocuğumu iyi davranışlarından sonra takdir ederim veya onun sevdiği bir şeyi yaparım/veririm.		.46	
Çocuğuma yapması gerekenleri defalarca hatırlatırım. (R)		.38	
Programımı çocuğuma göre ayarlar, onun da buna uymasını beklerim.		.33	
Uyarılarıma rağmen ısrar ederse, sonucundan ders alması için istediğini yapmasına izin veririm.		.31	
Çocuğum ne kadar tuttursa tuttursun, kurallarımı bozmam.		.30	
Component 3. Parental Psychological Control			
Çocuğum bir şey söylerken konuyu değiştiririm.			.69
Çocuğum konuşurken bitirmesini beklemeden cümlesini tamamlarım.			.63
Çocuğum konuşurken sözünü keserim.			.62
Çocuğumu eleştirirken geçmişte yaptığı hataları hatırlatırım.			.60
Çocuğumun bazı konulardaki hislerini ve düşüncelerini değiştirmeye çalışırım			.55
Beni üzdüğünü ve hayal kırıklığına uğrattığını söyleyerek suçlu hissettiririm.			.55
Aile üyelerinin yaşadığı zorluklar/sorunlardan dolayı çocuğumu suçlarım.			.39

Note: N = 305. The extraction method was principal component analysis with a varimax rotation. The factor loadings distributing with maximum load in a component is indicated in bold. Reverse scored items are denoted with (R).

APPENDIX R

ITEM LOADINGS IN PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS (ENGLISH)

PCAT Item	Factor Loading		
	1	2	3
Component 1. Culturally Valued Parental Control Practices			
When he does something wrong, I say that it is not in accordance with our religion and even that it is a sin.	.75		
I warn my child to avoid behaviors that will bring insults to our family.	.70		
When I see any wrongdoing, I say it is shameful.	.67		
If my child is disrespectful to an adult, "Would you like it if your mother/father was disrespected the same?" I ask.	.63		
I tell you how bad examples, those who act wrongly, get reactions from the environment.	.58		
I tell him he should be ashamed when he makes a mistake.	.58		
I warn my child to be decent.	.54		
There have been times when I have given something he loves beforehand to do what I want. (R)	.48		
I tell my child what to think and how to feel about most issues.	.48		
I tell my child that I will not forgive him when he does something wrong.	.44		
I check their bag, room, or phone to understand what my child is doing.	.42		
I tell my child how hard I worked and worked for him.	.42		
I don't allow her to make friends outside of school for fear of something happening to her.	.41		
I do not allow my child to spend time with friends away from home.	.37		
I don't ask what my child is feeling, what he thinks, I already know.	.34		
Component 2. Structuring			
I remind him of the consequences of his negative behavior to follow the rules.		.75	
I remind the rules in time.		.72	

Instead of imposing prohibitions on my child, I set certain limits.		.64	
I encourage my child to study and be successful.		.63	
I warn my child to understand the feelings of the other person when he/she misbehaves.		.57	
I appreciate my child for good behavior or do/give something he/she likes.		.46	
I remind my child over and over what to do. (R)		.38	
I adjust my schedule according to my child, and I expect him to follow suit.		.33	
If he persists despite my warnings, I'll let him do what he wants so that he learns from the outcome.		.31	
I don't break my rules no matter how hard my kid hits it.		.30	
Component 3. Parental Psychological Control			
I change the subject when my child is saying something.			.69
While my child is talking, do not wait for him to finish his sentence, I complete.			.63
I interrupt when my child is talking.			.62
When criticizing my child, I remind him of his past mistakes.			.60
I try to change my child's feelings and thoughts about certain issues.			.55
I make you feel guilty by saying that you upset and disappointed me.			.55
I blame my child for the difficulties/problems experienced by family members.			.39

Note: N = 305. The extraction method was principal component analysis with a varimax rotation. The factor loadings distributing with maximum load in a component is indicated in bold. Reverse scored items are denoted with (R).

REFERENCES

- Acar, I. H., Uçuş, Ş., & Yıldız, S. (2019). Parenting and Turkish children's behaviour problems: The moderating role of qualities of parent-child relationship. *Early Child Development and Care, 189*(7), 1072-1085.
- Acevedo, G. A., Ellison, C. G., & Yilmaz, M. (2013). Religion and child-rearing values in Turkey. *Journal of Family Issues, 36*(12), 1595-1623.
- Akcinar, B., & Baydar, N. (2014). Parental control is not unconditionally detrimental for externalizing behaviors in early childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 38*(2), 118-127.
- Alonso-Stuyck, P., Zacarés, J. J., & Ferreres, A. (2017). emotional separation, autonomy in decision-making, and psychosocial adjustment in adolescence: a proposed typology. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 27*(5), 1373-1383.
- Amato, P. R., & Fowler, F. (2002). Parenting practices, child adjustment, and family diversity. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(3), 703-716.
- Backman, H., Laajasalo, T., Jokela, M., & Aronen, E. T. (2021). Parental warmth and hostility and the development of psychopathic behaviors: A longitudinal study of young offenders. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 30*(4), 955-965.
- Barber, B. K. (1996). parental psychological control: revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*(6), 3296.
- Barber, B. K., & Harmon, E. H. (2002). Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescents. In *American Psychological Association eBooks* (pp. 15-52). <https://doi.org/10.1037/10422-002>
- Baudat, S., Van Petegem, S., Antonietti, J.-P., & Zimmermann, G. (2019). Parental solicitation and adolescents' information management: The moderating role of autonomy-supportive parenting. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 29*(2), 426-441.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development, 37*(4), 887.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*(1), 56-95.
- Bean, R. A., Bush, K. R., McKenry, P. C., & Wilson, S. M. (2003). The impact of parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control on the academic achievement and self-esteem of African American and European American adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 18*(5), 523-541.

- Bosmans, G., Braet, C., Beyers, W., van Leeuwen, K., & van Vlierberghe, L. (2011). parents' power assertive discipline and internalizing problems in adolescents: the role of attachment. *Parenting, 11*(1), 34–55.
- Brown, B. B., & Larson, J. (2009). Peer relationships in adolescence. *Handbook of adolescent psychology, 2*(Pt I), 74-104.
- Bumpus, M. F., & Hill, L. G. (2008). secrecy and parent-child communication during middle childhood: associations with parental knowledge and child adjustment. *Parenting, 8*(2), 93–116.
- Burt, K. B., & Roisman, G. I. (2010). Competence and psychopathology: Cascade effects in the NICHD study of early childcare and youth development. *Development and Psychopathology, 22*(3), 557–567.
- Camras, L. A., Sun, K., Li, Y., & Wright, M. F. (2012). Do Chinese and American children's interpretations of parenting moderate links between perceived parenting and child adjustment? *Parenting, 12*(4), 306–327.
- Calderón-Tena, C. O., Knight, G. P., & Carlo, G. (2011). The socialization of prosocial behavioral tendencies among Mexican American adolescents: The role of familism values. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(1), 98–106.
- Çatay, Z., Allen, R., & Samstag, L. W. (2008). Maternal regulation strategies in the United States and Turkey: A brief report. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 39*(5), 644–649.
- Chan, S. M., Bowes, J., & Wyver, S. (2007). Correction to: Chinese parenting in Hong Kong: Links among goals, beliefs, and styles. *Early Child Development and Care, 179*(8), 1125–1125.
- Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development, 65*(4), 1111-19.
- Chao, R. K., & Aque, C. (2009). Interpretations of parental control by Asian immigrant and European American youth. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*(3), 342–354.
- Charlot Colomès, A. A., Duchesne, S., & Boisclair Châteauvert, G. (2021). Autonomy support and school adjustment: The mediating role of basic psychological needs. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology, 9*(sup1), S182-S200.
- Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D. (2000). Parental warmth, control, and indulgence and their relations to adjustment in Chinese children: a longitudinal study. *Journal of family psychology, 14*(3), 401.

- Cho, H. S., Cheah, C. S., Vu, K. T., Selçuk, B., Yavuz, H. M., Şen, H. H., & Park, S.-Y. (2021). Culturally shared and unique meanings and expressions of maternal control across four cultures. *Developmental Psychology, 57*(2), 284–301.
- Chopik, W. J., O'Brien, E., & Konrath, S. H. (2017). Differences in empathic concern and perspective taking across 63 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 48*(1), 23-38.
- Chyung, Y. J., Lee, Y. A., Ahn, S. J., & Bang, H. S. (2021). Associations of perceived parental psychological control with depression, anxiety in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Marriage & Family Review, 58*(2), 158–197.
- Davis, A. N., Carlo, G., Streit, C., Schwartz, S. J., Unger, J. B., Baezconde-Garbanati, L., & Szapocznik, J. (2017). Longitudinal associations between maternal involvement, cultural orientations, and prosocial behaviors among recent immigrant Latino adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47*(2), 460–472.
- Deater-Deckard, K. (2000). parenting and child behavioral adjustment in early childhood: A quantitative genetic approach to studying family processes. *Child Development, 71*(2), 468–484.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). the “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268.
- Dinn, A., & A. & Sunar, D. (2017). Çocuk yetiştirme tutumları ve bağıntılarının kültür için ve kültürlerarası karşılaştırılması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 32*(79), 95–110.
- Dishion, T. J., & McMahon, R. J. (1998). Parental monitoring and the prevention of problem behavior: A conceptual and empirical reformulation. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e495502006-010>
- Dost-Gözkın, A. (2022). Adolescent–parent relationships and youth well-being in Turkey. *Child Development Perspectives, 16*(3), 173-179.
- Dwairy, M., & Achoui, M. (2009). Parental control: A second cross-cultural research on parenting and psychological adjustment of children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 19*(1), 16–22.
- Emmen, R. A. G., Malda, M., Mesman, J., Ekmekci, H., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2012). Sensitive parenting as a cross-cultural ideal: Sensitivity beliefs of Dutch, Moroccan, and Turkish mothers in the Netherlands. *Attachment & Human Development, 14*(6), 601–619.
- Field, A. P., & Field, A. P. (2020). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. SAGE Publications.

- Friedlmeier, W., Corapci, F., Susa-Erdogan, G., Benga, O., & Kurman, J. (2019). Cultural variations in maternal regulatory responses during a waiting task. *Culture and Brain*, 7(2), 99–125.
- Fu, W., Pan, Q., Zhang, W., & Zhang, L. (2022). Understanding the relationship between parental psychological control and prosocial behavior in children in China: the role of self-efficacy and gender. *International Journal of Environmental Research And Public Health*, 19(18), 11821.
- Fung, J., & Lau, A. S. (2012). Tough love or hostile domination? psychological control and relational induction in cultural context. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(6), 966–975.
- Garrett-Peters, P. T., Castro, V. L., & Halberstadt, A. G. (2016). Parents' beliefs about children's emotions, children's emotion understanding, and classroom adjustment in middle childhood. *Social Development*, 26(3), 575–590.
- Goodman, A., & Goodman, R. (2009). Strengths and difficulties questionnaire as a dimensional measure of child mental health. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48(4), 400-403.
- Gresham, F. M., Elliott, S. N., Vance, M. J., & Cook, C. R. (2011). comparability of the social skills rating system to the social skills improvement system: Content and psychometric comparisons across elementary and secondary age levels. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 26(1), 27.
- Gresham, F. M., Elliott, S. N., Metallo, S., Byrd, S., Wilson, E., & Cassidy, K. (2018). Cross-informant agreement of children's social-emotional skills: An investigation of ratings by teachers, parents, and students from a nationally representative sample. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55(2), 208-223.
- Grolnick, W. S. (2009). *The psychology of parental control: How well-meant parenting backfires*. Psychology Press.
- Grolnick, W. S., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1997). Internalizing problems within the family: The self-determination theory perspective. In J. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalizing problems of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (pp.135–161). New York: Wiley.
- Grolnick, W. S., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2009). Issues and challenges in studying parental control: toward a new conceptualization. *Child Development Perspectives*, 3(3), 165–170.
- Grusec, J.E., Rudy, D., & Martini, T. (1997). Parenting cognitions and child outcomes: An overview and implications for children's internalizing problems of values. In J.E. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalizing problems of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (pp. 259–282). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

- Gryczkowski, M., Jordan, S. S., & Mercer, S. H. (2018). Moderators of the relations between mothers' and fathers' parenting practices and children's prosocial behavior. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 49, 409-419.
- Guo, J., Tang, X., Marsh, H. W., Parker, P., Basarkod, G., Sahdra, B., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2023). The roles of social-emotional skills in students' academic and life success: A multi-informant and multicohort perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 124(5), 1079.
- Guzman, M. R., Do, K. A., & Kok, C. M. (2014). The cultural contexts of children's prosocial behaviors. *Prosocial Development*, 221-241. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199964772.003.0011>
- Güvenir, T., Özbek, A., Baykara, B., Arkar, H., Şentürk, B., & İncekaş, S. (2008). Güçler ve güçlükler anketi'nin (gga) Türkçe uyarlamasının psikometrik özellikleri. *Turkish Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 15, 65-74.
- Fowler, P. J., Toro, P. A., Tompsett, C. J., & Baltes, B. B. (2009). Community and family violence: Indirect effects of parental monitoring on externalizing problems. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 37(4), 302-315.
- Hauser Kunz, J., & Grych, J. H. (2013). Parental psychological control and autonomy granting distinctions and associations with child and family functioning. *Parenting*, 13(2), 77-94.
- Helwig, C. C., To, S., Wang, Q., Liu, C., & Yang, S. (2013). Judgments and reasoning about parental discipline involving induction and psychological control in China and Canada. *Child Development*, 85(3), 1150-1167.
- Hirvonen, R., Väänänen, J., Aunola, K., Ahonen, T., & Kiuru, N. (2018). Adolescents' and mothers' temperament types and their roles in early adolescents' socioemotional functioning. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 42(5), 453-463.
- Inguglia, C., Ingoglia, S., Liga, F., Lo Coco, A., & Lo Cricchio, M. G. (2014). Autonomy and relatedness in adolescence and emerging adulthood: relationships with parental support and psychological distress. *Journal of Adult Development*, 22(1), 1-13.
- Jones, D. E., Greenberg, M., & Crowley, M. (2015). Early social-emotional functioning and public health: The relationship between kindergarten social competence and future wellness. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(11), 2283-2290. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2015.302630>
- Machteld Hoeve; Judith Semon Dubas; Veroni I. Eichelsheim; Peter H. van der Laan; Wilma Smeenk; Jan R. M. Gerris (2009). *The Relationship Between Parenting and Delinquency: A Meta-analysis.*, 37(6), 749-775.

- Mikolajczak, M., Avalosse, H., Vancorenland, S., Verniest, R., Callens, M., van Broeck, N., Fantini-Hauwel, C., & Mierop, A. (2015). A nationally representative study of emotional competence and health. *Emotion, 15*(5), 653–667.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*(4), 403–422.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theory and applications*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kagitcibasi, C., D. Sunar, and S. Berkman. 1988. *Comprehensive Preschool Education Project*. Ottawa: IDRC.
- Karreman, A., van Tuijl, C., van Aken, M. A. G., & Deković, M. (2006). Parenting and self-regulation in preschoolers: a meta-analysis. *Infant and Child Development, 15*(6), 561–579.
- Knight, G. P., & Carlo, G. (2012). Prosocial development among Mexican American youth. *Child Development Perspectives, 6*(3), 258–263.
- Koçak, A., Selçuk, Ş., Mouratidis, A., Michou, A. A., & Sayıl, M. Perceived maternal psychological control and adolescent adjustment: The mediating role of basic psychological needs. *Behavioral Science, 29*, 76-82.
- Kurt, D., Sayıl, M., & Tepe, Y. K. (2013). Ana babanın psikolojik kontrolü ile gencin yalnızlığı arasındaki ilişkide kişilerarası güven inancı ve bağlanmanın rolü. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 28*(71), 105-116.
- Laible, D. J., & Carlo, G. (2004). The differential relations of maternal and paternal support and control to adolescent social competence, self-worth, and sympathy. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*(6), 759-782.
- Lansford, J. E. (2021). Annual Research Review: Cross-cultural similarities and differences in parenting. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*.
- Lee, J., & Randolph, K. A. (2015). Effects of parental monitoring on aggressive behavior among youth in the United States and South Korea: A cross-national study. *Children and Youth Services Review, 55*, 1–9.
- LeBuffe, P. A., Ross, K. M., Fleming, J. L., & Naglieri, J. A. (2012). The devereux suite: Assessing and promoting resilience in children ages 1 month to 14 years. *Resilience in Children, Adolescents, and Adults, 45–59*.
- Lieber, E., Fung, H., & Leung, P. W.-L. (2006). Chinese child-rearing beliefs: Key dimensions and contributions to the development of culture-appropriate assessment. *Asian Journal Of Social Psychology, 9*(2), 140–147.
- Liga, F., Lo Coco, A., Musso, P., Inguglia, C., Costa, S., Lo Cricchio, M. G., & Ingoglia, S. (2018). Parental psychological control, autonomy support and

- Italian emerging adult's psychosocial well-being: a cluster analytic approach. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 17(1), 37–55.
- Maccoby, E.E., & Martin, J.A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent–child interaction. In P. Mussen and E.M. Hetherington, editors, *Handbook of Child Psychology, volume IV: Socialization, personality, and social development*. New York: Wiley.
- Mansfield, E. R., & Helms, B. P. (1982). Detecting multicollinearity. *The American Statistician*, 36(3a), 158-160.
- Masten, A. S., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments. *American Psychologist*, 53, 205–220.
- McLeod, B. D., Wood, J. J., & Weisz, J. R. (2007). Examining the association between parenting and childhood anxiety: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27(2), 155–172.
- Mouratidis, Sayil, Kumru, Selcuk, & Soenens. (2019). Maternal knowledge as a mediator of the relation between maternal psychological control and altruistic prosocial, instrumental prosocial, and antisocial behavior. *Merrill- Palmer Quarterly*, 65(2), 207.
- 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(2), 461–471.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2021). *Digest of Education Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/>.
- Newton, E. K., Laible, D., Carlo, G., Steele, J. S., & McGinley, M. (2014). Do sensitive parents foster kind children, or vice versa? Bidirectional influences between children's prosocial behavior and parental sensitivity. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(6), 1808–1816.
- Olsen, S. F., Yang, C., Hart, C. H., Robinson, C. C., Wu, P., Nelson, D. A., Nelson, L. J., Jin, S., & Wo, J. (2002). Maternal psychological control and preschool children's behavioral outcomes in China, Russia, and the United States. *Intrusive Parenting: How Psychological Control Affects Children and Adolescents.*, 235–262. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10422-008>
- Pastorelli, C., Lansford, J. E., Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Malone, P. S., Di Giunta, L., Bacchini, D., ... & Sorbring, E. (2016). Positive parenting and children's prosocial behavior in eight countries. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 57(7), 824-834.

- Perris, C., Jacobsson, L., Linndström, H., von Knorring, L., & Perris, H. (1980). Development of a new inventory for assessing memories of parental rearing behaviour. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 61(4), 265-274.
- Pinquart, M. (2017). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with externalizing problems of children and adolescents: An updated meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(5), 873–932.
- Rapee, R. (1997). Potential role of childrearing practices in the development of anxiety and depression. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 17(1), 47–67.
- Rose-Krasnor, L. (1997). The nature of social competence: A theoretical review. *Social Development*, 6, 111–135.
- Rose-Krasnor, L., & Denham, S. (2009). Social-emotional competence in early childhood. In K. H. Rubin, W. M. Bukowski, & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Social, emotional, and personality development in context. Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (pp. 162-179). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Rothbaum, F., & Weisz, J. R. (1994a). Parental caregiving and child externalizing behavior in nonclinical samples: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(1), 55–74.
- Rothenberg, W. A., Lansford, J. E., Bornstein, M. H., Chang, L., Deater-Deckard, K., Di Giunta, L., Dodge, K. A., Malone, P. S., Oburu, P., Pastorelli, C., Skinner, A. T., Sorbring, E., Steinberg, L., Tapanya, S., Uribe Tirado, L. M., Yotanyamaneewong, S., Alampay, L. P., Al-Hassan, S. M., & Bacchini, D. (2020). Effects of parental warmth and behavioral control on adolescent externalizing and internalizing trajectories across cultures. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 30(4), 835–855.
- Sayı, M., & Kındap, Y. (2010). Ergenin anne-babadan algıladığı psikolojik kontrol: Psikolojik kontrol ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirliği. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 13(25), 62-71.
- Sayı, M., Kındap-Tepe, Y., & Kumru, A. (2019). Ebeveyn çatışması ve ergenin uyum sorunları arasındaki ilişkiler: Anne babanın kontrol uygulamalarının aracı rolü. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 34(83), 90-93.
- Seda, E., & Havva, E. (2021). Ergenlikte ebeveyn kontrolü ve ilişkisel saldırganlık: duyu düzenlemenin aracı rolü. *Kıbrıs Türk Psikiyatri ve Psikoloji Dergisi*, 3(2), 106-114.
- Selçuk, Ş., Ucanok, Z., & Sayı, M. (2021). Turkish adolescents' interpretations of psychological and behavioral control: Relation with adjustment problems and moderating factors. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 1-17.

- Sen, H., Yavuz-Muren, H. M., & Yagmurlu, B. (2013). Parenting: The Turkish context. *Science Across Cultures: The History of Non-Western Science*, 175–192.
- Serbin, L. A., Kingdon, D., Ruttle, P. L., & Stack, D. M. (2015). The impact of children's internalizing and externalizing problems on parenting: Transactional processes and reciprocal change over time. *Development and Psychopathology*, 27(4pt1), 969–986.
- Scharf, M., & Goldner, L. (2018). "If you really love me, you will do/be. . .": Parental psychological control and its implications for children's adjustment. *Developmental Review*, 49, 16–30.
- Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Smith, V., Zaidman-Zait, A., & Hertzman, C. (2011). Promoting children's prosocial behaviors in school: Impact of the "roots of empathy" program on the social and emotional competence of school-aged children. *School Mental Health*, 4(1), 1–21.
- Shek, D. T. (2007). Perceived parental control based on indigenous Chinese Parental Control Concepts in adolescents in Hong Kong. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 35(2), 123–137.
- Silk, J. S. (2003). Psychological control and autonomy granting: opposite ends of a continuum or distinct constructs? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(1), 113–128.
- Silk, J. S., Morris, A. S., Kayana, T., & Steinberg, L. (2003). Psychological control and autonomy granting: Opposite ends of a continuum or distinct constructs? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13, 113–128.
- Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Luyten, P. (2010). Toward a domain-specific approach to the study of parental psychological control: Distinguishing between dependency-oriented and achievement-oriented psychological control. *Journal of Personality*, 78(1), 217–256.
- Soenens, B., Park, S. Y., Vansteenkiste, M., & Mouratidis, A. (2012). Perceived parental psychological control and adolescent depressive experiences: A cross-cultural study with Belgian and South-Korean adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(2), 261–272.
- Sönmez, Ş. (2011). Ergenliğe geçişte annenin davranışsal ve psikolojik kontrolünün anne-ergen ilişkisine ve ergenin bir yıl sonraki uyumuna etkisi (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). *Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara*.
- Spinrad, T. L., & Gal, D. E. (2018). Fostering prosocial behavior and empathy in young children. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 20, 40–44.

- Sunar, D., & Brewster Smith, M. (n.d.). Mothers' and fathers' child-rearing practices and self-esteem in three generations of urban Turkish families. *Perspectives on Human Development, Family, and Culture*, 126–140.
- Sümer, N., Gündoğdu-Aktürk, E., & Helvacı, E. (2010). Psychological effects of parenting styles and behaviors: A Review of Studies in Turkey. *Turkish Psychological Articles*, 13, 42-59.
- Scharf, M., & Goldner, L. (2018). “If you really love me, you will do/be. . .”: Parental psychological control and its implications for children’s adjustment. *Developmental Review*, 49, 16–30.
- Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Smith, V., Zaidman-Zait, A., & Hertzman, C. (2011). Promoting children’s prosocial behaviors in school: Impact of the “roots of empathy” program on the social and emotional competence of school-aged children. *School Mental Health*, 4(1), 1–21.
- Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A Reinterpretation. *Child Development*, 71(4), 1072–1085.
- Streit, C., Carlo, G., Knight, G. P., White, R. M. B., & Maiya, S. (2021). Relations among parenting, culture, and prosocial behaviors in U.S. Mexican youth: An integrative socialization approach. *Child Development*, 92(4).
- Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (Vol. 6, pp. 497-516). Boston, MA: pearson.
- Tepe, Y. K., & Sayıl, M. (2012). Ebeveyn kontrolü ve ergenin sosyal işlevselliği arasındaki bağlantıda ilişkisel saldırganlığın aracı rolü. [The mediating role of relational aggression in the relationship between parental control and social functioning of the adolescent.]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 27(70), 119-132.
- Tobin, J. J., Wu, D.Y.H., & Davidson, D. H. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China, and the United States*. Binghamton, NY: Yale University Press.
- Tümer, B. (2021). *Qualitative examination of paternal and maternal parenting control in early and middle childhood among Turkish parents* (Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University).
- Weitkamp, K., & Seiffge-Krenke, I. (2018). The association between parental rearing dimensions and adolescent psychopathology: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(3), 469–483.
- Yagmurlu, B., & Sanson, A. (2009). Parenting and temperament as predictors of prosocial behavior in Australian and Turkish Australian children. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 61(2), 77–88.

- Yan, F., Zhang, Q., Ran, G., Li, S., & Niu, X. (2020). Relationship between parental psychological control and problem behaviors in youths: A three-level meta-analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review, 112*, 104900.
- Yap, M. B. H., Pilkington, P. D., Ryan, S. M., & Jorm, A. F. (2014). Parental factors associated with depression and anxiety in young people: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 156*, 8–23.
- Zhang, X., Li, Y., Nguyen-Jahiel, K., Lin, T.-J., Miller, B., Anderson, R. C., & Dong, T. (2013). Children's moral reasoning: Influence of culture and collaborative discussion. *Journal of Cognition and Culture, 13*(5), 503–522.