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CHAPTER 1

Parenting Beliefs and Practices of Turkish Immigrant Mothers in Western Europe

Parents all over the world share certain characteristics that are found to be intuitive and universal such as caring, nurturing, and loving their children (Bornstein, Tal, & Tamis-LeMonda, 1991; Luster & Okagaki, 2005). However, they also differ a great deal in the ways they display the task of taking care of and nurturing their children. Most of the child-rearing beliefs and practices vary depending on the socioeconomic and cultural background of the parents (Bornstein & Cheah, 2006; Luster & Okagaki, 2005). It has been shown in the literature that parents’ beliefs, values, goals, and expectations about child development are shaped by their culture (Bornstein & Cheah, 2006; Harwood, Schoelmerich, Ventura-Cook, Schulze, & Wilson, 1996), which in turn determine their parenting behaviors (Dix, 1992), moderate the effectiveness of their child-rearing practices (Kagitcibasi, 2007), and finally influence children’s social and cognitive development (Harkness & Super, 1992; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992; Wade, 2004). Therefore, studying parental beliefs and practices is of special importance for understanding the relations between child outcomes, child rearing, and sociocultural context.

This dissertation, in very broad terms, deals with how cultural background and socioeconomic factors relate to parenting beliefs and practices. The first topic involves the cross-cultural similarities and differences in parenting beliefs and practices of Turkish, German, and Dutch mothers. The second topic involves the role of immigration background and acculturation in Turkish-German and Turkish-Dutch mothers’ parenting patterns.

In this chapter, I describe the main concepts and terms that are used throughout this dissertation. I start with a brief explanation of how culture relates to parenting, and clarify the
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cultural frameworks and models I used to shape our understanding of Turkish, German, and Dutch cultures.

**Parenting and Culture**

Culture plays a major role in determining parenting and childhood (Luster & Okagaki, 2005). Although one of the major tasks of developmental psychology in the last decades has been to explain how cultural and socioeconomic context influences children’s development (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002), still too little is known about the beliefs and behaviors of many non-Western parents and their children. It is acknowledged that cross-cultural developmental studies are essential to understand when, why, and how parents behave in different parts of the world. This knowledge is needed to develop an understanding of culture-specific as well as universal factors that shape children’s development.

The relationship between culture, parenting, and the microenvironment around the child has been well formalized in the *developmental niche* framework by Harkness and Super (1992). The framework decomposes the child’s daily environment into three subsystems. The first subsystem, the physical and social settings, refers to the cultural variations in materials, toys, and play environment provided to the child. The second subsystem is culturally regulated customs and practices of child care and child rearing which includes parenting behaviors that are determined by the culture and, in turn, influence child development. For instance, the extent to which the child experiences a nurturing parenting would be an example of this second subsystem. The third and last subsystem is the psychology of the caretakers and it includes parental ethnotheories which constitute normative child-rearing values and beliefs in a particular culture. Parental ethnotheories are ‘cultural belief systems that parents hold regarding the nature of children, development, parenting, and the family’ (Harkness, Super, & Van Tijen, 2000, p. 249) which reflect parents’ developmental goals, expectations,
child-rearing beliefs and values, and perceptions about their children (Rosenthal & Roer-Strier, 2001). Studies indicated that parental ethnotheories affect child-rearing practices (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Kuczynski, 1984; Pomerleau, Malcuit, & Sabatier, 1991). In this project, I focused on the latter two subsystems: culturally regulated practices of child rearing and their relation to the psychology of the mothers. More specifically, I focused on socialization goals and developmental expectations which are aspects of ‘psychology of the mother’ and self-reported and observed parenting practices. Before going into the details of the theoretical frameworks that explain the role of culture on parents’ child-rearing patterns, I briefly explain the definitions of the key concepts studied in this project.

**Socialization Goals**

One aspect of the parental ethnotheories is parental *socialization goals* which can be described as the attributes parents value, endorse, and want their children to attain (Hastings & Grusec, 1998). Socialization goals refer to the characteristics that parents consider most important for their children to develop (Harwood et al., 1996). Developmental studies have shown that sociocultural background of parents has a strong influence on their socialization goals (Dennis, Talih, Cole, Zahn-Waxler, & Mizuta, 2007; Lamm & Keller, 2007) and it is believed that parenting goals must be understood in their context (Garcia Coll, Akerman, & Cicchetti, 2000). Therefore, it is important to examine parenting goals with respect to the culture they are shaped in.

**Developmental Expectations**

Another aspect of parental ethnotheories which is believed to have a significant influence on parenting behaviors and development of children is *developmental expectations* which refer to the time that parents believe particular milestones should be reached by the
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child (Goodnow, Cashmore, Cotton, & Knight, 1984). The importance of studying developmental expectations lies in the research findings which have shown that ages parents expect certain milestones to develop are positively related to the actual age their children achieve those skills (Hopkins & Westra, 1990). In the literature, parenting goals and developmental expectations have been mostly examined in relation to contextual and cultural factors; yet, cross-cultural studies on these topics are still scarce.

Parenting Practices

Examining parenting is of special importance since it is an attempt to understand the ways we can improve child outcomes. Literature on parenting was first dominated by studies focusing on parenting styles which are defined as ‘a constellation of attitudes toward the child that are communicated to the child and create an emotional climate in which parent’s behaviors are expressed’ (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, p. 493). Baumrind (1973), whose typology of parenting styles has been influential in the field, suggested three basic types of parental styles: Permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Permissive parents are warm, responsive to child’s needs but fail to set limits and provide a structure for the child. Authoritarian parents are less affectionate and they have a high control on the child. Authoritative parenting includes affections, sensitivity to child’s needs, and also a firm control. Later, neglectful parenting was added by Maccoby (1984) as a fourth parenting style in which parents are neither responsive to nor controlling their child; these parents do not monitor children’s activities and provide little structure for the child.

Although conceptualizing parenting in terms of general styles is useful to understand the framework through which characteristics of parents can be studied, researchers prefer to keep the distinction between parenting styles and parenting practices. This is especially important for the examination of the relations between parenting and children’s outcomes. It
has been suggested that *parenting style* refers to the quality whereas *parenting practices* refer to the content and frequency of practices through which parents can directly facilitate the attributes they want their children to have (Stevenson-Hinde, 1998). Inductive reasoning (e.g., providing explanations), warmth (e.g., nurturance, affection, support), and power assertion (e.g., punishment, restriction, obedience-demanding behavior) are some of the widely examined parenting behaviors in relation to child outcomes.

There are a large number of studies and theoretical models investigating cross-cultural similarities and differences in parenting practices of mothers across the world. For instance, the Component Model of Parenting (Keller, 2007) proposes six universal parenting systems that all parents display across the world; their display differs in terms of the emphasis given to the specific parenting systems and their combinations, depending on the cultural background of the parents (Keller, 2007). It is important to note that Keller’s model has been designed for parenting of infants whereas my study deals with older children. Common findings point out that, among parenting behaviors, caring and nurturing are assumed to be intuitive and universal as they are displayed by mothers across all cultural contexts (Bornstein, Tal, & Tamis-LeMonda, 1991; Rudy & Grusec, 2001). Moreover, non-western mothers are found to use more punishment and control than western mothers (Kelley & Tseng, 1992). In order to be able to understand these differences in parenting, we need to examine the broader sociocultural context in which family and parenting takes place.

In the following sections, I briefly introduce the two cultural frameworks which I used to examine differences and similarities between Turkish, German, and Dutch mothers in this project: Individualism – Collectivism (Triandis, 1994) and the Family Change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007).

**Individualism – Collectivism**
One of the theoretical frameworks I used throughout this project to examine cross-cultural differences in norms and values between Turkish, German, and Dutch mothers is the Individualism – Collectivism framework (Triandis, 1994) which classifies cultures into two. In a nutshell, in collectivistic societies dependence, obedience, having strong family and social ties are highly endorsed values. On the other hand, in individualistic cultures autonomy, independence, assertiveness, self-control, taking responsibility for the action, and exploration are highly endorsed values (Greenfield & Suzuki, 1998; Triandis, 1994).

In this project, I considered Turkey to be a collectivism-oriented culture and German and Dutch cultures as individualistic cultures. Individualism - Collectivism framework indeed guided this project when formulating hypotheses and examining cultural differences between the participating mothers. However, recent literature has criticized the Individualism - Collectivism paradigm and repeatedly argued that individualism and collectivism are two conceptually independent dimensions of family functioning that can coexist in the same culture or individual (Kagitcibasi, 2007; Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). Individualism - Collectivism proposes that cultures have a (in most studies low or high) standing on Individualism - Collectivism; however, the paradigm does not relate to socioeconomic and cultural changes cultures go through. Therefore in this project, I also benefited from Kagitzibasi’s (2007) Family Change model which is not limited to the differences between cultures but expands our understanding of the dynamics of parenting by incorporating several other sociocultural and socioeconomic factors that might affect parenting.

Family Change Model

This model proposes that contextual factors (e.g., culture, living conditions, level of affluence) determine how the family is structured (e.g., family type, family ties, woman’s status). Contextual factors and family structure influence the socialization goals and values
endorsed in a particular environment and they together influence certain family interaction and parenting that are influential in the development of children. By studying family and its links with social and economic factors, the Family Change model facilitates our understanding of the differences in parenting not only between different cultures but also among the urban, educated and middle class, and the rural, less educated, low SES and immigrant groups.

This model proposes three different types of family interaction patterns: independence, interdependence, and psychological interdependence. The family pattern of interdependence prevails in collectivistic cultures and traditional rural societies where intergenerational interdependence is functional and essential. Interdependence is valued more in traditional, underdeveloped, low-SES societies because the broader social system does not take care of its dependent members such as elderly; and the responsibility for taking care of them is on family members, particularly children. Thus, children are needed and expected to provide old-age security to their parents, which increases the functionality of child rearing dominated by obedience and relatedness (Kagitcibasi, 2007).

The family model of independence, on the other hand, is prevalent in individualistic cultures and in Western, urban, middle-upper class families. Values endorsed by the society are individuation, assertiveness, intergenerational autonomy, and self-reliance. Thus, child-rearing pattern in this context is dominated by encouraging children to be autonomous (Kagitcibasi, 2007).

The third family pattern, psychological interdependence, is closely related to socioeconomic development and modernization. It is generally assumed that with urbanization and modernization, a shift from the model of interdependence to the model of independence occurs (Inkeles & Smith, 1974). However, Kagitcibasi proposes this does not
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necessarily have to be the case. She argues that industrialization in collectivistic, traditional cultures can transform from the interdependence family patterns towards the psychological independence model. In this family pattern, intergenerational interdependencies and obedience in the family weaken as the affluence level of the society and families increases; however, psychological interdependencies and close family ties continue to remain important. Autonomy in child rearing is endorsed because children no longer provide old-age security to their parents. Besides, parents realize the functional value of assertiveness and autonomy in the new urban life style (Okagaki & Sternberg, 1993). However, because emotional relatedness continues to be important, parental control in child rearing remains important (Kagitcibasi, 2007).

The Family Change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007) is relevant in acculturation contexts which is also a form of social change. Migration is usually from collectivistic cultures to individualistic Western societies. Kagitcibasi proposes that some change would occur in immigrant parents’ beliefs and practices as they interact with Western life style. According to this model, as immigrant parents acculturate to the new society their child rearing would transform into the family model of psychological interdependence. In this dissertation, I mainly used the Family Change model to guide our understanding of Turkish, German, Dutch, and Turkish immigrant parenting patterns and also draw conclusions from the findings.

Acculturation and Immigration

Many studies have investigated the relationship between culture and parenting beliefs and practices; however, these studies have mostly examined differences between two cultures, particularly with the Individualism-Collectivism framework as their central theoretical background. It is indeed very important to study cultural differences and similarities of parenting patterns between various cultural groups; however, it is also essential to examine
changes within a cultural group undergoing sociocultural transformation. Examining parenting beliefs and practices in immigration context would provide us with valuable information on the dynamics of parenting patterns among immigrant mothers. Nevertheless, in the literature, there are few studies that have examined parenting beliefs and practices in relation to immigration and acculturation (Bornstein & Cote, 2004a, b).

In the last couple of years, immigration and diversity in the Western societies have attracted attention and gained prominence, especially in Europe. This is mainly due to the fact that very little is known about the parenting patterns and processes in immigration contexts and what is known shows that there are differences between parenting beliefs and practices of immigrants and mainstreamers that are especially leading to immigrant children’s negative developmental outcomes (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Furthermore, although immigrant children may perform as well as majority children on measures of social competence, they are usually disadvantaged. Particularly the backlog in cognitive development tends to rise over time and can perpetuate across generations (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Understanding the factors that lead to such unfavorable outcomes for immigrant groups requires investigation of parental cognitions and practices in an acculturation context.

Globalization has made people move out of their homelands to other countries, particularly for work reasons; as a consequence, intercultural contacts have increased. With the increasing number of ethnic minorities, the host societies, namely Western European countries, are becoming more aware of multiculturalism and acculturation. Many people especially from collectivistic cultures migrate to and settle down in Western countries and raise their children there. As these immigrants become more visible in the host societies, more research on their family structure and parenting has been conducted to capture possible changes in parenting patterns of immigrants resulting from the gap between their original values and those of the host society (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Although it is argued that
parenting beliefs and practices of immigrants accommodate those of the host culture, the
dynamics of stability and change in parenting beliefs and practices during the acculturation
process are still understudied (Bornstein & Cote, 2006).

The most widely applied model of acculturation has been developed by Berry (2001)
who defines acculturation as the form of cultural transmission experienced by an individual
that results from a contact with, and influence by, persons and institutions belonging to other
cultures than one’s own (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 2002). Berry’s (2001)
Bidimensional Model proposes two main dimensions to explain how an acculturating
individual wishes to relate to the dominant society. These dimensions are cultural
maintenance and cultural adoption. Cultural maintenance refers to the extent an acculturating
person is willing to maintain his/her own cultural values and norms, whereas cultural
adoption refers to the extent an acculturating person is willing to adapt the values and norms
of the host culture. Depending on the position of a person on these two dimensions, four
acculturation strategies are defined by Berry: Assimilation, separation, integration, and
marginalization. In assimilation, the individual does not want to maintain the values of
original culture and adopts those of the host culture. In separation, the individual preserves
the original culture and wishes to avoid interaction with others from the host culture. In
integration, the individual wants both to maintain the original culture and to be in frequent
interaction with the host culture; and in marginalization, the individual does not have any
interest in maintaining the original culture or being in interaction with the host culture.

Several studies have shown that parenting variables are related to the acculturation
orientation of immigrant parents (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Rosenthal, Bell, Demetriou, &
Efklides, 1989). Second-generation and integrated parents show a more autonomy- and
independence-oriented parenting pattern compared to the first-generation, less integrated
immigrant parents (Buriel, 1993; Delgado-Gaitan, 1994). These results show that participation
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of the immigrants in the host society and their acculturation orientations are related to changes and accommodations in their parenting beliefs and behaviors. This dissertation particularly focuses on Turkish-Dutch and Turkish-German immigrant mothers and their parenting goals, developmental expectations, and child-rearing practices.

Turkish Immigrants in Western Europe

Immigration from Turkey to Germany and the Netherlands goes back to the 1960s when the Western-European economy had a shortage of labor after the Second World War (Abadan-Unat, 2002). Between the early 1960s and 1970s, German and Dutch companies requested workers from Turkey who were usually recruited for unskilled jobs in the heavy industry sectors. This type of labor recruitment ended in mid-1970s; however, the number of Turkish immigrants kept increasing because of family reunifications. The majority of the first-generation Turkish immigrants were coming from rural and economically less advanced areas of Turkey with traditional family structure, and on average their education level was low (Abadan-Unat, 2002). Their goal of immigration was to earn enough money to build a better life in Turkey after remigration (Abadan-Unat, 2002; Kaya & Kentel, 2005); thus, most of the first-generation Turkish immigrants did not intend a long-term stay in Europe. In line with this perspective, they were called as “guest workers” (Gastarbeiter in German, gastarbeiders in Dutch), even officially. However, it became clear during the 1970s that immigrants would stay longer in Europe than initially intended and even would settle permanently. Currently, Turkish immigrants form the largest group of immigrants in Germany with a population of approximately 2 million (Worbs, 2003) and the largest non-Western immigrant group in the Netherlands with a population of 381,000 (CBS, 2010).

Turkish immigrants in Western Europe and their values and acculturation have received much attention in the last few years since they form one of the biggest immigrant groups in these countries, especially in Germany and the Netherlands. Even though it has
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been shown that Turkish immigrant children are below the standards of their mainstream Dutch or German counterparts in several developmental domains, particularly cognitive and school achievement (Schoelmerich, Leyendecker, Citlak, Caspar, & Jakel, 2008; Sowa et al., 2000; Te Nijenhuis, Tolboom, Reising, & Bleichrodt, 2004), there are very few studies in the literature that examine parenting beliefs and practices of Turkish immigrant parents in Europe (Leseman & Van den Boom, 1999; Nijsten, 2006; Phalet & Schönpflug, 2001; Schoelmerich et al., 2006; Yaman, Mesman, Van IJzendoorn, & Bakerman-Kranenburg, 2010). We know that parents influence child development greatly by their child-rearing beliefs and practices (Bornstein & Cheah, 2006). Therefore, it is indeed very important to investigate similarities and differences in parenting patterns of Turkish immigrant and mainstream European parents in order to elucidate the possible factors which may lead to the often unfavorable outcomes of Turkish immigrant children.

This dissertation

In this project, my major aim was to examine and understand cross-cultural similarities and differences between parenting beliefs (namely socialization goals and developmental expectations) and parenting practices by studying Turkish immigrant mothers in comparison with mainstream German and Dutch mothers. Figure 1 shows a simplified model presenting the concepts and relations between distal factors such as cultural and educational background, parenting beliefs, and parenting practices. The following chapters of this dissertation focus on and examine either some parts of this model or the entire model to find out the links between these parenting aspects. Investigating the role of acculturation orientation of Turkish immigrant mothers on their parenting beliefs and behaviors was another major aim of the thesis.
Another aim of this project was to look into socioeconomic and cultural influences on parenting beliefs and practices to distinguish the effect of socioeconomic factors from culture on parenting. In the literature, it is shown that the role of culture on parenting weakens and sometimes even disappears when socioeconomic variables are taken into account (Bornstein et al., 1991). It is a very common problem in cross-cultural studies, especially studies concerning immigrant groups, that differences attributed to the cultural background overlap with socioeconomic differences (Hill, 2006; Kagitcibasi, 2003; Leyendecker, Harwood, Comparini, & Yalcinkaya, 2005). I try to disentangle the role of culture, immigration, and several socioeconomic factors in relation to parenting beliefs and practices in this project.

**Figure 1.** A model of parenting and culture

This dissertation adds to the existing literature in several ways. Firstly, it goes beyond the often observed developmental psychology backlog of immigrant children and families and their poor performance at social and cognitive areas compared to their mainstream counterparts. Most of the research on immigrant families and children in Western countries deal with the problematic areas which can be subject to intervention to catch up with the norms of the host society. This is of course important and needed; however, it points to an
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assumed deficit in immigrant children and families. This dissertation assumed a different perspective by concentrating on many other domains than cognitive and aimed to examine both Turkish immigrant and the mainstream mothers to find out the differences as well as similarities in their parenting beliefs and practices. Secondly, even though Turks form the largest non-Western immigrant population both in Germany and in the Netherlands, there are not many extensive studies on their family dynamics and parenting patterns. Thus, this dissertation adds to the little we know about Turkish immigrant families in Western Europe. Lastly, this dissertation examined many parenting aspects and cultural and socioeconomic variables simultaneously to get a better grasp on the mechanisms behind the parenting of Turkish mothers in immigration contexts.

Overview of Chapters

In order to achieve the general aims of this project, four empirical studies have been conducted. Each chapter in this dissertation describes a separate study that deals with the aforementioned general goals, and can be read independent of one another.

Chapter 2 examines the similarities and differences in socialization goals of Turkish immigrant and mainstream German mothers in Germany. This chapter also aimed to identify the association of acculturation orientation with Turkish-German mothers’ socialization goals.

Chapter 3 is a replication of the previous study in the Netherlands with Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers. This paper used the data collected in Germany with an addition of data collected in the Netherlands to be able to compare the results of the mainstream and immigrant groups in two different country settings. In this chapter, cross-cultural differences in Dutch, German, Turkish-Dutch, and Turkish-German mothers’ socialization goals are studied. In addition, the role of educational background, acculturation, and generational status of mothers in their parenting goals are examined.
Chapter 1

**Chapter 4** describes an independent study that focused on developmental expectations, which is another aspect of parenting ethnotheories. In this chapter, cross-cultural comparisons of developmental expectations of first- and second-generation Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers are presented.

In **Chapter 5**, the relationship between developmental expectations and parenting practices of Turkish-Dutch, mainstream Dutch, and mainstream Turkish mothers is presented. This study examines the relative importance of ethnicity, type of residence (urban vs. rural), and educational background of mothers on their parenting variables. This study used the Turkish-Dutch and Dutch samples collected for Chapter 4, and added data from different sociocultural contexts in Turkey.

**Chapter 6** is an independent study that presents the relationship between developmental expectations and the self-reported and observed parenting practices of Turkish-Dutch, mainstream Dutch, and mainstream Turkish mothers.

The last chapter, **Chapter 7**, summarizes the findings of the previous chapters and presents a discussion and conclusion based on these findings. Theoretical and practical implications of these studies are discussed and suggestions for future research are made.
Introduction
CHAPTER 2

Sociocultural Influences on German and Turkish Immigrant Mothers’ Long-Term Socialization Goals

Abstract

The major aims of this study were (1) to investigate the differences and similarities in long-term socialization goals of German mothers and Turkish immigrant mothers living in Germany; and (2) to examine socialization goals of Turkish immigrant mothers in relation to their acculturation attitudes. Participants were composed of 79 Turkish mothers who were either raised in Germany or migrated to Germany, and 91 German mothers of preschoolers living in Germany. Turkish immigrant mothers were more likely to expect their children to have close relations with the family, to be well-mannered and they were less likely to value autonomy than were German mothers. Turkish mothers who were more integrated into German culture were found to value individualistic goals such as self-control more than Turkish mothers who were more separated from the German culture, yet both groups valued mutual support within the family very highly. The findings reveal that socialization goal patterns of Turkish immigrant mothers represent the pattern depicted in the psychological interdependence model proposed by Kagitcibasi (2007).

*This study was conducted as a part of “Home Start Before School Start” project funded by Volkswagen Foundation and run by Prof Birgit Leyendecker from Ruhr-Bochum University.

Parents’ socialization goals are associated with parenting practices and children’s social and cognitive development (Harkness & Super, 1992; Kagitcibasi, 2007; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch & Darling, 1992) and vary by culture and socioeconomic status (Harwood, Schoelmerich, Ventura-Cook, Schulze & Wilson, 1996; Tudge, Hogan, Snezhkova, Kulakova & Etz, 2000; Tulviste & Ahtonen, 2007). Therefore, studying parental beliefs and socialization goals is of special importance for understanding the relationship between child development and the sociocultural child-rearing environment. In the last few years, research on parenting beliefs and practices of immigrant groups has gained prominence in Europe, and it has been shown that patterns of parenting cognitions vary across majority and minority groups within the same society (Citlak, Leyendecker, Schoelmerich & Harwood, 2008; Nijsten, 2006). The aim of the present study was to examine the similarities and differences between German and Turkish-German mothers’ parenting goals, and to identify the role of acculturation on Turkish immigrant mothers’ socialization goals.

Parental beliefs are defined as the adult cognitions about child development, and they influence on parents’ child-rearing practices (Hastings & Grusec, 1998; Kuczynski, 1984). One aspect of parental beliefs are the long-term socialization goals, which refer to the qualities parents value and want their children to attain as they grow up (Harwood et al., 1996; Hastings & Grusec, 1998). This study examines long-term socialization goals of German and Turkish immigrant mothers by asking them about the characteristics they would and would not like their children to possess as adults.

Socioeconomic and Cultural Influences

Some of the first studies on the relationship between parenting goals and socioeconomic status were conducted by Miller and Swanson (1958), and demonstrated that parents’ job characteristics are related to what they value in their children. Miller and
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Swanson’s (1958) study was based on the contrast between entrepreneurial orientations that emphasize self-sufficiency, risk taking, autonomy, and control at work, and bureaucratic orientations which emphasize compliance, stability and security of employment. Similarly, Kohn (1959) studied the role of social class on parents’ socialization goals. He found that in general, middle-class mothers who have prestigious occupations display a socialization goal pattern favoring self-confidence and independence in the child, whereas mothers coming from lower socioeconomic backgrounds emphasize good manners and obedience to authority (Harwood et al., 1996; Tudge et al., 2000). Some researchers (Lueptow, McClendon, & McKeon, 1979) have argued that the effect of socioeconomic status actually lies in the amount of schooling that parents have received, and that maternal education is the best predictor of maternal behaviors and child outcomes as compared to the composite SES index, and individually occupation and income (Bornstein, Hahn, Suwalsky, & Haynes, 2003). In support of this view, studies on migrant and non-migrant Turkish mothers have found that mothers with a low education level are more likely to emphasize the importance of their children staying close to the family throughout their lives, of listening to their parents’ advice (Dost, Citlak, Yagmurlu & Leyendecker, 2006), and of being compliant (Yagmurlu & Sanson, 2004) compared to mothers with a high education level. Higher-educated mothers, on the other hand, value autonomy, academic achievement, and self-confidence in the child (Dost et al., 2006; Phalet & Schopf, 2001).

However, beyond socioeconomic background, culture also exerts a strong influence on maternal beliefs (Harkness & Super, 1992; Harwood et al., 1996; Lamm & Keller, 2007). One explanation for cultural influence on socialization goals lies in the concepts of Individualism and Collectivism. Although there is no consensus on a precise definition of these terms, collectivistic values are typically described as consisting of interdependence, obedience, and strong family ties, whereas individualistic values comprise independence,
assertiveness, the development of individual skills and talents, and self-esteem (Harwood et al., 1999; Pearson & Rao, 2003; Triandis, 1994).

Nevertheless, Individualism and Collectivism constructs (Triandis, 1987) are not unidimensional concepts. In her Family Change Model, Kagitcibasi’s (2007) attempt to explain differences in parenting between cultures is a refinement of the Individualism-Collectivism paradigm and argues that individualism and collectivism are multifaceted dimensions that can coexist in all cultures. Kagitcibasi assumed that modernization and socioeconomic changes in society influence the adaptive characteristics expected of an individual, and that these changes lead people to transform and accommodate their values and family relations. In her model, she differentiated between three types of family interaction patterns: Independence, interdependence, and psychological interdependence. The family pattern of interdependence prevails in cultures of relatedness, traditional rural societies and contexts where the individual has a contribution to family income and well-being from very early ages on and therefore, economic value of children is important. In contrast, the independence family model is prevalent in cultures of separateness, Western, urban, middle-upper class families where children have no material value for the family, where values endorsed by the society are individuation, intergenerational autonomy, and self-reliance. The third family pattern which is psychological interdependence is closely related to socioeconomic development and modernization in collectivistic cultures. It is generally accepted that with economic development, a shift occurs from the model of interdependence to the model of independence (Inkeles & Smith, 1974). However, Kagitcibasi proposed that urbanization and industrialization in collectivistic cultures do not necessarily transform the interdependence family patterns toward typical family interaction patterns of independence. Material interdependencies in the family and economic value of an individual for the older generations do weaken as affluence level increase, but psychological interdependencies and
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close family ties continue to remain (Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005). This third family model does not propose a hierarchy-oriented parenting pattern. Instead, autonomy as well as relatedness in child rearing are likely to co-occurs.

Research on Turkish parenting beliefs has indicated that traditional rural Turkish families emphasize the importance of being obedient and grateful to one’s parents, having life-long close ties with family members, and expecting the adult offspring to contribute financially to the family (Imamoglu, 1998; Sunar, 2002). Highly educated and urbanized Turkish mothers, on the other hand, do not expect their children to be grateful yet they still expect their adult children to maintain close ties with the family (Imamoglu, 1998) and to possess emotionally interdependent traits (Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005). In addition, they encourage their children to be autonomous and economically independent and to develop their cognitive skills. In contrast, German mothers are more likely to display parenting practices considered to support both emotional and material independence and agency of the child, and their parenting is considered to reflect a typical individualistic pattern (Lamm & Keller, 2007). Therefore, we can expect similarities between German and Turkish mothers in regard to their support of economic independence yet differences with respect to the importance which mothers place on interdependence and close family ties.

Acculturation and Socialization Goals

In the previous decades, migration to and within Europe has increased considerably. As ethnic minorities have become more visible, more research into families, parenting, and child development in acculturation contexts has been conducted (Kwak, 2003). However, the origins of parental beliefs and goals and the dynamics of stability and change in parenting cognitions during the acculturation process are still understudied (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Acculturation refers to the form of cultural transmission experienced by an individual that
results from contact with persons and institutions belonging to other cultures than one’s own (Berry, Poortinga, Segall & Dasen, 2002). According to Berry’s (2001) widely used model of acculturation, the way in which a migrant relates to the dominant society is dependent upon both cultural maintenance and adaptation dimensions. In his model, Berry differentiates between four broad acculturation strategies - assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. The assimilation strategy assumes that the individual does not maintain the values of original culture and adopts those of the host culture instead. In the separation strategy, the individual preserves the original culture and has little exposure or contact to the dominant culture. In the integration strategy, the individual wants both to maintain the original culture and to be in daily interactions with others from the dominant culture whereas an individual who favors the marginalization strategy has interest neither in maintaining the original culture nor in adopting the dominant culture.

Bornstein and Cote (2006) argued that parental beliefs and goals of immigrants must accommodate those of the culture of origin and those of the culture of destination. Although theories on the development of acculturation over time are still lacking (Arends-Toth & Van de Vijver, 2006a, b), Berry’s (2001) model of acculturation, which describes behavioral changes in the context of acculturation, might have implications for explaining the changes in the parental goals of immigrant parents. Combining Berry’s (2001) model with Kagitzcibasi’s (2007) Family Change model, one can argue that as parents integrate with the host culture parenting goals related to autonomy are likely to increase, hierarchy goals are likely to decrease whereas the importance placed on relatedness is likely to be unrelated to their acculturation orientations. Empirical studies with immigrant groups (Delgato-Gaitan, 1994; Yagmurlu & Sanson, 2002) have reported findings that support the implications of Berry’s (2001) and Kagitzcibasi’s (2007) predictions.
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Aside from interdependence and dependence goals, studies with immigrants living in the United States (Delgato-Gaitan, 1992; Leyendecker et al., 2002), in Australia (Burns, Homel, & Goodnow, 1984) and in Germany (Citlak et al., 2008) have shown that immigrant parents strongly emphasize the importance of their children receiving a good education. Parents who migrated from a more agrarian to a more industrialized Western country are likely to value educational achievement as an adaptive strategy for their children’s social and economical advancement (LeVine, Miller, & West, 1988; Phalet & Schonpflug, 2001).

Turkish Immigrants in Germany

The history of migration from Turkey to Germany began in the 1960s. The first Turkish immigrants arrived in Germany to compensate for the labor shortage at that time. These workers were usually recruited to perform unskilled manual labor in factories and coal mines. The majority of the Turkish immigrants came from rural and undeveloped areas of Turkey, and on average their education level was low (Abadan-Unat, 2002). According to 2002 statistics, Turkish immigrants form the largest ethnic group of immigrants in Germany with a 1.9 million population in addition to an unknown number with German passports. Regarding the acculturation processes of Turkish immigrants in Europe, the majority feels close to the Turkish culture and maintains close ties with Turkey (Kaya & Kentel, 2005). For the Netherlands, Arends-Toth (2003) found that Turkish-Dutch people displayed integration with the Dutch culture in public domains such as school and work, but maintained their traditional Turkish values in private spheres such as family relations.

The subject of Turkish immigrants in Europe and their lifestyle, values, and integration issues has received attention in the last few years due to the problems Turkish children have in school and in social areas (Sowa et al., 2000). Despite this, there are very few studies (Citlak et al., 2008; Harwood, Yalcinkaya, Citlak, & Leyendecker, 2006; Leyendecker et al., 2006; Nijsten, 2006; Phalet & Schonpflug, 2001) which focus on the
parenting of Turkish immigrants. Previous research (Leyendecker et al., 2006; Nijsten, 2006) has indicated that Turkish immigrant mothers expect their children to be respectful and to foster close, lifelong relationships with the family. In addition, however, mothers who were raised in Germany and who had a higher level of education were also more likely to value their children’s autonomy when compared to mothers who were raised in Turkey and migrated as adults (Citlak et al., 2008).

Overall, the current findings suggest that a study on parenting goals in an immigration context needs to take into account both socioeconomic and cultural factors. In this study, the primary goal was to investigate the differences and similarities in long-term socialization goals of German mothers and Turkish immigrant mothers living in Germany, after accounting for the education level of the mothers. Based on the previous findings, we hypothesized that Turkish immigrant mothers would want their children to be more obedient and respectful, whereas German mothers were expected to value autonomy, self-reliance, and psychological well-being goals more highly. In addition, our interest lay in exploring the role of acculturation on Turkish immigrant mothers’ socialization goals. In line with Berry’s (2001) and Kagitcibasi’s (2007) models, we expected that Turkish immigrant mothers who adopt German cultural values would be more likely to value goals related to self-maximization such as economic and psychological independence, and less likely to endorse obedience of the child and respectfulness goals compared to Turkish mothers who adopt fewer German values. It was also predicted that both integration and separation-oriented Turkish mothers place a high importance on having close family ties.
Method

Participants

Participants in the study comprised 79 immigrant Turkish and 91 German mothers living in the highly industrialized Ruhr Area in Germany. In this area, migrants from Turkey form the single largest minority group. All of the participating mothers had at least one child of pre-school age who was the target child in this study. A mother was classified as Turkish only if both her parents had a Turkish background; mothers classified as German were all born in Germany, had parents raised in Germany, and spoke German at home.

In the German sample, the mean age of the mothers was 33.60 years ($SD = 5.06$), the youngest was 22 years old and the oldest was 46 years old. The mean age of the German fathers was 37.17 ($SD = 6.76$), and ranged between 25 and 61 years. The mean age of the children of German mothers was 46.03 months ($SD = 3.74$), the youngest was 39 months old and the oldest 55 months old. Of the German children, 51% were girls and 49% were boys. In terms of composition, 78% of the German mothers were married, 8% were divorced, 8% of the mothers were unmarried, and 6% were married but not living with their husbands. Nineteen percent of the German mothers had completed the Hauptschule, a type of secondary school that represents the lowest level of the three-tier German secondary school system and prepares children for practical vocational training after grade 10. Forty-six percent of the mothers had completed the Realschule, the middle tier of German secondary school which usually leads to vocational training and apprenticeship after grade 10, 13% had completed 12 years of schooling, acquiring the Fachhochschulreife, a prerequisite to enter a university of applied sciences; and 22% of the women had completed 13 years of schooling and acquired the Abitur, which corresponds to the highest tier and is a prerequisite to enter university (see Table 1 for descriptive statistics for the German and Turkish samples).
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Of the Turkish immigrant sample, 28% were born in Germany and 72% were born in Turkey. The mean age of the Turkish mothers was 30.47 years ($SD = 4.51$), the youngest was 22 years old and the oldest 43 years old. The mean age of the fathers was 32.31 ($SD = 4.39$) and ranged between 24 and 41. The mean age of the Turkish children was 46.11 months ($SD = 4.25$), the youngest was 37 months old and the oldest 57 months old. Forty-eight percent of the target Turkish children were girls and 52% were boys. In terms of composition, 93% of the mothers were married, 3% were divorced, 2% were married but not living with their husbands, and 2% of mothers were widowed. All but one mother went at least some years to school. In terms of the highest level of education that the other Turkish mothers had completed in school, 17% had completed Ilkokul, the compulsory 5-year primary education in Turkey; 2% had completed Ortaokul in Turkey, secondary school with 8 years of education in total; 44% of mothers had completed the Hauptschule in Germany; 11% had completed Realschule; 13% had completed Lise which is the Turkish form of high school with 11 years of education; 8% had attained the Fachhochschulreife; and 4% had attained the Abitur.

Turkish was the preferred language of 57% of Turkish immigrant mothers, while 11% preferred German, 31% described themselves as bilingual, and 1 mother preferred Kurdish.

Results of ANOVA revealed that German mothers were significantly older than Turkish mothers ($F(1, 170) = 17.97$, $p < .001$) and German fathers were significantly older than Turkish fathers, $F(1, 170) = 27.45$, $p < .001$. The age of the target child of the German and Turkish mothers did not differ significantly.

Materials and Procedure

Participants were recruited from public daycare centers. The child-care teachers approached the mothers and provided them with a letter describing the purpose and procedure of the project. The mothers who agreed to participate received a call from the study’s staff to
schedule an interview, which was conducted either at the daycare center or at the mother’s home, if she preferred. Interviewers were ethnically matched, and the interviewers who saw the Turkish mothers were bilingual and able to conduct the interview in the mother’s preferred language.

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Data, Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N = 91)</td>
<td>(N = 79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, not living with husband</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education reached by the mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilkokul (Turkish primary school)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortaokul (Turkish)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauptschule (German)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realschule (German)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lise (Turkish)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fachhochschulreife (German)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abitur (German)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For the assessment of long-term socialization goals, the mothers were requested to complete the Socialization Goals Inventory-Pilesort (SGI) which was developed by the ‘Home Start before School Start’ research group at Ruhr-University, Bochum (Korom, Harwood, & Leyendecker, 2004) based on the original version of in-depth, semi-structured interviews. The original version of the SGI (Harwood, 1992) consisted of four open-ended questions where mothers were asked to describe the attributes they would and would not like their children to have as adults. However, SGI interviews were a very time consuming way of examining long-term parental goals. A Likert-type scale was not appropriate since testing using the SGI showed that mothers tended to rate every item as very important and had difficulties labeling certain items as less important, which masked the differences between mothers’ socialization goals. Therefore, the ipsative Q-sort technique (Brown, 1986) was preferable since this design forces participants to make decisions and label items as more or as less important. Data from previous research (Citlak et al, 2008; Harwood 1992; Harwood et al., 1996; Leyendecker et al., 2002) that used the Socialization Goals Interview was compiled to create a Q-sort scale (the Bochum-SGI-Pile-Sort) based on the nine categories of the original SGI-Coding procedure developed by Harwood (1992; Citlak et al., 2008; Leyendecker et al., 2002). This pile sort was created following a multi-step process. First, the main goals of Euro-American, Latin-American, and German mothers were compiled based on responses to the full SGI interview. In the following step, all items that were semantically similar were deleted. In the third step, the goals mentioned by Turkish mothers (Citlak et al., 2008) but not by others were identified and added to the scale. The final Q-sort version of the SGI was a 54-item instrument. Each item was written on a card and mothers were asked to prioritize their socialization goals for their children according to a fixed distribution from 1 (less important/ of no concern) to 6 (very important); nine cards were put in each six category. It consisted of the following nine categories:
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1. Emotional and physical well-being, or concern that the child be happy and psychologically and physically healthy (e.g., “to be happy”);
2. Personal and economic potential, or concern that the child develop cognitive skills and fulfill his/her individual potential (e.g., “to receive a good education”);
3. Psychological development, or concern that the child be self-reliant, assertive, decisive, and be one who insists on his/her rights (e.g., “to develop an independent personality”);
4. Close warm relationships, or concern that the child develop the emotional ability to build and to maintain close, warm relationships with others (e.g., “to show understanding towards others”, “to be warm towards others”);
5. Self-control, or concern that the child learn to control aggression and egocentrism (e.g., “able to control his/her aggression”);
6. Avoidance of illicit behavior, or concern regarding delinquency, sexual misconduct, and finding the right kind of friends (e.g., “does not use drugs”);
7. Personal integrity, or concern that the child be morally upright (e.g., to act according to society’s expectations regarding right and wrong);
8. Respectfulness, or concern that the child behave respectfully towards others who are older than him/her (e.g., “to behave respectfully toward adults”); and
9. Role obligations within the family, or concern for lifelong mutual support within the family (e.g., “to help one’s parents when they get older”).

It was possible for each statement to receive between 1 and 6 points, depending on the location within the pile sort. For the data coding, items sorted into the pile with the highest importance were given 6 points, and items sorted into the least important pile were given 1 point each. In the following step, we computed the number of points given to any of the 9 scales described above.

Turkish immigrant mothers were also administered a modified version of the Bicultural Involvement Scale (Cortes, Rogler, & Malgady, 1994). This scale includes 30 items that form two parallel sets. Fifteen items in each set were equivalent items that differ from each other only with respect to the culture to which they refer. Responses of participants were rated on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = “not at all” and 4 = “very much”) to assess their levels of enjoyment and relative preference for culturally-specific activities, including the media, food, interpersonal relationships, childrearing practices, and comfort with the two languages. Additionally, it provided information about the extent to which an individual felt
competent in and enjoyed aspects of the Turkish and German cultures. The subscales 
Involvement in Turkish Culture and Involvement in German culture were found to have high 
internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha of .77 and .82, respectively. The correlation 
between Involvement in Turkish Culture and Involvement in German culture was 
nonsignificant ($r = -.05$, $p = .66$).

Results

The primary goal of this study was to investigate the differences and similarities in 
long-term socialization goals of German and Turkish immigrant mothers living in Germany. 
First of all, correlational analysis was conducted to examine the association between 
socialization goals, mother’s education, and acculturation orientation. Afterwards, in order to 
test the hypothesis regarding the cultural differences between Turkish and German mothers 
MANCOVA was applied. Lastly, we investigated the role of acculturation on socialization 
goals by carrying out MANCOVA analyses in order to compare socialization goals patterns 
of integration-oriented and separation-oriented Turkish mothers.

Maternal Education and Socialization Goals

The degree of association between maternal education and socialization goals was 
examined through bivariate correlations (see Table 2). With the exception of personal and 
economic potential, the association between maternal education and socialization goals was 
parallel in both samples. Mothers who had acquired more education were more likely to 
emphasize the importance of emotional well-being, psychological development and 
independence, and were less likely to prefer respectfulness and role obligations within the 
family. In addition, we found a positive relationship between the education of Turkish 
mothers and their preference for socialization goals referring to the development their 
children’s personal and economic potential. In addition, involvement with the German culture
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increased with education ($r = .43, p < .001$), yet involvement with Turkish culture was not related to maternal education ($r = -.10$).

Acculturation to the German culture was significantly and positively related to the goals close warm relationships ($r = .30, p < .01$), personal and economic potential ($r = .23, p < .05$) and negatively associated with respectfulness goals ($r = -.34, p < .01$). In contrast, correlational analyses showed that involvement in the Turkish culture was significantly and positively related to respectfulness goals ($r = .22, p < .05$).

Cultural Differences between Turkish and German Mothers

One of the major goals of the present study was to examine the differences between German and Turkish mothers’ socialization goals. An ANOVA revealed that German mothers were significantly more educated when compared to the Turkish mothers, $F(1, 170) = 32.96, p < .001$. Bivariate correlations for the Turkish and German samples indicated that mothers’ education was significantly associated with their socialization goals. Therefore, maternal education was set as the covariate.

MANCOVA results showed a significant overall difference between Turkish and German mothers with respect to their long-term socialization goals (Pillai’s $T = .50, F(1, 170) = 17.88, p < .001, \eta^2 = .50$), after accounting for mother’s education. Figure 1 summarizes the results for MANCOVA examined for the nine socialization goal categories.
Table 2

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations among Variables for Turkish (N = 79, in bold) and German Mothers (N = 91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal and economic potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological development</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Close warm relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>-.51***</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-control</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avoidance of illicit behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Respectfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Role obligations within family</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results indicated that the two groups of mothers differed significantly for all socialization goals except personal integrity. German mothers were significantly more likely to endorse self-control, close warm relationships, emotional well-being, and psychological development whereas Turkish mothers were significantly more likely to endorse personal and economic potential, avoidance of illicit behavior, respectfulness, and role obligations within the family. We found no differences between the German and Turkish mothers for personal integrity goals; the mean scores of 3.52 and 3.54, respectively, reflect the high emphasis mothers place on this goal.

Figure 1. Mean differences between Turkish immigrant and German mothers for nine socialization goals

Note: Effect sizes (partial eta squared) are shown with significant effects, after maternal education was taken as covariate, indicated by asterisks (*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001).
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**Group Differences According to Acculturation**

Another major goal of the present study was to examine the acculturation attitudes in relation to the socialization goals of Turkish mothers. Based on Berry’s (2001) model, we wanted to create four groups of Turkish immigrant mothers according to their acculturation orientation. However, Turkish mothers were found to be highly involved in the Turkish culture ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .33$, $min = 2.24$, $max = 3.81$), therefore it was not possible to categorize Turkish mothers as assimilated or marginalized according to Berry’s (2001) model. Instead, Turkish mothers were then categorized as integration-oriented or separation-oriented according to their reports on the Involvement with the German Culture subscale. If a mother scored higher than the median ($Mdn = 2.67$, $min = 1.71$, $max = 3.57$), she fell into the integration-oriented category; if she scored below the median, she fell into the separation-oriented category. Accordingly, 51% of the Turkish sample was classified as more oriented towards the Turkish culture and 49% as more integration oriented. We found a significant association between acculturation orientation and mothers’ education level. Education levels of integration-oriented and separation-oriented Turkish mothers were compared via ANOVA, with the results indicating that Turkish mothers who were more oriented towards integration were significantly more educated than the mothers who were more oriented towards the Turkish culture, $F(1, 79) = 7.45$, $p < .01$. Therefore, maternal education was set as the covariate in further analyses.

We further examined differences between integration-oriented and separation-oriented Turkish mothers via a MANCOVA (see Table 3). After controlling for education, there was a marginally significant overall difference between the socialization goals of integrated and separated Turkish mothers, Pillai’s $T = .18$, $F(1, 79) = 1.65$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .18$. 
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### Table 3

*Comparison of German, Integrated Turkish and Separated Turkish mothers for Socialization Goals (Maternal Education as the Covariate)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Separated (n = 40)</th>
<th>Integrated (n = 39)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional well-being</td>
<td>3.56 .72</td>
<td>3.65 .75</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal potential</td>
<td>3.68 .69</td>
<td>3.92 .75</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological development</td>
<td>3.43 .75</td>
<td>3.61 .82</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close warm relationships</td>
<td>3.15 .66</td>
<td>3.42 .65</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>3.00 .68</td>
<td>3.35 .74</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid illicit behavior</td>
<td>3.81 .91</td>
<td>3.78 .82</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal integrity</td>
<td>3.57 .68</td>
<td>3.58 .75</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td>3.53 .57</td>
<td>3.19 .53</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role obligations within family</td>
<td>3.45 .82</td>
<td>3.35 .87</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>German (n = 91)</th>
<th>Integrated (n = 39)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional well-being</td>
<td>4.07 .77</td>
<td>3.65 .75</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal potential</td>
<td>3.59 .75</td>
<td>3.92 .75</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological development</td>
<td>4.39 .73</td>
<td>3.61 .82</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close warm relationships</td>
<td>4.26 .64</td>
<td>3.42 .65</td>
<td>42.37</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>3.52 .78</td>
<td>3.35 .74</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid illicit behavior</td>
<td>2.67 .79</td>
<td>3.78 .82</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal integrity</td>
<td>3.49 .56</td>
<td>3.58 .75</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td>2.72 .67</td>
<td>3.19 .53</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role obligations within family</td>
<td>2.79 .69</td>
<td>3.35 .87</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>German (n = 91)</th>
<th>Separated (n = 40)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional well-being</td>
<td>4.07 .77</td>
<td>3.56 .72</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal potential</td>
<td>3.59 .75</td>
<td>3.68 .69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological development</td>
<td>4.39 .73</td>
<td>3.43 .75</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close warm relationships</td>
<td>4.26 .64</td>
<td>3.15 .66</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>3.52 .78</td>
<td>3.00 .68</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid illicit behavior</td>
<td>2.67 .79</td>
<td>3.81 .91</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal integrity</td>
<td>3.49 .56</td>
<td>3.57 .68</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td>2.72 .67</td>
<td>3.53 .57</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role obligations within family</td>
<td>2.79 .69</td>
<td>3.45 .82</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results showed that Turkish mothers who were integration-oriented endorsed close warm relationships and self-control significantly more than mothers who were more separated. Results also showed that the difference in respectfulness goals between Turkish mothers who were more integrated and mothers who were more separated was marginally significant. An examination of the differences between the German and the integration-oriented Turkish mothers showed that German mothers emphasized psychological development and close warm relationships goals significantly more, and avoidance of illicit behavior, respectfulness and role obligations within the family goals significantly less than the integration-oriented Turkish mothers, Pillai’s $T = .51$, $F(1, 131) = 13.83$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .51$.

Finally, a significant overall difference between German and separation-oriented Turkish mothers in their socialization goals was found, Pillai’s $T = .44$, $F(1, 130) = 10.55$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .44$. German mothers valued psychological development, self-control and close warm relationships goals significantly more highly, whereas separated Turkish mothers valued avoidance of illicit behavior, respectfulness and role obligations within the family significantly more highly. These two groups of mothers did not differ significantly in the goals emotional well-being, personal and economic potential and personal integrity.

In sum, it appears that with a greater level of education, mothers in both samples were more likely to be concerned about their children’s future emotional well-being, psychological development/independence, development of their personal and economic potential, and less concerned about respectful behavior and role obligation within the family.

With increased acculturation into the German culture, Turkish mothers were less likely to emphasize the importance of respectfulness and were more likely to emphasize close warm relationships and self-control. However, regardless of the acculturation of the Turkish
Socialization Goals of Turkish-German Mothers

mothers, German mothers were much more likely to emphasize the importance of close, warm relationships, psychological development/independence and less likely to emphasize the importance of respectfulness than Turkish mothers.

Discussion

The main aim of the present study was to investigate the effect of culture on parenting goals. For this purpose, we compared the long-term socialization goals of German mothers and Turkish immigrant mothers living in Germany. The study’s results demonstrated that after controlling for differences in mother’s education, German mothers were significantly more likely to expect their children to be independent, to be able to control negative impulses and to be socially skilled, whereas Turkish immigrant mothers placed a higher importance on their children’s respectful and well-mannered behavior, and on close family ties. These findings were consistent with the characterization of German culture as being more independence-oriented (Lamm & Keller, 2007) and Turkish culture as being more interdependence-oriented (Kagitcibasi, 2007).

The mean scores of the German mothers for each socialization goal category showed that they considered psychological development and independence to be very important for a child whereas they were much less concerned about goals related to respectful behavior and close family relationships. Kagitcibasi (2007) proposes that parents living in individualistic Western societies expect their children to be autonomous and assertive since these characteristics are adaptive in such a context. In addition, separation of the self from the family is considered healthy in this cultural context. Therefore, one could argue that the long-term socialization goal patterns of German mothers exemplify the child-rearing orientations depicted in the Family Model of Independence (Kagitcibasi).
On the other hand, although Turkish immigrant mothers expected their children to be respectful, well-mannered and close to the family to a greater extent than did the German mothers, the mean scores of Turkish immigrant mothers indicated that they rated autonomy as well as family integrity and closeness as very important for the child. This finding can be interpreted as showing that Turkish immigrant mothers value having close relations with the family; yet also realize the adaptive value of autonomy and self-control in the individualistic German culture. In support of this argument, Kagitcibasi (2007) proposes that in cultures of relatedness, families in developed areas display relation patterns in which autonomy in child rearing is endorsed due to the functional value of individuation in an urban lifestyle; however, close family ties and relatedness goals are still valued, and thus remain. The present study therefore shows that the socialization goal patterns of Turkish immigrant mothers convincingly represent the pattern depicted in the Psychological Interdependence Model proposed by Kagitcibasi (2007).

German mothers placed a greater importance on their children having close warm relationships with others compared to Turkish immigrant mothers. In this study, the category “close warm relationships” refers to the development of loving, caring relationships with others, to the development of empathy and understanding. Parents who want their children to develop social skills should be high on both categories of Close, warm relationships and Self-control, which includes items such as “not showing off or being arrogant”, “being able to control one’s anger, and to deal with frustration”. These qualities combined should facilitate children’s ability to move in and out of groups and to develop friendships with others, as proposed by Triandis (1994). In comparison with the Turkish mothers, German mothers are indeed very high on both of these two categories. It might be argued that social competence, as proposed by Triandis, was desired more by German mothers mainly because these characteristics and competences facilitates easier and smoother transition into and out of
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groups which is a value endorsed more in individualistic cultures. The comparison of integration- and separation-oriented Turkish mothers revealed that these were the only two categories which revealed significant differences, as the integrated mothers were more likely to endorse self-control and close warm relationships than separation-oriented mothers.

In addition to differences between cultural groups, the study also investigated parental goals within the Turkish group in relation to mothers’ level of acculturation. Comparisons between integration-oriented and separation-oriented Turkish mothers were in line with Berry’s (1992) model of acculturation and Kagitcibasi’s (2007) predictions, and indicated that Turkish mothers who were more integrated into the German culture wanted their children to be socially competent and to control their negative impulses significantly more than separation-oriented Turkish mothers. Further, there was a tendency in the more integrated Turkish immigrant mothers towards expecting their child to be more autonomous and self-confident compared to the separation-oriented mothers, but the difference did not reach statistical significance.

Additionally, integration-oriented and separation-oriented Turkish immigrant mothers did not differ significantly from each other in terms of the importance they placed on role obligations within the family. It seems that as they integrate with the German culture, Turkish immigrant mothers realize that being respectful and accepting hierarchy is not functional anymore in the German society. However, they still want their children to have close ties with the family, to act according to moral rules, and not to display unwanted behaviors as much as separation-oriented mothers want. It appears that both groups of Turkish immigrant mothers preserve their own traditional parenting goals.

Turkish immigrant mothers endorsed academic and professional success more strongly than German mothers, and Turkish immigrant mothers of a separation versus
integration orientation did not significantly differ in terms of this goal. This finding is consistent with the argument that in the context of modernizing collectivistic cultures, parents realize the adaptive value of education for social survival and endorse academic goals more highly (Levine, Miller & West, 1988; Phalet & Schonpflug, 2001). In addition, a recent study by Leyendecker, Yagmurlu, Citlak, Dost, and Harwood (2008) comparing migrant and non-migrant mothers in Turkey and in Germany found Turkish mother regardless of their education and migration experiences to be more likely to endorse socialization goals related to their children’s personal and economic potential when compared to German mothers.

With respect to education-related differences in German and Turkish mothers’ socialization goals, goals related to autonomy and emotional well-being of the child were more salient in the reports of high-educated mothers in both German and Turkish-German groups. The reports obtained from mothers with less education highlighted the importance of being close to the family and respectful. These findings support previous research (Citlak et al., 2008; Dost et al., 2006; Harwood et al., 1996; Tudge et al., 2000) which has reported a significant relationship between socioeconomic status and socialization goals for several aspects of the long-term socialization goals. It appears that as mothers receive more education, they are more likely to endorse the functional value of autonomy and self-control. On the other hand, low-educated mothers seem to value compliance on behalf of the child more since compliance to authority represents a central adaptive element of low socioeconomic status and low-skilled occupations (Kohn, 1959). Further, respectfulness combined with a high value of role obligations within the family can be considered functional for parents from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, since they expect their children to take care of the family (Kagitcibasi, 2007).

A methodological issue that needs to be pointed out is the pile sort technique used for measuring mothers’ socialization goals. The pile sort version of the SGI revealed findings
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that were similar to those of previous studies which used the original interview version of the SGI (Dost et al., 2006; Leyendecker et al., 2002, 2006). A critical advantage of using the pile sort version of the SGI is the lower time consumption compared to SGI interviews. Moreover, since it is an ipsative approach, using SGI-pilesort allows us assess the socialization goals intra-individually and examine the relative importance of certain goals for the mothers (Block, 1957; Caspi, Block, & Block, 1997). On the other hand, the fact that participants are forced to make certain decisions, due to the nature of the pile-sort technique, might have restricted mothers’ judgments, and influenced the results of the present study.

Moreover, even though we controlled for education of the mothers, there might be some other contextual factors that can explain cross-cultural differences between mothers. One of the most likely sources of influence is the residential background of the mothers. Turkish immigrant mothers were mainly coming from rural whereas German mothers were from urban backgrounds. Many studies (Abels et al., 2005; Imamoglu, 1987; Kagitcibasi, 2007; Sunar, 2002) have shown that there are substantial differences in parenting patterns of rural and urban mothers. On the whole, obedience in child rearing and closely-knit family relations are prevalent in rural context while autonomy, intelligence, and education of the child are highly valued in urban context because in modernized, urbanized cities these values are adaptive for social survival. Therefore, the reason German mothers valued autonomy more than Turkish immigrant mothers might be the fact that they have an urban background. Likewise, valuing autonomy-related goals of Turkish immigrant mothers as they integrate with the German culture might also occur because these mothers accommodate with the values that are actually adaptive not only in Western, individualistic societies but in urbanized collectivistic contexts as well.

The findings of the present study also have implications for interventions which attempt to facilitate the well-being and psychological adaptation of Turkish immigrants in
Germany. Findings of the present study provide insight into cultural differences in Turkish immigrant and German mothers’ socialization goals. German mothers appear to consider both economic and emotional independence of the child as desirable and they consider the maintenance of close family relationships as less important. Turkish immigrant mothers, on the other hand, appear to strike a balance between having close family ties and being autonomous.

The findings of the present study indicated that the mother’s education and their relations with the host society are likely to influence their long-term socialization goals. Higher-educated Turkish immigrant mothers as well as the ones who are more integrated with the German culture want their children to be autonomous, self-confident and assertive more, which are considered to be the functional characteristics for being socially, academically and professionally successful in Western cultures (Kagitcibasi, 2007; Rogoff, 2003).
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Family Change Model in Immigration Context: Socialization Goals of Mainstream and Turkish Immigrant Mothers in the Netherlands and Germany

Abstract

Objective. Using Kagitcibasi’s (2007a) family change model as conceptual framework, this study examined (1) cross-cultural differences in Dutch, German, Turkish-Dutch, and Turkish-German mothers’ socialization goals; and (2) relation between socialization goals, acculturation attitudes and generational status of Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands and Germany. Design. Participants were 79 Dutch, 91 German, 89 Turkish-Dutch, and 79 Turkish-German mothers with a preschool age child. Results. Dutch and German mothers were found to display the family model of independence, whereas Turkish immigrant mothers favored the interdependence model. In Turkish immigrant samples, increased adjustment to the mainstream culture was found to be associated with more endorsement of autonomy goals and less endorsement of obedience. Yet, the effect sizes of most analyses were small and expected significances were not found for all socialization goals. Conclusion. The inferences of the family change model on socialization goals and values were largely confirmed to be applicable also in an immigration context; yet, the expected increase in autonomy and decrease in obedience were more supported than the continued importance of relatedness.

*Part of this study was conducted under supervision of Prof Birgit Leyendecker based on “Home Start Before School Start” project.
The family change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007a) is a widely studied and cited framework to explain the role of sociocultural and socioeconomic factors on parenting processes; however, it has not yet been tested in an immigration context (Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005; Keller et al., 2003; Kim, Park, Kwon, & Koo, 2005). Our study set out to test whether Kagitcibasi’s model on the role of socioeconomic changes on parenting processes in a society holds in immigration contexts as well. More specifically, our study aimed to (1) examine cross-cultural differences in Dutch, German, Turkish-Dutch, and Turkish-German mothers’ socialization goals; and (2) verify the feasibility of the assumptions of the family change model that are related to obedience, autonomy, and relatedness goals in immigration contexts. For the latter, socialization goals of Turkish immigrant mothers were examined in relation to their acculturation attitudes and generational status.

Socialization goals refer to the characteristics and attributes that parents consider most important for their children to develop (Harwood, Schoelmerich, Ventura-Cook, Schulze, & Wilson, 1996; Hastings & Grusec, 1998). Interest in the study of socialization goals was spurred by findings which showed that parental views on children influence the behaviors that parents are likely to use and hence, children’s developmental outcomes (Dix, 1992). Developmental studies have shown that the sociocultural background of parents has a strong influence on socialization goals (Dennis, Talih, Cole, Zahn-Waxler, & Mizuta, 2007; Lamm & Keller, 2007) and hence that socialization goals must be understood in their context (Garcia Coll, Akerman, & Cicchetti, 2000).

Studies addressing cross-cultural differences and similarities in socialization goals mainly focused on the comparison of parents from individualistic and collectivistic backgrounds and concluded that parents from collectivistic cultures value obedience-oriented goals such as compliance and respectfulness more, and rated behaviors such as being quiet and respectful as more positive, whereas parents from individualistic cultures endorse
Socialization Goals and Family Change Model

autonomy-oriented goals like independence, exploration, and self-reliance more (Harwood et al., 1996; Harwood, Schoelmerich, Schulze, & Gonzalez, 1999; Pearson & Rao, 2003). Other cross-cultural studies have evaluated the association between socialization goals and parents’ background characteristics that are related to individualism-collectivism like education and socioeconomic status. Background variables explained a large amount of variance in cross-cultural differences in goals; yet, these differences remained significant after the statistical correction (Leyendecker, Harwood, Lamb, & Schoelmerich, 2002; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997).

The Family Change Model

Recent literature has repeatedly criticized the original model and argued that individualism and collectivism are two conceptually independent dimensions of family functioning that can coexist in the same culture or individual (e.g., Kagiticibasi, 2007a; Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). This stance suggests that we need models and empirical data that deepen our understanding of the relation between the two dimensions and expand our understanding of the dynamics of parenting. Cross-cultural studies are crucial for understanding of how sociocultural and socioeconomic factors affect these two parenting dimensions. Kagiticibasi’s (2007a) family change model is one of those models that address the link between the family and socioeconomic factors in the context. The model, used as conceptual framework in the present study, proposes specific socialization goals and values that can be seen in certain contexts depending on their cultural and socioeconomic characteristics, and it also addresses how sociocultural changes in a society might affect socialization goals. Our main goal was to test its propositions regarding socialization goals in acculturating families. The model views contextual factors like living conditions as determinants of family structure (e.g., family type, family ties) and the socialization values endorsed in a particular environment. The model assumes that urbanization and
socioeconomic changes in the society influence the characteristics expected from an individual in the new context, and these changes lead people to transform and accommodate their values, goals, and family relations.

The family change model differentiates between three types of family interaction models: interdependence, independence, and psychological interdependence family models. The family pattern of *interdependence* prevails in traditional, rural societies where intergenerational interdependence is functional. In such contexts, obedience of children is highly endorsed so that they can provide old-age security to their parents. The main values in socialization are maintaining hierarchical family relations, behaving according to societal rules, and compliance to elderly. In contrast, the *independence* family model is prevalent in Western, urbanized societies where intergenerational autonomy and individuation are strongly endorsed goals by parents. The third family pattern, *psychological interdependence*, is typical in traditional societies that undergo major socioeconomic changes. Kagitcibasi (2007a) proposes that urbanization and industrialization in such cultures lead to a transformation of the pattern of interdependence toward family interaction patterns of psychological interdependence. As urbanization and affluence levels increase, the economic value of an individual for the older generations, the need for compliance, and hierarchical relationships within the family weaken, and are replaced by more egalitarian norms and autonomy, which are adaptive and functional in an urban lifestyle. Therefore, obedience goals of parents tend to decrease while autonomy of the children starts being endorsed more. However, a third goal, relatedness which refers to the psychological closeness and emotional ties within the family, remains important in psychological interdependence families (Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005).

Evidence supporting the family change model comes mainly from cross-cultural research on parenting. Keller et al. (2003) tested the model with mothers from urban areas in
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Germany and Greece and revealed that, as expected, urban German mothers’ parenting practices exemplified a model of independence. On the other hand, parenting patterns of urban Greek mothers were more congruent with the model of psychological interdependence. Kagitcibasi (2007b) argues that her propositions on family change within a society can also be applied to migration from traditional to Western urbanized cultures. The family model of psychological interdependence can be expected to emerge in immigrant parents’ child rearing entailing a continuation of the importance of relatedness, an increase in autonomy and a decrease in obedience. A few studies with immigrants found supporting results for the family change model (Koutrelakos, 2004; Kwak, 2003); however, these were studies on intimate relationships or on adolescents’ familial expectations. To our knowledge, there is no study that directly examined socialization goals of immigrant parents within the family change framework. Our study set out to test Kagitcibasi’s assumptions on obedience, autonomy, and relatedness goals within the Turkish immigrant contexts in the Netherlands and Germany.

Turkish, Dutch, and German Familial Patterns

The Turkish sociocultural context has been characterized by close interpersonal relationships, group ties, loyalty, and kinship (Aygun & Imamoglu, 2002). Since the Turkish social security system is not elaborate (compared to the welfare states of western Europe), the responsibility for taking care of dependent people rests mainly with family members (Kagitcibasi, 1982). Therefore, although the basic family structure appears to be nuclear, it serves the functions of an extended family by providing social, emotional, and material support when needed (Aygun & Imamoglu, 2002). Research on parenting beliefs of Turkish parents has indicated that the model of interdependence is common in traditional, rural Turkish families (Imamoglu, 1998; Sunar, 2002). In such contexts, being grateful and obedient to parents and having close ties with family members are highly endorsed, and parents expect their children to contribute financially to the family as an adult. Educated
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Turkish mothers in urbanized areas, however, display the psychological interdependence model, because on the one hand, they expect their children to be autonomous and economically independent, and on the other hand, they prefer their children to be emotionally interdependent and to have close ties with family members (Imamoglu, 1998).

Both Germany and the Netherlands are prototypical cultures of individualism (Hofstede, 2001). The common family structure in these societies is nuclear, with privacy as an important value. For instance, in the Netherlands it is considered inappropriate to pay unannounced visits, not only for friends, but also for family members and even parents (Kooy, 1992). Because of the available social security system, the majority of elderly and dependent people live without having to rely on their family members, especially children (Georgas, Berry, Van de Vijver, Kagitcibasi, & Poortinga, 2006). Regarding parenting, empirical studies have shown that German (Lamm & Keller, 2007) and Dutch mothers (Pels, 1991; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997) endorse independence and assertiveness goals, and even infants are expected to be able to play alone. These mothers display parenting styles that support both emotional and material independence of the child (Georgas et al.).

Acculturation and Socialization Goals of Immigrants

Acculturation is defined as the form of cultural transmission experienced by an individual that results from contact with persons and institutions belonging to other cultures than one’s own (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 2002). How an immigrant relates to the host and the original culture is based on two dimensions: cultural maintenance (i.e., the extent to which immigrants wish to maintain their own cultural roots and identity) and cultural adoption (i.e., the extent immigrants wish to participate in the daily life of the host society and to adopt the host culture) (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2006a, b; Berry, 2001). It is interesting to note that both the acculturation model and the family change model are based
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on a classification of two dichotomous constructs that combine "old" and "new": “old” representing the ethnic culture in the acculturation model and interdependence family pattern in the family change model, and “new” referring to the mainstream culture in the acculturation model and independence family pattern in the family change model. Cultural adoption in Western societies would be associated positively with endorsement of autonomy-oriented goals and negatively with endorsement of obedience-oriented goals; analogously, a higher cultural maintenance would be associated with less endorsement of autonomy goals and more endorsement of obedience goals (Berry, 2007). The family model of psychological interdependence can be expected to emerge in immigrant parents’ child rearing. Yet, there is a paucity of studies addressing socialization goals of the immigrant parents. The few studies that have been published suggest that first-generation immigrant mothers promote greater interdependence than later generations (Delgato-Gaitan, 1994) and immigrant parents who are more adjusted to the host culture expect more autonomy from their children and are less controlling (Buriel, 1993).

In immigration contexts, achievement goals are seen as adaptive for the social survival and upward social mobility (Lee, 1997). Studies with immigrants living in the US (Delgato-Gaitan, 1992) and in Australia (Burns, Homel, & Goodnow, 1984) pointed to the fact that regardless of their acculturation attitudes, immigrant parents highly value having a good education and a good occupation compared to mainstream parents.

From our perspective, there are two problems with the study of socialization goals in an immigration context. The first is their scarcity (Bornstein & Cote, 2010), which prevents an adequate integration of the findings. Second, most studies have used only parents’ generational status or the length of time spent in the host society as a proxy for acculturation. The level of acculturation of an immigrant is indeed related to the amount of first-hand interaction and active involvement in the host society (Christenson, 2004; Dumka & Roosa,
1997). However, using more detailed measures of acculturation orientations in addition to generational status may provide us with a more detailed and perhaps different pattern in terms of immigrants’ acculturation. Studies focusing only on generational status generally assume that later-generation parents are more adjusted to the host culture. However, the pace of this process varies considerably across immigrant groups (Sam & Berry, 2006). Therefore, it is important to examine the role of both generational status and acculturation in parenting beliefs.

**Turkish immigrants in Europe.** Turkish immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands have a common migration history which goes back to the 1960s. The first Turkish immigrants arrived in Europe to compensate for the shortage of laborers in the booming economy at that time. These workers were usually coming from underdeveloped areas of Turkey, and their average education level was very low due to the limited availability of schools (Abadan-Unat, 2002). According to recent statistics, Turkish immigrants form the largest ethnic group of immigrants in Germany with a population of 1.68 million in addition to an estimated 1.10 million with German citizenship (Federal Statistical Office, 2009). Similarly, Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands form one of the largest immigrant groups with a population size of 378,000 (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2009). Regarding acculturation attitudes of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands (Arends-Tóth, 2003), a preference was found for integration in public domains like school and work, and for maintaining their traditional Turkish values in private spheres like family relations.

In terms of socialization goals, second-generation Turkish mothers in Western Europe were found to endorse autonomy and self-maximization of their children significantly more than first-generation mothers (Leyendecker, Schoelmerich, & Citlak, 2006). However, Leyendecker, Citlak, and Harwood (2002) found that even second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers in Germany expected their children to be respectful, starting from the
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early ages, like first-generation mothers. Yagmurlu and Sanson’s (2009) research on socialization goals and behaviors of Turkish immigrant mothers in Australia is one of the few studies that assessed acculturation as a psychological variable. They found that mothers who were inclined to endorse cultural adoption of Western patterns were more likely to value self-direction goals and less likely to endorse compliance in their children. Lastly, regardless of their generational status or acculturation orientations, Turkish immigrant mothers rated achievement goals as very important (Citlak, Leyendecker, Schoelmerich, & Harwood, 2008; Leyendecker et al., 2006; Nijsten, 2006).

In summary, the evidence suggests that acculturation influences socialization goals. Acculturation is not a process that affects all domains at the same speed (Bornstein & Cote, 2006); core values like being respectful are more resistant to acculturative change. Attributing much value to achievement and education are socialization aspects that are widespread among Turkish immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands, given that these may lead to upward social mobility in the mainstream society.

Hypotheses

Two types of hypotheses regarding socialization goals were tested in this study. The first involves cross-cultural differences among Dutch, German, Turkish-Dutch, and Turkish-German mothers’ socialization goals. The second hypothesis focuses on testing assumptions of the family change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007a) in an acculturation context.

Hypothesis 1: Cross-cultural comparisons. As mentioned earlier, Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands and Germany have a common migration history, a common socioeconomic background, and their countries of settlement share the same cultural values (Schwartz, 1999). Thus, we expected socialization goals of the mothers to differ with immigration status (i.e., immigrant versus non-immigrant/mainstreamer) more than with the
country of residence (i.e., Netherlands versus Germany) (Hypothesis 1a). According to the family change model, we hypothesized that because Turkish immigrant mothers are from more traditional and rural origins (Basgoz & Furniss, 1985), they would endorse obedience-oriented goals (e.g., respectfulness) and relatedness goals (e.g., social skills and family orientation) more than mainstream mothers, whereas the opposite pattern was expected for autonomy-oriented goals (e.g., personal potential) (Hypothesis 1b). It was also expected that differences in background variables such as educational background could statistically explain (part of) the cross-cultural differences between the mainstream and immigrant mothers (Hypothesis 1c).

**Hypothesis 2: Family change model in acculturation context.** To test the assumptions of the family change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007a) on endorsement of obedience, autonomy, and relatedness as socialization goals in acculturation context, we chose to look at two different aspects of immigration: generational status and acculturation orientations. Based on the family change model’s assumptions on urbanization we predicted that cultural maintenance would be positively associated with obedience-oriented goals and negatively associated with autonomy-oriented goals. Analogously, cultural adoption and generational status would be positively associated with endorsement of autonomy-oriented goals and negatively related with endorsement of obedience-oriented goals. However, relatedness goals would not be associated with any acculturation orientation or generational status (Hypothesis 2).

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants of the study comprised 79 Dutch, 91 German, 89 Turkish-Dutch, and 79 Turkish-German mothers. All participating mothers had at least one child of preschool age.
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who was the target child in this study. A mother was classified as Turkish only if her both parents had a Turkish background; mothers classified as German or Dutch were all born in their respective countries, as were their parents. Fifty percent of the Turkish mothers were first-generation immigrants who were born in Turkey and moved to the host society after the age of seven (see Table 1 for descriptive characteristics of participants). Most of the Turkish immigrant mothers or their parents were from rural, agricultural areas of central Turkey. Many of them were stay-at-home mothers involved in domestic work and their spouses had the role of mediating between the host society and the family. Most of the Dutch and German mothers had part-time or full-time jobs. The common family type in all groups was the nuclear family with an average of four members. Most families were living in either a two-bedroom apartment or in a single family home where the children usually had a separate room. Turkish immigrant mothers were residing in neighborhoods with a high concentration of Turkish immigrants.

Materials

Socialization Goals Inventory-Pilesort (SGI). The 54-item pile-sort version of the SGI, which was developed by the ‘Home Start before School Start’ research group at Ruhr-University, Bochum (Korom, Harwood, & Leyendecker, 2004), was administered to assess mothers’ long-term socialization goals. Each item was written on a card and mothers were asked to sort these cards and prioritize their socialization goals according to a fixed distribution from 1 (not important at all) to 6 (very important); nine cards had to be put in each of the six categories. The items covered the following nine scales: (1) Psychological Well-Being, or concern that the child is happy and psychologically and physically healthy (e.g., “to enjoy life”); (2) Personal and Economic Potential, or concern that the child develops cognitive skills and fulfill his/her individual potential (e.g., “to receive a good education”); (3) Psychological Development, or concern that the child is self-reliant and assertive (e.g., “to
find own path”); (4) Social Skills, or concern that the child develops the emotional ability to build and to maintain warm relationships with others (e.g., “to be warm towards others”); (5) Affableness, or concern that the child is able to deal with skills that can challenge or create tension in social relationships (e.g., “to be able to control jealousy”); (6) Avoidance of Illicit Behavior, or concern regarding delinquency, sexual misconduct, and finding the right kind of friends (e.g., “not to use drugs”); (7) Moral Values, or concern that the child is morally upright (e.g., to orient oneself according to societal values); (8) Respectfulness, or concern that the child behaves respectfully towards older people (e.g., “to behave respectfully toward adults”); (9) Family Solidarity, or concern for mutual support within the family (e.g., “to help out with family problems”).

In order to test our hypotheses, we classified the SGI scales in terms of the family change model. Psychological Well-being, Personal and Economic Potential, and Psychological Development scales were categorized as Autonomy-oriented goals, whereas Avoidance of Illicit Behavior, Moral Values, and Respectfulness were grouped as Obedience-oriented goals. The Social Skills, Affableness, and Family Solidarity scales were taken together to refer to relatedness goals (C. Kagitcibasi, personal communication, February 22, 2009). The Social Skills and Affableness scales refer to developing close and warm relationships with others, being generous, kind and sharing with others. These are characteristics that help children to create and maintain friendships and to deal with social groups and therefore can be seen as relatedness goals.
Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Dutch (n = 79)</th>
<th>German (n = 91)</th>
<th>Turkish-Dutch (n = 89)</th>
<th>Turkish-German (n = 79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s age (years)</td>
<td>36.54 4.87</td>
<td>33.60 5.06</td>
<td>32.61 5.71</td>
<td>30.47 4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.63 .001 .15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education (years)</td>
<td>14.30 1.61</td>
<td>10.96 1.29</td>
<td>9.36 3.55</td>
<td>9.22 2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.57 .001 .41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Married</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Single parent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s age(in months)</td>
<td>50.15 11.51</td>
<td>46.03 3.74</td>
<td>54.16 8.40</td>
<td>46.11 4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.60 .001 .16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s sex</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s age at migration (years)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.11 8.92</td>
<td>9.89 9.42</td>
<td>8.87 8.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01 .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in the host culture (years)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.54 10.04</td>
<td>20.58 9.97</td>
<td>1.73 n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Turkish culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.23 0.27</td>
<td>3.10 0.28</td>
<td>8.49 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in mainstream culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50 0.38</td>
<td>2.61 0.32</td>
<td>3.95 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicultural Involvement Scale. A modified version of the Bicultural Involvement Scale (Cortes, Rogler, & Malgady, 1994) was administered to the immigrant mothers to assess the degree to which they had acculturated to the host and original cultures. This scale includes 30 items that form two parallel sets that are ‘Involvement in original culture’ and ‘Involvement in the mainstream culture’. Responses of participants were rated on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = not at all to 4 = very much) to assess their levels of enjoyment and relative preference for activities in a specific culture, including media, food, interpersonal relationships, and child-rearing practices. For the Turkish-German sample, the subscales “Involvement in original culture” and “Involvement in the mainstream culture” were found to have high internal consistencies, with Cronbach’s alpha of .77 and .82, respectively. For the Turkish-Dutch sample, these values were .72 and .83, respectively. The correlation coefficient of $r = .01$ between the two subscales was non-significant, which indicated that cultural adoption and maintenance are unrelated in the total Turkish sample (which is compatible with the bidimensional acculturation model; Berry, 2001).

Procedure

Original questionnaires and SGI Pilesort cards were translated into Turkish, German, and Dutch by at least two (independently working) bilingual graduate students or researchers at the participating universities, which then were finalized by group discussions on the translated versions of questionnaires.

Participants were mainly recruited from preschools within the research area. The mothers whose children attended these schools were given a letter which described the purpose and procedure of the project. In the Netherlands, Turkish-Dutch participants were mostly reached via Turkish cultural organizations and associations. Members of these associations with a child at preschool age were given information on the study. Appointments
for home visits were made with mothers who were willing to participate in the study. German and Dutch mothers were interviewed by a German and Dutch researcher, respectively and Turkish mothers were interviewed by a Turkish assistant in either host language or Turkish, according to their preference. Questionnaires on demographical background (e.g., age of the mother, gender of the child, and educational background of the mothers) and acculturation, and SGI task were administered by psychology graduate students. An interview with a mother lasted approximately two hours.

Results

We first describe equivalence analyses in which the question is addressed to what extent the SGI Pile Sort measures the same psychological constructs in each group. Then, cross-cultural comparisons of socialization goals are examined in a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) with country of residence (two levels: Germany and the Netherlands) and immigration status (two levels: immigrants and mainstreamers) as independent variables and the SGI Pile Sort scale scores as the dependent variables. The third section tests the feasibility of family change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007a) in an acculturation context. The relation between socialization goals of Turkish immigrant mothers and their acculturation orientations and generational status is examined in multiple regression analyses.

Equivalence Analyses

Since the SGI used in this study is a pile-sort and uses a forced choice of socialization goals, a PROXSCAL multidimensional scaling procedure was used to analyze the structure of SGI subscales in each of the four groups. These structures were then compared using Generalized Procrustes Analysis (GPA; Commandeur, 1991). Equivalence analyses showed that 10 items of the SGI were biased and lowered the structure fit coefficients to values below .90, commonly viewed as the threshold value of an acceptable structure fit coefficient.
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(Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). Mainstream mothers valued being happy, having a good sense of humor, developing an independent personality, and being amiable much more than Turkish immigrant mothers did, which means that the coordinates of the items for the Dutch mothers were relatively high as compared to the other items of the scale. On the other hand, being financially secure, accepting family hierarchy, helping parents when they are older, and behaving according to societal rules were the items that were valued relatively more by Turkish mothers than by mainstreamers. It is important to note that scores on these biased items themselves were in line with our hypotheses concerning cross-cultural comparison of mothers’ goals according to which mainstream mothers would value autonomy-oriented goals more and obedience-oriented goals less than Turkish immigrant mothers. Still, since these items showed a very different pattern than other items in the scales did, they were deleted and further analyses were done on the remaining 44 items. Overall, the analyses revealed acceptable fit values for each scale and supported the unidimensionality of each scale. The Family Solidarity displayed a fit value just lower than the threshold level of .90; yet, no substantive reason for the lower fit could be found and since the fit coefficient was close to the threshold level, it was decided to retain the scale in further analyses.

Cross-Cultural Comparisons on Socialization Goals (Hypothesis 1)

We hypothesized that immigration status (i.e., immigrant vs. mainstremmer) would play a stronger role in maternal socialization goals than country (i.e., Germany vs. the Netherlands) (Hypothesis 1a). To test the hypothesis, a MANOVA was conducted with immigration status and country as independent variables and the nine socialization goals as dependent variables; results are given in Table 3. The patterning of the results was clear; the effect sizes were much smaller for the main effect of country than for immigration status; the average effect size across all dependent variables was .02 for country and .20 for immigration status. The univariate effect of country was only significant for the Social Skills scale, with
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higher scores for the German groups, $F(1, 337) = 47.49, p < .001$, (partial) $\eta^2 = .12$. The average interaction effect of country by immigration status was small with a value of .01. These findings confirmed Hypothesis 1a.

Univariate comparisons between Turkish immigrant and mainstream mothers revealed that Turkish immigrant mothers endorsed Personal and Economic Potential, Avoidance of Illicit Behavior, Moral Values, Respectfulness, and Family Solidarity more, and Psychological Well-being, Psychological Development, Affableness, and Social Skills less than Dutch and German mothers (see Table 2 for means and Table 3 for effect sizes). From the perspective of the family change model, obedience-oriented and relatedness goals were to be endorsed more by Turkish immigrant whereas autonomy-oriented goals would be valued more by mainstream mothers. Because Social skills and Affableness, contrary to our prediction, were endorsed more by mainstream mothers, we can conclude that Hypothesis 1b was partly confirmed.

Lastly, it was expected that the cross-cultural differences in socialization goals between groups of mothers could be (partly) accounted for by differences in background variables such as educational background (Hypothesis 1c). To test the hypothesis, we first tested the presence of differences in background variables between the groups. ANOVA results revealed that mainstream mothers were significantly more educated ($F(1, 338) = 120.69, p < .001$) and older ($F(1, 337) = 35.23, p < .001$) than Turkish immigrant mothers. We then conducted a one-way MANOVA with immigration status (two levels: Turkish immigrant vs. mainstreamer) as independent variable and the nine socialization goals categories as dependent variables. In a second step, we introduced the two background variables as covariates, both separately and jointly (see Table 3 for the changes in effect sizes). When only education of the mothers was controlled, the influence of immigration
status on socialization goals was reduced considerably (by 33%); the age of the mother did not explain much of the cross-cultural variance in socialization goals (8%). The combination of the two covariates reduced the variation by 40%; yet, even after this considerable reduction, the two groups of mothers significantly differed from each other on all socialization goal scales ($p < .05$). These findings confirm Hypothesis 1c; background characteristics of mothers partly explained differences between immigrant and mainstream mothers in socialization goals.

In summary, Turkish immigrant mothers were found to endorse behaving respectfully towards parents, close family ties, moral values, and improving personal potential mainly in financial sense more than Dutch and German mothers. On the other hand, mainstream mothers endorsed personal happiness, assertiveness, and social skills more than Turkish mothers. Maternal education was found to be strongly associated with mothers’ socialization goals.

**Family Change Model in Acculturation Context (Hypothesis 2)**

As the main aim of the paper was to test the assumptions of family change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007a) in acculturation context, Turkish immigrant mothers’ socialization goals were examined with respect to their generational status and acculturation orientations. For this purpose, multiple regression analyses were run for each socialization goal individually, with generational status, cultural maintenance, cultural adoption, and maternal education as independent variables (see Table 4 for results of the regression analyses). As expected, psychological well-being and personal potential (autonomy-oriented goals) were significantly predicted; yet, the multiple correlation of psychological development was not significant.
Table 2

*Means of Socialization Goals of Turkish-German, Turkish-Dutch, German, and Dutch Mothers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Country of settlement</th>
<th>Immigration status</th>
<th>Mainstreamers</th>
<th>Generation status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Mainstreamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Potential</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Development</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Illicit Behavior</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affableness</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Solidarity</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Values in italics denote the average across the three socialization goals of a domain.
Table 3

Effect Sizes (a) in a MANOVA with Immigration Status (Mainstreamers vs. Immigrants) and Country as Independent Variables; (b) in MANCOVAs with the Same Independent Variables and Education, Mother’s Age and Their Combination as Covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Immigrant status</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>(a) Effect size before correction</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Mother’s age</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Potential</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Development</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.05***</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Illicit Behavior</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfulness</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affableness</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02**</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td>.02**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Solidarity</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average reduction in $\eta^2$  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Mother’s age</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average reduction in $\eta^2$</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Effect sizes of country and the interaction component with covariates are not presented. Effect sizes in italics denote the average across the three socialization goals of a domain. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Socialization Goals and Family Change Model

Turkish mothers with a stronger mainstream orientation rated their children’s wellbeing as more important, and second-generation immigrants valued personal and professional potential and psychological development of their children more than did first-generation immigrants.

Our expectations were also largely confirmed for the obedience-oriented goals. Again, two goals (moral values and respect) showed significant multiple correlations with acculturation orientations. Mothers who adopted mainstream cultural norms more were less likely to endorse respectfulness, whereas mothers who tended to maintain their traditional Turkish values were more likely to endorse the importance of moral values. Significance of two of the three socialization goals was also found for the relatedness (social skills and family solidarity). Generational status, as expected, did not have a significant relation with relatedness goals. However, contrary to our expectation, family solidarity showed a significant association with acculturation orientations; Turkish mothers who adopted the mainstream culture more were likely to endorse social skills more and family orientation less than mothers who displayed less cultural adoption. Mothers who maintained their Turkish cultural values highlighted the importance of family orientation for their children. Affableness was only positively predicted by maternal education.

Overall, Hypothesis 2 was partly confirmed. As expected, second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers endorsed autonomy-oriented goals more than first-generation Turkish mothers, whereas relatedness goals did not lose salience with generational status; yet, most of the regression coefficients and proportions of explained variances showed small to medium effect sizes and some expected associations did not even significantly differ from zero. Acculturation orientations did predict relatedness goals significantly, unlike our expectations and the assumptions of the family change model.
### Table 4

**Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses for Socialization Goals in the Turkish Immigrant Sample (n = 167)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Obedience</th>
<th>Relatedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Well-being</td>
<td>Personal Potential</td>
<td>Psychological Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>.190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Maintenance</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Adoption</td>
<td>.236*</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Education</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.093**</td>
<td>.061*</td>
<td>.038 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

This study examined cross-cultural differences in Dutch, German, Turkish-Dutch, and Turkish-German mothers’ socialization goals. Our main goal was to test the feasibility of Kagitcibasi’s (2007a) family change model in explaining maternal socialization goals in an acculturation context. Kagitcibasi (2007b) proposes that the transformation processes of traditional societies, such as urbanization and modernization, influence families’ values and child-rearing goals. Given that immigration often involves the same transition, the prepositions of the family change model, particularly about the family model of psychological interdependence, were expected to hold in immigrant families as well. Our study was a test of this argument particularly in Turkish immigrant contexts in the Netherlands and Germany.

**Mainstream - Immigrant Differences**

From the viewpoint of the family change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007a), the pattern of socialization goals of the mainstream mothers reflected the family model of independence whereas Turkish immigrant mothers displayed an interdependence family model. As hypothesized, mainstream mothers expected their children to be more autonomous and self-reliant, whereas Turkish immigrant mothers placed a higher importance on their children behaving respectfully, being well-mannered, acting according to moral values, and being in intimate contact with the family. In line with previous work (Citlak et al., 2008; Leyendecker et al., 2002), we also found that personal and economic potential goals like being professionally and financially successful were seen as very important by immigrant mothers. In the context of immigration, parents from traditional backgrounds realize the adaptive value of education for their children to improve their social position in the urbanized society (Lee, 1997; Levine, Miller, & West, 1988).
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The support was more equivocal for relatedness goals. Although overall relatedness goals were valued more by Turkish immigrant mothers than the mainstream mothers, this was not the case for every subgoal. The family change model suggests a higher endorsement of social skills in cultures with a strong interdependence orientation. Contrary to our expectations, goals like being sociable, kind and generous were valued more by German and Dutch mothers than by Turkish mothers. We believe that our finding is due to the types of skills referred to in the instrument. Almost all items of Social Skills and Affableness scales involved relationship skills with out-group members and did not involve the family. Social skills in relationships with non-kin and out-group members are presumably more important for functioning in individualistic than in collectivistic groups. If this interpretation were correct, our findings regarding relatedness goals would largely support the family change model.

It is a recurrent problem in acculturation studies that immigrant - mainstream comparisons on psychological variables are made without considering the influence of confounding group differences. In line with our previous studies among immigrant groups in the Netherlands (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2007), we found that education could account for a substantial part of the cross-cultural differences in socialization goals. The “unpackaging” (Whiting, 1976) of cross-cultural differences, which has been proposed as an approach to make our interpretations of cross-cultural differences more precise (e.g., Poortinga & Van de Vijver, 1987), is also an adequate approach in acculturation studies.

Acculturation

The family change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007a) proposes that parents in a transition from rural traditional to urban contexts, as experienced by our immigrant mothers, would endorse autonomy and emotional relatedness, combined with a decrease in the importance of
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compliance and material interdependence. Our data provided strong support for this assumption and for the family model of psychological interdependence.

An examination of generational status and socialization goals of immigrant mothers yielded an interesting picture which revealed that the length of time spent in the host culture does not make a large difference in immigrant mothers’ goals, particularly in Turkish immigrant context. Generational status significantly predicted hardly any socialization goal except for goals related to improving and developing personal and economic potential. Second-generation mothers found such goals more important for their children than did first-generation mothers. Thus, we can argue that although these mothers realize the function of autonomy and personal development in the host culture, they still highly value their traditional Turkish socialization patterns, such as compliance of their children as much as first-generations. Rosenthal, Bell, Demetriou, and Efklides (1989), in their study with Greek immigrants in Australia, found that these mothers wanted to instill respect and compliance in their children just like Greek mothers in Greece did, even though their valuing of autonomy was almost as high as mainstream Australian mothers. We know that cultural adoption does not affect every life domain similarly or at the same pace (Bornstein & Cote, 2006) and especially core cultural values like obedience remain important across generations and tend to resist rapid changes (Phalet & Schönpfleg, 2001). However, it is striking that Turkish mothers do not tend to change their original socialization goals even after spending long time in Europe. This can be explained partly by the context Turkish immigrants live in these host countries. Many of our participants, representing the general Turkish immigrant population in the Netherlands and Germany, have a rural, traditional ancestry, keep close contact with the Turkish community, live in neighborhoods where many other Turkish fellows reside, and join Turkish associations during their spare time. Therefore, even if they spend a long time in the host culture they still keep closer contact and communication with the Turkish community,
rather than the host society. Another important point is that many second-generation Turks in Europe tend to marry people from Turkey, and so Turkish values remain fresh and dominant within the family. It is an interesting question to ask how socialization goals of later generations would take shape.

Cultural maintenance and especially cultural adoption predicted many goals significantly and strongly. Turkish mothers with a stronger acculturation orientation towards the host culture endorsed their children to become autonomous and happy individuals more and compliant less than mothers with a weaker orientation towards the host culture. This finding is in line with our expectations and previous research with Mexican immigrant mothers in the U.S.A. (Buriel, 1993) and Turkish-Australian mothers (Yagmurlu & Sanson, 2009). It seems that as they adopt the host cultural values, Turkish immigrant mothers realize the increasing importance of autonomy-related characteristics and decreasing importance of obedience and accepting hierarchy. This finding shows that as Turkish immigrant parents adjust to the host culture, their socialization goal pattern starts to reflect characteristics of the family model of psychological interdependence. However, it is important to note the decrease in the perceived importance of close family connections as these mothers adjust to the host culture. This finding is pointing to a direction of change which is not predicted by the family change model.

Our findings indicate that both generational status (a more distal variable) and acculturation orientations (more proximal variables) were significantly related to some socialization goals. Cultural adoption was the most powerful predictor (with significant values in five of the nine regression analyses, whereas all other predictors were significant in two regressions). It can be concluded that although acculturation orientations are the better predictors, generational status captures some acculturation-related changes in socialization goals that are not covered by orientations.
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The family change model (Kagitcibasi, 2007a) has been used more often in cross-cultural studies where different nations were compared than in studies with immigrant samples. This study applied the model in Turkish immigrant context with a traditional Turkish cultural origin in Western, urbanized environment. Overall, the results provided evidence that the model is not only suitable for studies examining sociocultural and socioeconomic changes that families go through within a society but can also be applied in immigration context which is characterized by a change from a traditional to a western environment by migration. Nevertheless, it is an interesting question whether assumptions of the family change model would hold in any immigration context. Kagitcibasi (2007a) argues that the family model of psychological interdependence reflects an optimal condition which is theoretically adaptive and healthier than other family models; however it needs to be stimulated to develop. It is not an automatic process. She argues that extraneous factors may work against the emergence of this adaptive model and lead to the persistence of the traditional interdependent family in these contexts. In fact in our study, immigrant mothers displayed a decrease in endorsement of relatedness goals as they adopted host cultural values; which shows that family model of psychological interdependence does not entirely occur within these contexts under present conditions. Moreover, every cultural group experiences acculturation differently (Bornstein & Cote, 2010). Thus, it would be very beneficial to examine and point out which factors lead to the psychological interdependence model, especially important for the practice of psychology and psychological services provided in immigration contexts.

In theory, the stability of the family model of psychological interdependence could continue for generations as an adequate way to nurture both autonomy and connectedness needs of people (Kagitcibasi, 2007a). However, what may happen in practice is that agency and interpersonal distance may show adjustment to the culture of settlement at different pace.
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Just like how cultural adoption does not influence every aspect of socialization similarly (Bornstein & Cote, 2006), agency dimension may be affected by the new culture much quicker than interpersonal distance.

**Limitations**

The present study is not free from limitations. First of all, this study only examined mothers’ socialization goals. However, parenting is a very broad concept and how parents behave toward their children is another important aspect which has a direct and significant influence on child development (Dix, 1992). Therefore, examination of maternal goals and behaviors together would give a better insight of parenting of these cultural groups. Secondly, our sample represented only mothers with children at preschool age. Besides, although it is the mother who spends more time with the child and who is seen as more closely concerned with child rearing, fathers also have a significant role in child rearing (Lamb, 1997). Therefore, examination of socialization goal patterns of both mothers and fathers also with children from several age groups can be suggested for future studies for a more complete understanding of child socialization. Lastly, our SGI-Pilesort instrument was not developed in the first place to be used within the family change framework. Thus, some scales, particularly Social Skills did not come out with results in the predicted direction. This shows us a way to improve the instrument for further studies by including more items related to family and in-group rather than out-groups like friends into Social Skills goals. Despite these limitations, our study highlights the importance of studying socialization goals in relation to educational and cultural background of parents. This study enlarged our insight of socialization in an acculturation context and also revealed significant information about differences and similarities between socialization patterns of mainstream and immigrant parents for professionals working in cross-cultural environments.
CHAPTER 4
Developmental Expectations of Dutch and First and Second Generation Turkish Immigrant Mothers in the Netherlands

Abstract
This study aimed at investigating differences and similarities in developmental expectations between Dutch mothers and first and second generation Turkish immigrant mothers, using individualism-collectivism and acculturation theory as conceptual frameworks. Participants were 111 Dutch mainstream and 111 Turkish immigrant mothers of preschoolers in the Netherlands. Mothers’ developmental expectations were assessed in nine domains: Physical Skills, Cognitive Skills, Self-control, Social Skills, Autonomy, Obedience, Family Orientation, Moral Rules, and Competitiveness. Second generation Turkish immigrant mothers had similar age expectations as Dutch mothers; both expected earlier ages than first generation Turkish-Dutch mothers. These differences were smallest for physical skills and largest for interpersonal and social skills. Results of this study pointed out that mothers with Western background perceive children as individuals with a potential to develop at earlier ages compared to the mothers from traditional non-Western backgrounds. The non-Western mothers who spent more time in a Western context adjusted their expectations towards the host culture.
Cross-cultural studies have pointed out that parents hold cultural belief systems regarding the nature of children and development, and these cognitive systems are known as parental ethnotheories (Harkness, Super, & Van Tijen, 2000). Ethnotheories reflect parents’ developmental goals, expectations, parenting cognitions and values, and perceptions about their children (Rosenthal & Roer-Strier, 2001), and thereby, determine the behaviors that parents are likely to use (Bornstein & Lansford, 2009). Developmental studies have shown that the sociocultural background of parents has a strong influence on their parenting patterns (Kagitcibasi, 2007; Lamm & Keller, 2007; McGillicuddy-DeLisi, 1980; Raghavan, Harkness, & Super, 2010; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997) and that parenting variables must be understood in their context (Garcia Coll, Akerman, & Cicchetti, 2000). One aspect of parental ethnotheories is developmental expectations which refer to the age that parents believe particular developmental skills should be reached by the child (Goodnow, Cashmore, Cotton, & Knight, 1984). It has been shown that ages parents expect certain milestones to develop are related to the actual age their children achieve those skills (Hopkins & Westra, 1990). Developmental expectations have hardly been studied in an immigrant context. This study aimed to investigate differences and similarities between Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers’ developmental expectations, and to identify the role of generational status on Turkish-Dutch mothers’ developmental expectations.

Research has shown that parents’ sociocultural background has a strong relationship with their parenting cognitions. Parents from different parts of the world hold different ideas about child development and child rearing. For instance, English mothers emphasize the importance of socio-emotional competence in children such as letting the child develop his/her abilities as an individual, whereas Chinese mothers value filial piety more, which refers to respectfulness, proper demeanor, and obedience (Pearson & Rao, 2003). Studies on parenting cognitions and behaviors of mothers from various cultural backgrounds often use
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the individualism-collectivism paradigm which is one of the most widely used cross-cultural frameworks to understand and explain cultural differences across groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1994). Mainly, parents from collectivistic cultures value obedience, close family ties, and respectfulness, and behave in ways to encourage interdependence in their children, whereas parents from individualistic cultures endorse autonomy, exploration, and self-reliance, and behave in ways to encourage independence more in their children (Bornstein, Azuma, Tamis-Lemonda, & Ogino, 1990; Harwood et al., 1999).

Developmental expectations, an aspect of parenting cognitions, have also been reported to vary significantly across cultures (Hess et al., 1980; McGillicuddy-DeLisi, 1980), even after controlling for socioeconomic factors (Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997). In one of the earliest cross-cultural studies on developmental expectations, Hess et al. compared Japanese and American mothers and found that the Japanese desired earlier development in areas like obedience, compliance with adult authority, and social courtesy in interaction with adults while mothers in the US expected earlier acquisition of skills like standing up for own rights, verbal assertion, and autonomy. A replication of this study with Anglo and Lebanese mothers in Australia (Goodnow et al., 1984) displayed similar findings. Lebanese immigrant mothers expected earlier mastery in compliance with authority and social courtesy, whereas Anglo-Australian mothers expected an earlier development of autonomy-related skills.

From the perspective of individualism-collectivism, the differences found in developmental expectations in studies by Hess et al. (1980) and Goodnow et al. (1984) were argued to reflect the importance attributed to the skills in those particular cultural contexts. In other words, these authors claimed that Japanese and Lebanese mothers expect earlier mastery in skills related to obedience and interdependence since in collectivistic cultures close family ties and compliance are highly valued characteristics. However, in individualistic cultural contexts like the Anglo-American and -Australian where assertiveness
and autonomy is highly endorsed, mothers expect the development of autonomy-related skills to be early.

A more recent study by Willemsen and Van de Vijver (1997) compared developmental expectations of Dutch, Turkish-Dutch and Zambian mothers and found somewhat different results. In this study, Zambian mothers expected the latest ages of development on many aspects (e.g., cognitive, intra-individual, and social skills), and Dutch mothers the earliest. Turkish-Dutch mothers were in between with their expectations. These results are not entirely in line with the claim that parents have earlier expectations of achievement of the skills that are highly endorsed in their cultural context. Willemsen and Van de Vijver argued that parents from Western backgrounds, in general, see children with a potential to develop earlier than parents from non-Western backgrounds. Thus, Western mothers expect children to achieve developmental milestones at earlier ages compared to non-Western mothers, regardless of the domain of the skills.

Developmental expectations of parents were found to have a significant association with the actual age their children develop certain skills as well as the behaviors they are likely to use to promote these skills. Hopkins and Westra (1990) compared English and Jamaican mothers’ developmental expectations for their infants to achieve milestones like sitting, crawling, and walking and found that Jamaican mothers expected their infants to sit earlier than the English mothers did. More importantly, the infants’ actual achievement of sitting alone was in line with their mothers’ expectations. Moreover, Jamaican mothers who had earlier expectations of a child sitting alone displayed certain behaviors like stretching and handling the child which promote the attainment of the skill earlier.

In summary, some studies show that mothers’ developmental expectations vary across cultures depending on the domain of skills; Western mothers expect earlier development of independence-oriented skills whereas mothers from non-Western origins expect earlier
Developmental Expectations

achievement of interdependence-oriented skills. However, other studies show that Western mothers believe children are more capable of achieving developmental milestones at an earlier age regardless of the domain of the skill compared to the mothers from more traditional cultures. What is certain is that mothers’ expectations are related to the way they train their children towards developing skills and also affect the actual time of onset of these skills. Therefore, it is very important to examine sociocultural background of parents in order to gain a better understanding of parenting processes. This is especially true in immigration contexts particularly because immigrant populations in the Western world become larger every day and upbringing and development of immigrant children deserves a comprehensive investigation.

Acculturation and Developmental Expectations

In the last years, research on parenting beliefs and practices of immigrant groups has gained prominence due to the migration flow to and within Europe. As ethnic minorities have become more numerous and immigrant children face social and academic difficulties especially at school, more research into families, parenting, and child development in acculturation contexts has been conducted (Kwak, 2003). It has been shown that patterns of parental ethnotheories vary across majority and minority groups within the same society (Citlak, Leyendecker, Schoelmerich & Harwood, 2008; Nijsten, 2006; Raghavan, Harkness, & Super, 2010). However, the origins of parental beliefs and the dynamics of stability and change in parenting cognitions during the acculturation process are still understudied (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Studies particularly on developmental expectations are very scarce.

Bornstein and Cote (2004a, b) compared Japanese, South American, and European American mothers’ knowledge about child development and milestones and found out that immigrant parents knew less about child development than their European American
counterparts. When asked about actual knowledge of developmental milestones (at what age babies begin to achieve certain skills such as babbling), more than half of the immigrant mothers were unaware of the correct age of onset of developmental skills. This is particularly important because we know that parents train their children based on their knowledge and expectations about these skills, and if parents are unaware of developmental milestones, they are likely to miss opportunities to recognize problematic areas of their children’s development. Thus, understanding what immigrant parents know and expect from their children and their development is crucial to understand and intervene in the problems immigrant children are likely to experience.

Acculturation refers to the question of how an immigrant deals with the culture of origin and the culture of destination (Arends-Tóth, 2003). The cultural transmission that is experienced by an immigrant resulting from contact with persons and institutions belonging to the host culture is called acculturation (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 2002). Globalization and modernization have made people move out from their homelands to other countries, and when people from different cultural backgrounds come into contact with each other, some changes appear in their original cultural patterns. Their cognitions and behaviors, including parenting cognitions, tend to change and accommodate with those of the culture of destination (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). According to Berry’s (2001) widely used model of acculturation, the way in which a migrant relates to the host society is dependent upon both cultural maintenance and adoption dimensions. Cultural maintenance refers to the extent the immigrant is willing to maintain his or her original cultural values and cultural adoption refers to the extent the immigrant is willing to adjust to the values of the host culture.

Berry’s (2001) model of acculturation, which describes behavioral changes in the context of acculturation, might have implications for explaining the changes in the developmental expectations immigrant parents. Research on parenting cognitions in general
Developmental Expectations

shows that immigrant parents who are more adjusted to the host culture expect more autonomy from their children and are less controlling (Buriel, 1993). Similarly, Costigan, and Su (2008) found that Chinese-Canadian mothers who were strongly attached to Chinese cultural values were involved in culturally-based interdependence-oriented parenting more, whereas mothers who participate more in Canadian culture endorsed culturally-based parenting cognitions less. To our knowledge, there is unfortunately no study examining differences in developmental expectations within an immigrant population in relation to their adjustment towards the host culture. Our study aims to bring light on how immigrant parents’ age expectations for developmental skills change with acculturation by focusing on the generational differences within Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands.

The level of acculturation of an immigrant is found to be closely related to the amount of first-hand interaction he or she has with the services, institutions, and schools, and active involvement in the host society (Christenson, 2004; Dumka & Roosa, 1997). That is why generational status is a widely used proxy variable which was found to be a good predictor of acculturation in many studies (Cabassa, 2003; Christenson, 2004). Studies which focused on generational differences in parenting goals pointed out that first generation immigrant mothers promote interdependence more than later generations (Delgato-Gaitan, 1994). Studies with Turkish immigrants showed that first and second generation mothers in Germany display different patterns of parenting beliefs (Citlak, Leyendecker, Schoelmerich, Driessen, & Harwood, 2008). First generation Turkish-German mothers put more emphasis on respectfulness and less focus on independence and self-control.

In summary, acculturation research shows that immigrant parents who are more involved in and adjusted to the host culture expect more autonomy from their children whereas mothers who are strongly attached to their own cultural values display a more traditional parenting pattern. In terms of developmental expectations, immigrant parents have
a tendency to expect later ages than mainstream mothers for achievement of developmental skills however, more studies are needed to understand the mechanisms behind how immigration and acculturation plays a role in parents’ developmental knowledge and expectations.

**Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands**

Immigration to the Netherlands has been going on for centuries by people migration due to poverty or political reasons from their home countries, and currently there is historically a high density of immigrant population in the country. About 20% of the total population consists of immigrants who mainly migrated from Indonesia, Netherlands Antilles, Suriname, Turkey, Morocco, Eastern Europe, and Germany. Some of these groups like the Turkish and Moroccan were recruited in the beginning of the 1960s to fill shortage in labor market, whereas others such as Surinamese and Indonesian were residents of Dutch colonies and migrated to the Netherlands to improve their socioeconomic circumstances. There is currently 1.4 million non-Western immigrants in the Netherlands and Turkish immigrants form the largest ethnic group of non-Western immigrants with a population of 381,000 (CBS, 2010).

In the early 1960s, Dutch government and companies recruited Turkish males for unskilled jobs in the heavy industry sectors. Majority of these workers were coming from underdeveloped areas of Turkey, and their average education level was very low due to the limited availability of schools (Abadan-Unat, 2002). Initially, they did not intend to stay long in the Netherlands; however, after some years it became obvious that they would not return and they started bringing their wives and children over to the Netherlands. In the late 1970s, even though there were no new recruitments from Turkey, the Turkish population increased tremendously due to family reunions. Turkish immigrants still arrive in the Netherlands
mainly because of marriage reasons. About half of the Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands come from a small set of towns in Northern and Central Anatolia (CBS, 2010) and the number of people from the same village or region in Turkey increases because they bring their relatives and fellow-villagers to where they reside in the Netherlands (Nijsten, 2006).

Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands realize the importance of learning how to speak Dutch and having Dutch social contacts; yet, they also want to promote the Turkish identity of their children and themselves (Nijsten, 2006). Turkish-Dutch show a preference for integration in public domains like school and work, and for maintaining their traditional Turkish values in private spheres like family relations (Arends-Tóth, 2003). For instance, statistics show that about 80% of the Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands choose to marry someone from the same nationality or same religious belief (CBS, 2010).

In terms of parenting ethnotheories, Turkish-Dutch mothers and fathers find having a good education and a professional career as the most important goal for their children. Obedience is the second most highly endorsed parenting goal of Turkish-Dutch, followed by autonomy and sociability (Nijsten, 2006). It was also found that parents who had higher education valued autonomy more than the less educated mothers. Willemsen and Van de Vijver (1997) studied Turkish-Dutch mothers’ developmental expectations and found that their age expectations of achievements of developmental skills were later than the Dutch mainstream mothers. Unfortunately there are not many studies focusing on the role of acculturation or generational status on Turkish-Dutch parents’ parenting cognitions and practices. Studies with Turkish immigrant mothers in Germany pointed out that second generation Turkish mothers endorse autonomy and self-maximization of their children significantly more than first-generation mothers (Leyendecker, Schoelmerich, & Citlak, 2006). However, Leyendecker, Citlak, and Harwood (2002) found that like first generation
mothers, second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers expected their children to be respectful, starting from an early age.

**Turkish and Dutch Familial Patterns**

According to Schwartz’s (1999) model of cultural differences in values, Turkey scores high on conservatism and hierarchy and low on autonomy and egalitarianism. The Turkish sociocultural context is defined as a culture of interdependence (Hofstede, 2001) and has been characterized by close interpersonal relationships, group ties, loyalty, and kinship (Aygun & Imamoglu, 2002). Since the Turkish social security system is not elaborate (compared to the welfare states of western Europe), the responsibility for taking care of dependent people is mainly on family members. Therefore, although the basic family structure appears to be nuclear, it serves the functions of an extended family in terms of providing social, emotional, and material support when needed (Aygun & Imamoglu, 2002). Research on parenting beliefs of Turkish parents has indicated that, especially in traditional rural Turkish families, being obedient and grateful to parents, having close ties with family members are highly endorsed, and parents expect their children to contribute financially to the family as an adult (Imamoglu, 1998; Sunar, 2002). Educated Turkish mothers in urbanized areas, on the other hand, live in nuclear families (Ataca, 2009) and expect their children to be autonomous and economically independent, and at the same time they prefer their children to be emotionally interdependent and to have close ties with family members (Imamoglu, 1998).

Regarding Dutch familial patterns, results of Schwartz’s study (1999) indicated that the Netherlands score high on egalitarianism and autonomy and low on hierarchy and conservatism. It is a prototypical culture of independence (Hofstede, 2001). The common family structure in this society is nuclear, with privacy as an important value. Because of the
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available social security system, the majority of elderly and dependent people live without having to rely on their family members, especially children (Georgas, Berry, Van de Vijver, Kagitcibasi, & Poortinga, 2006). Regarding parenting, studies have shown that Dutch mothers are found to endorse independence and assertiveness goals (Pels, 1991), and even infants are expected to be able to play alone and take care of themselves (Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997).

Overall, studies of developmental expectations yield a significant cross-cultural difference in expected age of mastery of skills among mothers from different cultural backgrounds. Although the importance of sociocultural context in developmental expectations is widely acknowledged, hardly any study examined the relationship between acculturation and immigrant parents’ developmental expectations.

The Present Study

This study investigates one of the significant aspects of parental ethnotheories, developmental expectations, and aims to identify the differences and similarities in expectations of Dutch and Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands. There are different results in the literature regarding the cross-cultural differences in developmental expectations. Hess et al. (1980) and Goodnow et al. (1984) found that parents in individualistic cultures expect earlier ages of mastery in autonomy-oriented skills whereas parents from collectivistic backgrounds expect earlier ages of mastery in obedience-oriented skills. On the other hand, Willemsen and Van de Vijver (1997) found support to the claim that Dutch parents have an earlier expectation of mastery than the Turkish-Dutch parents, regardless of the domain of the skills since they have a Western orientation and see children as an individual with a potential to develop from the very early ages on. We hypothesized to find significant differences between Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers’ developmental expectations in autonomy-related
domains (as the only domain where the previous studies reported would lead to the same hypothesis); more specifically, we expect that Dutch mothers report a younger age of mastery of autonomy-related skills. However, the direction of these differences in other domains cannot be derived from the literature.

Regarding the role of acculturation on Turkish immigrant mothers’ developmental expectations, we used generational status as a proxy variable of acculturation since it is shown to be the best predictor of acculturation orientations of immigrants (Cabassa, 2003; Christenson, 2004). We hypothesized that second generation Turkish-Dutch mothers who grew up and had formal education in the Netherlands to expect ages that are closer to the Dutch mainstreamers than the first generation Turkish mothers who moved to the Netherlands at later ages.

Method

Participants

Participants of the study comprised 111 mainstream Dutch and 111 Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands. All participating mothers had at least one child at preschool age who was the target child in this study. A mother was classified as Turkish immigrant only if both her parents were born in Turkey and migrated to the Netherlands; and mothers were classified as Dutch if they were born in the Netherlands, as were their parents and grandparents.

Among the Dutch sample, mean age of participants was 33.97 (SD = 5.31). Dutch mothers had preschool aged children whose mean age was 48.94 months (SD = 20.50). Of these children, 51% was girls and 73% was first-born children. The mean years of education of the mothers was 12.37 (SD = 3.98), with 35% having minimum of secondary school
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education and 17% being university graduates. Fifty-five percent of the sample was married, 18% was single, and 18% was cohabitating, 9% was divorced.

The mean age of Turkish immigrant participants was 32.71 years ($SD = 7.32$). Turkish-Dutch mothers had preschool aged children whose mean age was 49.78 months ($SD = 22.81$). Of these children, 43% was girls and 45% was first-born children. Mean years of education of Turkish immigrant mothers was 11.14 ($SD = 4.00$), with 21% having minimum of primary school education and 14% being university graduates. Ninety-four percent of the sample was married, 4% were partners, and 2% were divorced. Of the Turkish immigrant sample, 28% of the mothers were born in the Netherlands and 72% were born in Turkey. The mean age of migration of Turkish-Dutch mothers to the Netherlands was 12.14 years ($SD = 10.22$).

In line with earlier studies (e.g., Citlak et al., 2008), mothers were classified as the first generation immigrant if they had their elementary school education in Turkey and migrated to the Netherlands after the age of 14. The second generation was defined as mothers who were either born in the Netherlands or who had migrated before the age of 6 years. The ground for this application is the crucial importance of schooling for the individual’s involvement in the host culture. Based on this, 50% of our Turkish-Dutch sample was first generation and 35% was second generation Turkish immigrants.

When compared in an ANOVA, it was found that Dutch, first generation Turkish, and second generation Turkish mothers differed significantly in their educational background ($F(2, 222) = 20.477, p < .001, \eta^2 = .17$). Dutch and second generation mothers had a similar educational level which was higher than the first generation Turkish-Dutch mothers.
Materials

**Sociodemographic Questionnaire.** The background information form provided information about the target child (e.g., date of birth, sex) and family background characteristics (e.g., maternal and paternal age, education, and marital status). For Turkish participants additional questions regarding their immigration history (e.g., age of migration, preferred language at home) were asked as well.

**Developmental Expectations Scale.** Developmental expectations scale which was developed by Durgel and Van de Vijver (2008) based on the scales used in previous relevant studies (e.g., Goodnow et al., 1984; Hess et al., 1980; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997) was administered to provide an index regarding developmental expectations of mothers. Mothers were asked to indicate the age they expect a child to achieve certain skills for the first time (0.5 represents before age of 1 and 6.5 represents after age of 6). The scale consisted of 126 items and nine subscales: Physical Skills (e.g., “Stand without support more than 1 minute”), Cognitive Skills (e.g., “Tell what is left and right”), Self-control (e.g., “Keep playing according to game rules even if she loses”), Social Skills (e.g., “Share toys with other children”), Autonomy (e.g., “Decide what to wear”), Obedience (e.g., “Give up reading/TV when mother asks for help”), Family Orientation (e.g., “Like to visit grandparents”), Traditional/Moral Rules (e.g., “Have a preference on toys according to own gender (e.g., boys-cars, girls-dolls”)”), and Competitiveness (e.g., “Try to be ahead of peers”). For each subscale, average scores of mothers’ reported age expectations for the particular skill were calculated. Low scores indicated earlier expectations for a particular domain, while high scores indicated later expectations for a particular domain. When checked separately for Dutch and Turkish-Dutch samples, the reliability values of subscales were high, ranging between .84 and .92; the values of Cronbach’s alpha are presented in Table 1.
Developmental Expectations

**Procedure**

Original scales in English were translated into Dutch and Turkish by the researchers using a committee approach. Data were collected by graduate and undergraduate student assistants in North Brabant province of the Netherlands. All participants were recruited through snow-ball sampling method. Turkish immigrant participants were reached via Turkish social organizations and institutions. Mothers were given information on the study and asked whether they would like to participate. Those who agreed to take part were visited in their home. Dutch mothers were interviewed by a Dutch researcher and Turkish immigrant mothers were interviewed by a Turkish interviewer either in Dutch or Turkish, according to their preference. The researcher gave the instruction about how to fill in the questionnaires and let the mothers answer them without any interference. Filling out the questionnaires took about 40 minutes.

Table 1

*Reliability Coefficients (Cronbach’s Alpha) for the Developmental Expectations Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Turkish-Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Skills</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Orientation</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

The main goal of the paper was to investigate the differences between the Dutch, the first and the second generation Turkish immigrant mothers’ developmental expectations. For that, we applied a oneway MANCOVA with group as independent variable (three levels: Dutch mainstream, first generation Turkish-Dutch, and second generation Turkish-Dutch), developmental expectations as dependent variables, and maternal education as covariate (see Table 2). The overall multivariate tests were significant, Wilks’ lambda = .79, $F(2, 222) = 2.629$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .11$. Post-hoc analyses indicated that second generation Turkish immigrant mothers had earlier expectations for self-control, social skills, and family orientations than the first generation Turkish mothers. The first hypothesis which stated that immigrant mothers would report higher ages for autonomy was only confirmed for the first generation. Dutch and the first generation Turkish-Dutch mothers had significantly different age expectations on all domains except for physical skills. Lastly, Dutch and second-generation Turkish mothers did not differ significantly in their expectations across domains. These findings corroborated the second hypothesis which stated that compared to the first generation, parental expectations of second generation mothers would be closer to those of Dutch mainstreamers.

Overall, Dutch mothers and second generation mothers (who migrated to the Netherlands at a young age) had earlier developmental expectations than Turkish-Dutch and first generation Turkish immigrant mothers, respectively. Second generation Turkish immigrant mothers displayed a similar pattern of developmental expectations to their Dutch mainstream counterparts.
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Table 2

Comparison of Developmental Expectations between Turkish-Immigrant and Dutch Mothers in a MANCOVA (with Maternal Education as Covariate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>1st Generation Turkish-Dutch</th>
<th>2nd Generation Turkish-Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Skills</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Skills</td>
<td>3.73$_a$</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>4.92$_a$</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>5.76$_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>4.29$_a$</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>5.00$_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.68$_a$</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>5.08$_a$</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Orientation</td>
<td>5.13$_a$</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.81$_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>4.42$_a$</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>5.03$_a$</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Subscripts of means refer to post hoc tests. Significant differences between means of Dutch and first generation Turkish-Dutch are mentioned by “$_a$” and significant differences between means of first and second generation Turkish-Dutch are mentioned by “$_b$”. The last column represents the proportion of variance accounted for by cultural group.

Discussion

Developmental expectations refer to the age that parents believe particular developmental skills should be reached by a child (Goodnow et al., 1984). Cross-cultural studies showed that sociocultural background of the parents have a role in their age expectations of achievement of developmental skills (Goodnow et al., 1984; Hess et al., 1980; Hopkins & Westra, 1990). Developmental expectations of parents have an effect on the type of behaviors parents are
likely to use to foster these developmental skills and thereby determine the actual age of
achievement of the skills. Hopkins and Westra pointed out that mothers who expected
children to sit and walk early actually had children who showed earlier development in these
areas than other children. Therefore it is very important to examine what parents’
expectations are in terms of the onset of developmental milestones in order to understand,
predict, and intervene with (if delayed) the actual development of their children. This relation
is of particular importance in immigration context mainly because immigrant children are
usually in a disadvantaged position compared to their mainstreamer counterparts particularly
in cognitive skills (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Understanding the factors that may lead to such
unfavorable outcomes for immigrant groups requires investigation of parental cognitions and
practices. For instance, Bornstein and Cote (2004a, b) found out in the USA that immigrant
mothers have a poorer knowledge about developmental milestones compared to mainstream
European Americans. In this study, our main goal was to examine cultural differences in
developmental expectations of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers. Our second goal was to
integrate acculturation literature into the developmental expectations area. To our knowledge,
there is hardly any study that focused on the role of generational status or acculturation
orientations in immigrant mothers’ developmental expectations. We wanted to examine the
differences between first and second generation Turkish immigrant mothers to gain an insight
in acculturation-related changes in immigrant mothers’ developmental expectations.

Earlier research on parental expectations showed that parents from collectivistic
cultures tend to expect earlier mastery in interdependence-oriented skills such as compliance
and social courtesy whereas parents from individualistic cultures expect earlier achievement
of independence-oriented skills like autonomy, assertiveness (Goodnow et al., 1984; Hess et
al., 1980). Based on these findings it was argued that skills that are more endorsed and valued
in a particular context are expected to be reached by children earlier than other skills.
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However, Willemsen and Van de Vijver (1997) had different results in a study among Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Zambian mothers. They found that Zambian mothers expected the latest ages and Dutch mothers expected the earliest ages of mastery across all domains of skills. Turkish immigrant mothers’ pattern was in between these two groups of mothers. In line with Willemsen and Van de Vijver, our findings also showed that Turkish immigrant mothers had later expectations than Dutch mothers regardless of the domain of the skills. We can argue that since in individualistic cultures (Triandis, 1994) parents see their children (even babies) as individuals with their own will, interest, and potential and because they believe children, even at very early ages of life, have a potential to learn and develop (Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997), Western mothers report earlier ages of mastery, without differentiating between skills.

Physical skills was the only domain where we did not find significant differences between Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers. This finding is in line with the domain dependence model (Van de Vijver & Poortinga, 1990), which argues that cross-cultural differences increase with the cultural loadings of the domain. Van de Vijver and Poortinga distinguished six domains from physical to perceptual, cognitive, intra-individual, inter-individual, and social, and argued that from the first to the last the influence of genetics decreases and the influence of culture increases. We can argue that the reason behind the absence of any difference in physical skills could be the relatively little influence of cultural factors on this domain. Moreover, in line with the domain dependence model, the largest cultural differences were in social skills, self-control, and family orientation which are the inter-individual and social domains compared to domains like autonomy, competitiveness which are more intra-individual characteristics.

Another goal of this study was to examine the role of generational status on Turkish immigrant mothers’ developmental expectations. Our results showed that second generation
Turkish-Dutch mothers who migrated to the Netherlands at a young age had earlier developmental expectations than first generation Turkish-Dutch mothers, especially for self-control, social skills, and family orientation. The pattern of expectations of the second generation Turkish mothers was similar to that of Dutch mainstream mothers. This result is in line with literature pointing out to the generational differences in immigrant populations (Delgato-Gaitan, 1994), also in Turkish immigrant context (Citlak, Leyendecker, Schoelmerich, Driessen, & Harwood, 2008). Turkish immigrant mothers who were either born in the Netherlands or migrated at a very early age, followed Dutch education and participate fully in the Dutch culture seemed to accommodate to the Dutch norms and showed a pattern close to the Dutch mothers by reporting earlier ages of mastery.

Our study is not free from limitations. This study only examined mother’s beliefs and expectations and our findings do not imply any reference to actual differences in Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers’ behaviors. Parenting is a very broad concept and how parents behave toward their children is another important aspect which has a direct and significant influence on child development (Dix, 1992). Therefore, examination of maternal beliefs and behaviors together can be suggested for future studies for a more complete understanding of child socialization and parenting of these cultural groups.
CHAPTER 5

The Role of Ethnicity, Immigration, Urban/Rural Residence, and Parental Education in Developmental Expectations and Child-Rearing Practices

Abstract

This study aimed at (1) disentangling the role of ethnicity, immigration, type of residence, and educational background in developmental expectations and self-reported child-rearing practices, and (2) identifying the relation between developmental expectations and child-rearing practices. Participants were 111 Dutch and 111 Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands, 161 Turkish mothers in urban areas, and 81 Turkish mothers in rural areas of Turkey. Dutch, urban, and higher educated mothers expected earlier achievement of developmental skills than Turkish, rural, and low-educated mothers. Turkish mothers, mainstreamers, and more highly educated mothers reported more positive and fewer negative parenting practices than Dutch mothers, immigrants, and mothers with less education. Implications for research on the relations between sociocultural background, parenting beliefs and practices are discussed.
Parental ethnotheories are belief systems parents hold regarding the nature of children and development (Harkness, Super, & Van Tijen, 2000), which reflect parents’ developmental goals, expectations, child-rearing beliefs and values, and perceptions about their children (Rosenthal & Roer-Strier, 2001). Ethnotheories of parents are associated with their behaviors (Dix, 1992) and moderate the effectiveness of parents’ child-rearing practices (Kagitcibasi, 1996). Ethnicity (in many studies equivalent to country), socioeconomic background, and parental education have been shown to influence parental ethnotheories and child-rearing practices; however, most studies examine these factors in isolation without addressing their relations or relative influence (Atkinson, 1994; Dawson & Cain, 1990). For example, comparisons of ethnotheories of immigrant and mainstream mothers may confound cultural and educational differences, as the latter group is usually better educated. The present study set out to examine the role of ethnicity, immigration, type of residence (urban vs. rural), and educational background in developmental expectations and child-rearing practices. In addition, we aimed to identify the relation between developmental expectations and parenting practices. We examined parental expectations and practices of five samples: Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands, Dutch mainstream mothers in the Netherlands, Turkish mothers with high levels of education in urban areas of Turkey, Turkish mothers with low levels of education in urban areas of Turkey, and Turkish mothers in rural areas of Turkey. Disentangling the relative importance of these factors can be expected to significantly increase our understanding of parenting beliefs and practices and hence, policies and programs regarding child development and family dynamics.

Developmental Expectations

Developmental expectations are an aspect of parental ethnotheories and refer to the age that parents believe particular developmental skills should be reached by the child (Goodnow, Cashmore, Cotton, & Knight, 1984). Research has shown that ages parents expect
certain milestones to develop are positively related to the actual age their children achieve those skills (Hopkins & Westra, 1990), thus it is important to examine the factors associated with developmental expectations. Furthermore, it has been shown that parents’ background variables, such as education, occupation, and income have a relationship with their developmental expectations (Hess, Kashiwagi, Azuma, Price, & Dickson, 1980; McGillicuddy-DeLisi, 1980; Von der Lippe, 1999). Mothers from higher socioeconomic backgrounds tend to indicate earlier ages of mastery than mothers from lower socioeconomic background. Research shows that socioeconomic factors explain more variance in mothers’ expectations than culture does (Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997); yet, the relations of culture and socioeconomic factors with parental expectations are only partly overlapping.

In one of the earliest cross-cultural studies on developmental expectations, Hess et al. (1980) compared Japanese and American mothers and found that Japanese mothers who are considered to be high on collectivism (Triandis, 1994) expected early development in areas like compliance with adult authority and social courtesy. Anglo-American mothers, on the other hand, expected earlier acquisition of skills like standing up for own rights and verbal assertion. A replication of this study with Anglo and Lebanese mothers in Australia displayed similar findings (Goodnow et al., 1984). Authors argued that the developmental skills that are deemed more important in a culture will be expected to develop earlier in that culture.

In another cross-cultural study, developmental expectations of Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Zambian mothers were examined and somewhat different results were found (Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997). Zambian mothers reported the highest ages on aspects like cognitive, intra-individual, and social skills, and Dutch mothers the earliest. Ages expected by Turkish-Dutch mothers were in between. Willemsen and Van de Vijver found cross-cultural differences in various domains, which is difficult to combine with the claim of earlier studies that parents have earlier expectations of achievement of the skills that are more valued
in their cultural context. The authors argued that the reason Dutch mothers had earliest expectations across all domains was because these parents see children with a global potential to develop earlier than do parents from non-Western backgrounds.

In addition to ethnicity and socioeconomic status (SES), we were also interested in type of residence with a focus on comparing rural and urban areas. One of the few existing studies on developmental expectations among urban and rural parents found that Balinese mothers in urban areas had earlier expectations about cognitive, psychosocial, and physical/perceptual-motor development compared to rural mothers (Williams, Williams, Lopez, & Tayko, 2000). However, the study did not address the confounding influence of educational background on developmental expectations of these mothers.

It appears that mothers’ developmental expectations vary depending on their cultural, socioeconomic, and residential background. The background variables that have been studied in the literature are often confounded, which makes it impossible to draw precise conclusions about the relative contribution of cultural and socioeconomic influences to parenting ethnotheories.

**Child-Rearing Practices**

Child-rearing practices are specific, goal-directed behaviors through which parents perform their parental duties (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Child-rearing practices vary according to parents’ ideas and knowledge about child development (McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 1980) and influence child development in several domains (Wade, 2004). The most frequently studied parenting behaviors include responsiveness, warmth, induction, power assertion, cognitive stimulation, and demandingness (Dekovic & Janssen, 1992; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2004; Yagmurlu & Sanson, 2009). Some of these practices like caring and
nurturing are found to be intuitive and universal (Bornstein, Tal, & Tamis-LeMonda, 1991). However, most of the practices may vary with socioeconomic or cultural background.

Regarding socioeconomic background of the parents, research has shown that those who have higher levels of education know more about child development, display higher levels of emotional and verbal responsivity, and provide higher levels of appropriate cognitive stimulation and inductive reasoning to their children (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Davis-Kean, 2005; Williams, Soetjiningsih, & Williams, 2000). These parenting practices are considered to be positive and conducive for child development (Eisenberg et al., 2005). On the other hand, less educated mothers display more controlling behaviors and physical discipline, and less verbal interaction or stimulation of children (Hoff-Ginsberg & Tardiff, 1995; Pinderhughes et al., 2000; Von der Lippe, 1999), which are considered to be negative and less stimulating for the child (Dallaire et al., 2006). Type of residence is related with parenting practices in a similar way. Urban mothers engage in negative parenting less and use positive child-rearing practices more with their children than rural mothers (Pinderhughes et al., 2001).

Most studies investigating parenting practices among different cultural groups yielded significant cross-cultural differences, even after controlling for socioeconomic background of the parents. More specifically, non-Western mothers were found to use more negative parenting, punishment, and control (Cardona, Nicholson, & Fox, 2000) and less praising and verbal encouragement (Bradley, Corwyn, & Whiteside-Mansell, 1996) than Western mothers.

It can be concluded that both socioeconomic and cultural background of the parents are related to their parenting practices. Yet, there is little knowledge on the relative importance of these background variables to explain parenting practices.
A number of studies confirmed the association between parent’s beliefs and practices (Coleman & Karraker, 2003; Okagaki & Bingham, 2005; Sigel & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 2002), but there are only few studies on developmental expectations and parents’ behaviors. In one of these studies, Williams et al. (2000) examined Balinese mothers and found that compared to mothers with lower education, more educated mothers had earlier developmental expectations about physical and perceptual-motor behaviors of children. Moreover, more educated mothers reported earlier ages to start talking to babies, telling stories, reading books, letting their babies feed themselves, and disciplining their children. Pomerleau, Malcuit, and Sabatier (1991) were interested in the relationship between mothers’ beliefs about infants’ competence and the interactive styles of the parent and the infant. They showed that Quebecois mothers expected earlier emergence of infant competencies, especially perceptual and cognitive abilities, than Haitian and Vietnamese mothers. Quebecois mothers introduced specific activities very early in order to stimulate development of this area; they gave their babies the opportunity to explore and to mouth objects which is known to be beneficial for cognitive development of the child (Bornstein, Tal, & Tamis-Le Monda, 1991).

Hopkins and Westra (1990) also examined actual development of infants in relation to their mothers’ expectations and practices regarding achievement of milestones like sitting, crawling, and walking in English and Jamaican groups. They found that Jamaican mothers expected their infants to sit alone without any help earlier than the English mothers did and the Jamaican mothers also displayed certain behaviors which promote the attainment of this particular skill earlier. More importantly, the infants’ actual achievement of sitting alone was in line with their mothers’ expectations and supportive practices.

It appears, in summary, that there is some support for the assumed association between developmental expectations and parenting practices. The question arises as to how background variables, developmental expectations, and child-rearing practices are related. In
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our view a mediation model would be a natural choice that is based on an analogy with Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) model of more proximal and more distal influences on psychological functioning. We argue that developmental expectations (partly or fully) mediate the relation between background variables and parenting practices, because developmental expectancies, known to be related to background variables, are conceptually closer to child-rearing practices than background variables are.

**Turkish and Dutch Parenting Patterns**

Turkey is a country that is high on conservatism and hierarchy and low on autonomy and egalitarianism based on Schwartz’s (1999) model of cultural values. The Turkish sociocultural context has been characterized by close interpersonal relationships, loyalty, and a focus on kinship (Aygun & Imamoglu, 2002). Research on parenting beliefs of Turkish parents has indicated that obedience to parents and having close ties with family members are highly endorsed, especially in traditional rural Turkish families. In rural and low-SES settings, parents display obedience-oriented parenting and low levels of supportive parenting and autonomy granting (Kagitcibasi, 2007; Sunar, 2002). On the other hand, well-educated Turkish parents in urbanized areas expect their children to be economically independent and emotionally connected (interdependent) with the family (Imamoglu, 1998). These parents display more autonomy-oriented values and child-rearing practices (Kagitcibasi, 2007). However, studies showed that power-assertive discipline techniques and strict control in Turkish parents’ child-rearing pattern do not exclude emotional closeness between parent and child (Kagitcibasi, 1970). Obedience-oriented parenting and controlling behaviors are common among Turkish immigrant parents in the Netherlands (Gerrits et al., 1996; Nijsten, 2006).

The Netherlands is a country that is high on egalitarianism and autonomy and low on hierarchy and conservatism based on Schwartz’s (1999) values model. It is a highly
developed European society and defined as a prototypical culture of independence (Hofstede, 2001). Personal privacy stands out as an important value even when the nuclear family is concerned. Since the social security system is well developed and takes care of citizens in need, the majority of elderly and dependent people live without having to rely on their family members, especially children (Georgas, Berry, Van de Vijver, Kagitcibasi, & Poortinga, 2006). Independence and assertiveness are highly endorsed goals in Dutch families, and even infants are expected to be able to play alone and take care of themselves (Pels, 1991; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997). Dutch mothers often display parenting styles that support both emotional and material independence of the child (Georgas et al., 2006), use less controlling and more autonomy-oriented parenting behaviors (Gerrits et al., 1996).

The Present Study

Five groups of mothers were involved in the study: two groups in the Netherlands (Dutch mainstream and Turkish-Dutch immigrant mothers) and three groups in Turkey (urban mothers with high levels of education, urban mothers with low levels of education, and rural mothers). In this study, we were interested in group differences in developmental expectations and child-rearing practices across these five groups. In addition, we addressed the relations between cultural background, immigration status, type of residency, and maternal socioeconomic status as antecedent variables, developmental expectations as mediating variables, and parenting practices as outcome variables. The variation in all background variables enables us to statistically estimate the relative contribution of home culture and immigration status. These research questions were tested in the following three hypotheses:
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*Developmental expectations:* Dutch, mainstream, urban, and high-educated mothers expect earlier achievement of developmental skills than Turkish, immigrant, rural, and low-educated mothers, respectively (Hypothesis 1).

*Child-rearing practices:* Dutch, mainstream, urban, and high-educated mothers report more use of positive parenting (i.e., inductive reasoning, responsiveness, and stimulation) and less use of negative parenting (i.e., obedience-demanding behavior and punishment), compared to Turkish, immigrant, rural, and low-educated mothers, respectively (Hypothesis 2).

*Relation between developmental expectations and child-rearing practices:* A significant overall association between mothers’ expectations and parenting practices is expected (Hypothesis 3a). Mothers with earlier developmental expectations report using higher levels of positive parenting behavior and less negative parenting practices (Hypothesis 3b). Lastly, developmental expectations mediate the relation between background variables and mothers’ parenting practices (Hypothesis 3c).

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants of the study comprised 111 mainstream Dutch, 111 Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands, 90 high-educated and 71 low-educated Turkish mothers living in an urban city in Turkey, and 81 Turkish mother living in a rural areas of Turkey (see Table 1 for descriptive statistics). All participating mothers had at least one child of preschool age who was the target child in this study. A mother was classified as Turkish immigrant only if both her parents were born in Turkey and migrated to the Netherlands; and mothers classified
as Dutch if they were born in the Netherlands, as were their parents and grandparents.

Table 1

*Descriptive Characteristics of the Five Samples (Percentages unless Stated Otherwise)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, Urban: high-educated, Urban: low-educated, Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (N of mothers)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of child (in months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>48.94</td>
<td>49.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>22.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of mother (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>32.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, not living with husband</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education mother (M and SD in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M and SD in years)</td>
<td>(12.37)</td>
<td>(11.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.99)</td>
<td>(5.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.97)</td>
<td>(4.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.09)</td>
<td>(1.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child order (first child)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Participants in the Turkish urban sample were living in Istanbul which is the largest city in Turkey with a population of over 12 million and considered to be the country’s cultural and financial capital. Participants in the Turkish-rural sample were chosen from Kayseri, Konya, Nevsehir, and smaller towns and villages around these cities, because these are the cities of origin of most of the Turkish-Dutch mothers. These are the three old cities in Central-Turkey that are considered to represent characteristics of the traditional Turkish family. It should be noted that urban - rural differences are substantial in Turkey and much larger than in the Netherlands.

Of the Turkish immigrant sample, 28% of the mothers and 18% of their husbands were born in the Netherlands. The mean age of migration to the Netherlands was 12.14 years (SD = 10.22) for the Turkish mothers and 13.26 (SD = 9.33) for the fathers.

An analysis of variance revealed that the five groups of mothers were significantly different from each other in terms of age and years of education. Mothers in Turkish-urban-low educated and Turkish-rural samples were significantly younger than mothers in other groups, $F(4, 464) = 7.31, p < .001$, (partial) $\eta^2 = .06$. Regarding maternal education, mothers in the Istanbul high-educated sample showed the highest level of education followed by mothers in the Dutch mainstream, Turkish-Dutch, Turkish-rural, and Istanbul-low educated samples, respectively, $F(4, 464) = 81.68, p < .001, \eta^2 = .42$.

Materials

Sociodemographic Questionnaire. The background information form provided information about the target child (e.g., date of birth and sex) and family background characteristics (e.g., maternal and paternal age, education, and marital status). Education of mothers and fathers was rated according to the highest level achieved (0 represented none or dropped out of primary school and 5 represented university graduate).
**Child-Rearing Behaviors Questionnaire.** Mothers completed a modified version of the Child Rearing Questionnaire developed by Sanson (1994) and elaborated by Paterson and Sanson (1999). The Turkish version of the Child Rearing Questionnaire was developed by Yagmurlu and Sanson (2009). The original Child Rearing Questionnaire has 30 items where parents indicate the frequency of each behavior on a 5-point scale, where 1 describes *Never* and 5 describes *Always*. The original scale has four domains (subscales): Inductive Reasoning (e.g., “I try to explain to my child why certain things are necessary”), Punishment (e.g., “I use physical punishment, such as smacking, for very bad behavior”), Obedience-Demanding Behavior (e.g., “I expect my child to do what he/she is told to do, without stopping to argue about it.”), and Warmth (e.g., “My child and I have warm, intimate times together.”). The modified version of the scale included two new domains that tap into Permissiveness (e.g., “I believe that my child should have his/her way as often as I do”) and Stimulation (e.g., “I read books to my child to enhance his/her cognitive development”). Items in these two domains were developed based on previous studies and existing scales (e.g., Bradley & Corwyn, 2005; Buri, 1991; Keller, 2003; Keller et al., 2004).

Internal consistency scores for subscales were .72 for Obedience Demanding, .74 for Punishment, .79 for Warmth, .79 for Inductive Reasoning, .70 for Permissiveness, and .82 for Stimulation. Reliability values of subscales for the five samples were also examined separately and found to be fairly similar to those reported for the total sample.

**Developmental Expectations Scale.** The Developmental Expectations Scale, which was developed by Durgel and Van de Vijver (2008) as a measure of maternal developmental expectations, is based on scales used in previous studies (e.g., Goodnow et al., 1984; Hess et al., 1980; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997). Mothers were asked to indicate the age they expect a child to achieve certain skills for the first time (a score of 0.5 was given to ages below 1 year and a score of 7 to ages above 6). The scale consisted of nine subscales:
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Physical Skills (e.g., “Stand without support more than 1 minute”), Cognitive Skills (e.g., “Tell what is left and right”), Self-control (e.g., “Keep playing according to game rules even if she loses”), Social Skills (e.g., “Share toys with other children”), Autonomy (e.g., “Decide what to wear”), Obedience (e.g., “Give up reading/TV when mother asks for help”), Family Orientation (e.g., “Like to visit grandparents”), Traditional/Moral Rules (e.g., “Have a preference on toys according to own gender (e.g., boys-cars, girls-dolls”)”), and Competitiveness (e.g., “Try to be ahead of peers”). For each subscale, average scores of mothers’ reported age expectations for the particular skill were calculated. Low scores indicated earlier expectations for a particular domain, while high scores indicated later expectations for a particular domain. Reliability analysis showed that the alpha coefficients (internal consistency) for the total sample were .88 for Physical Skills, .91 for Cognitive Skills, .89 for Self-control, .91 for Social Skills, .88 for Autonomy, .90 for Obedience, .90 for Family Orientation, .88 for Traditional/Moral Rules, and .93 for Agency. Values for the five samples were also examined separately and found to be similar to those reported for the total sample.

Procedure

All participants were recruited through snowball sampling. Mothers were given information on the study and asked whether they were willing to participate. Those who agreed to take part were visited in their home. Dutch mothers were interviewed by a Dutch researcher and Turkish immigrant mothers were interviewed by a Turkish interviewer in either Dutch or Turkish, according to their preference. During home visits, the researcher gave the instruction about how to fill in the questionnaires and let the mothers answer them without any interference unless they needed help with filling in the questionnaires. Mothers were instructed to answer the child-rearing practices questionnaire with the target child in mind; however, the Developmental Expectations scale was referring to their general opinions
about child development, not specifically related to their own child. Home visits took about two hours to complete all the tasks.

**Results**

We first describe equivalence analyses in which the question was addressed to what extent the Developmental Expectations and Child-Rearing Practices questionnaires measure the same psychological constructs in each group. Then, group comparisons of developmental expectations and child-rearing practices were examined in a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). Finally, we addressed the relation between child-rearing practices and developmental expectations in the five groups by regression and path analysis.

**Equivalence Analysis**

We investigated the construct equivalence of the scales by first computing factor loadings of each item of the scales on their corresponding subscales and then making all ten pairwise comparisons of factors across the five samples. The agreement between the factor loadings of items from different groups is reflected in Tucker’s phi value (Tucker, 1951). As a rule of thumb, values higher than .90 are taken to provide evidence for factorial invariance (Van de Vijver & Poortinga, 1994). Equivalence analyses showed that both the Developmental Expectations Scales and the Child-Rearing Practices Scales displayed high factor congruence, thereby providing strong evidence for structural equivalence across the five groups (see Table 2 for Tucker’s phi values).

**Group Comparisons on Developmental Expectations**

One of the aims of this study was to examine group differences in developmental expectations of mothers. To test this, a oneway MANOVA was conducted with group as
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independent variable and developmental expectations as dependent variables (see Table 3).

Table 2

**Factorial Agreements (Tucker’s phi) across the Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychomotor</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child-rearing behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience demandingness</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive reasoning</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multivariate test was significant, Wilks’ lambda = .66, $F(4, 464) = 5.467, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$. As expected, univariate tests revealed significances for all subscales. Dutch mothers and high-educated Turkish mothers in Istanbul expected earliest achievement, whereas mothers in Turkish-rural and Istanbul-low educated samples expected latest development; Turkish-Dutch ranked in between.
Table 3

Developmental Expectations and Child-Rearing Behaviors for Five Samples: Means, Standard Deviations, and MANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Effect sizes ($\eta^2$)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Turkish-Dutch</td>
<td>Urban: High-educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Developmental expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychomotor</td>
<td>2.94&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2.98&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>3.73&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4.03&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>4.92&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>5.51&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>4.29&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.78&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.69&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>5.02&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>5.08&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>5.35&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>5.13&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.59&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>4.42&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.93&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>5.03&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.46&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.47&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>4.85&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Child-rearing behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience demandingness</td>
<td>3.10&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3.08&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>1.53&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.63&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>4.44&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>4.42&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive reasoning</td>
<td>4.15&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.20&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness</td>
<td>2.96&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.28&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>3.50&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.90&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive parenting</td>
<td>3.77&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.95&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative parenting</td>
<td>2.31&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.35&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Subscripts of means refer to post-hoc tests. Means with different subscripts are significantly different.  
<sup>a</sup>refers to the effect sizes of ethnic group (5 levels) in MANOVA. All effect sizes were significant at $p < .001$.  


Group Comparisons on Child-Rearing Practices

Another goal of the present study was to examine group differences in parenting practices of mothers. A one-way MANOVA was run with group as independent variable and child-rearing practices subscales as dependent variables. MANOVA results (see Table 3) showed that groups were significantly different in their parenting behaviors, Wilks’ lambda = .58, $F(4, 464) = 11.248, p < .001, \eta^2 = .13$. The post-hoc tests showed that high-educated Turkish mothers in Istanbul used obedience demanding behaviors less compared to Turkish-Dutch, Dutch, Turkish mothers in rural areas, and low-educated mothers in Istanbul, respectively, $F(4, 464) = 11.824, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09$. Punishment was used most by Turkish mothers in rural areas and low-educated mothers in Istanbul, followed by Turkish-Dutch, high-educated Turkish mothers in Istanbul, and Dutch mothers, $F(4, 464) = 11.891, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09$. Warmth was displayed more by mothers in Turkey than by mothers in the Netherlands, $F(4, 464) = 3.943, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$. Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers in the Netherlands were found to use less inductive reasoning compared to low-educated mothers in Istanbul, Turkish mothers in the rural, and high-educated mothers in Istanbul, respectively ($F(4, 464) = 5.118, p < .001, \eta^2 = .04$). Dutch mothers reported to display least permissiveness followed by Turkish-Dutch and low-educated Turkish mothers in Istanbul, and finally high-educated Turkish mothers in Istanbul and mothers in rural-Turkey, $F(4, 464) = 25.181, p < .001, \eta^2 = .18$. Lastly, high-educated mothers in Istanbul and mothers in rural sample were found to stimulate their children more compared to low-educated mothers in Istanbul and Turkish-Dutch mothers, followed by the Dutch mothers, $F(4, 464) = 29.484, p < .001, \eta^2 = .20$.

Relations between Background Variables, Developmental Expectations, and Child-Rearing Practices: Regression and Path Analysis
We examined the role of culture (i.e., Turkish vs. Dutch), immigration (i.e., immigrant vs. mainstremer), type of residence (i.e., rural vs. urban), and educational background on developmental expectations separately in both regression and path analyses. The relatively large number of scales for both developmental expectations and child rearing created a challenge in the analyses, given the relatively small sample sizes per group. Therefore, we first used exploratory factor analysis of the subscale scores to reduce the dimensionality. A factor analysis of the nine subscales of the Developmental Expectations was conducted to analyze these correlations. All subscales formed one major factor which explained 65% of the total variance (in line with earlier studies which found that these expectations are positively interrelated; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997). A factor analysis of the child-rearing subscales showed that Obedience Demanding and Punishment scales form a factor that explained 43% of the variance, whereas Warmth, Inductive Reasoning, Permissiveness, and Stimulation formed another factor which explained 21% of the total variance. The correlation between the two factors was weak ($r = -.15$). Thus, we created a Positive Parenting variable with mean score of Warmth, Inductive Reasoning, Permissiveness, and Stimulation and another variable named Negative Parenting by taking mean score of Obedience Demanding and Punishment.

Regression analysis was used to estimate the relative influence of the background variables on developmental expectations and child rearing. Dummy variables were created for culture (0 referring to Dutch and 1 referring to Turkish), immigration status (0 being mainstremer and 1 being immigrant), and type of residence (0 being urban and 1 being rural). A stepwise regression analysis was conducted; mothers’ age was entered in the first step to account for its confounding effect, and maternal education, culture, immigration status, and residence together were added in the second step. Results showed that parental education, culture, and neighborhood were significant predictors of developmental expectations, $R^2 = .10,$
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$F(4, 464) = 13.133, p < .001$. Immigrant status (being an immigrant or a mainstreamer) did not show an effect on mothers’ expectations. Findings confirmed our hypothesis (Hypothesis 1) regarding comparisons of developmental expectations of five groups of mothers; as expected, Dutch mothers, urban mothers, and high-educated mothers expected earlier ages of achievement in developmental skills than Turkish mothers, rural mothers, and low-educated mothers (see Table 4). We were interested in the relative contribution of the four predictors (culture, education, residency, and immigration status) on developmental expectations; the regression analyses showed that each of the predictors had its own contribution and that the predictors had a fairly similar impact on mothers’ developmental expectations (with a possibly somewhat weaker effect of immigration status).

Table 4

*Standardized Regression Coefficients of Regression Analyses with Developmental Expectations, Positive Parenting, and Negative Parenting as Dependent Variable (N = 464)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Developmental expectations</th>
<th>Positive parenting</th>
<th>Negative parenting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>.172***</td>
<td>.392***</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.147**</td>
<td>.117**</td>
<td>-.237***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>.160**</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.192***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.204***</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.095**</td>
<td>.148**</td>
<td>.105***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scoring of dummy variables is as follows: For culture 0 = Dutch, 1 = Turkish; for immigration status 0 = mainstreamer, 1 = immigrant; for residence 0 = urban, 1 = rural.

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

The regression analyses with the child-rearing factors as dependent variables showed that parental education, culture, and immigration status were significant predictors of Positive Parenting practices, $R^2 = .16, F(4, 464) = 21.027, p < .001$; yet, living in rural or urban areas
did not show any effect on mothers’ positive parenting behaviors. Turkish mothers, mainstreamers, and higher educated mothers displayed more positive parenting than Dutch mothers, immigrants, and mothers with less education (See Table 4). Regarding negative parenting, parental education and living in rural (vs urban) area were the only significant predictors, $R^2 = .11$, $F(4, 464) = 19.198$, $p < .001$. Culture and immigration status did not predict negative parenting practices. Mothers with more education and mothers in urban cities were found to display less negative parenting than mothers with lower education and mothers in rural areas (See Table 4). Turkish, high-educated, urban mothers reported more use of positive parenting. Low-educated, rural mothers indicated more use of negative parenting. Although the global pattern of the findings is in line with the second hypothesis, it should be noted that not all expected regression coefficients were significant and that, contrary to the hypothesis, Turkish mothers reported more use of positive parenting than Dutch mothers.

Although the previous regression analyses yielded insight in the associations between background variables and the parenting variables, the analyses did not address the relations of the variables in a single model. Therefore, we tested a path model with background variables as input, developmental expectations as mediating variables, and the parenting practices as outcomes. (Figure 1). To test the relationships, we tested the fit of the model in Figure 1 across the five groups of mothers participating in our study. All possible relations between the input, mediating, and outcome variables were included in an initial model; we then decided to skip the nonsignificant path coefficients to determine the most parsimonious model with a reasonable fit. A multigroup comparison showed that the most restrictive model with a good fit was the structural weights model (identity of path coefficients across groups), which was of primary importance to us, $\chi^2(49, N = 464) = 53.592$, $p = .303$, $\chi^2/df = 1.094$, GFI = .96, AGFI = .92, RMSEA = .014 (see Table 5). The results showed that developmental
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expectations and parenting practices were significantly related to one another in a similar way across all five groups of mothers, which confirmed Hypothesis 3a. As expected in Hypothesis 3b, mothers who expected later ages of development of their kids were found to use negative parenting more and positive parenting less than mothers with earlier expectations of mastery. Our last hypothesis (Hypothesis 3c) regarding the mediating role of developmental expectations was partly confirmed. The relation between parents’ background variables and child-rearing practices was mediated by developmental expectations only for child’s age. Mothers with older children expected later ages of mastery. Nevertheless the associations between child’s sex and parental education on the one hand and positive and negative parenting on the other hand were not mediated by developmental expectations; they were found to be directly related to child-rearing practices. Mothers reported to use more negative parenting for their sons than their daughters. Lastly, mothers with higher education reported less use of negative parenting.

Discussion

We examined developmental expectations and parenting practices in Dutch mainstream and Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands, and high- and low-educated Turkish mothers in urban and rural areas of Turkey. To our knowledge, this is one of the most comprehensive studies in terms of integrating several background variables (culture, education, immigration status, and residency) to investigate their relative importance for parenting. It is a recurrent problem in studies with immigrant samples that cultural differences overlap with socioeconomic differences; what is attributed to the culture may actually be due to the socioeconomic or contextual differences between groups (Hill, 2006; Kagitcibasi, 2003; Leyendecker, Harwood, Comparini, & Yalcinkaya, 2005). Our study aimed at disentangling the effects of culture, socioeconomic factors, immigration, and residence from one another.
Table 5

Results of the Structural Equation Model Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconstrained</td>
<td>30.013</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural weights</td>
<td>53.592</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural covariances</td>
<td>308.904</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.232</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>255.32***</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural residuals</td>
<td>334.219</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.755</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The model and values in italics denote the most restrictive, yet well-fitting model.

***$p < .001$.

Figure 1. The SEM model relating background variables, developmental expectations, and child-rearing practices.

Note. Scoring of child’s sex is 0 = Girl, 1 = Boy. All weights are standardized.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.
Regarding developmental expectations, we found that Dutch mothers and highly educated Turkish mothers in urban areas expected the earliest development in all domains and low-educated and rural Turkish mothers expected the latest development in all domains. The mean scores of Turkish immigrant mothers, who typically come from a mainly rural background, showed a pattern confirming their ‘in-between’ status. They had later expectations than the Dutch and high-educated Turkish mothers, yet earlier expectations than rural and low-educated mothers. This finding can be discussed within an acculturation framework (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 2002; Kagitcibasi, 2007). When individuals or groups of people from traditional, rural contexts migrate to Western, urban societies, their values, attitudes, and behaviors go through a transformation and they tend to combine the "old" and "new" cultures. It is argued that particularly values related to autonomy of children become more important for immigrant parents after the migration (Kagitcibasi, 2007) because of their relevance in the competitive, industrial, modern nature of the society of settlement. Thus, the pattern Turkish immigrant mothers displayed in this study shows that they come closer to the Western and high-educated mothers in their expectations. They build up an understanding that children are capable of achieving certain developmental skills at an earlier age, compared to their reference groups back in Turkey.

Previous research has shown that child-rearing practices are associated with parents’ socioeconomic background (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002), type of residence (Pinderhughes et al., 2001), and cultural background (Bornstein, Azuma, Tamis-Lemonda, & Ogino, 1990; Dennis, Cole, Zahn-Waxler, & Mizuta, 2002). Generally speaking, mothers from higher educational, urban, and Western backgrounds tend to engage in positive practices more and in negative practices less than mothers from lower socioeconomic, rural, and non-Western backgrounds. Our results were supportive of the existing literature on many points in that Dutch, high-educated, and urban mothers reported more use of positive parenting like inductive reasoning
and less use of negative parenting practices such as obedience-demanding and punishment compared to others. For certain practices, however, we found a different pattern. For instance, stimulation was reported to be used more by high-educated Turkish mothers compared to the Dutch mothers, which is most likely because the Turkish-urban sample was significantly more educated than the Dutch sample. Thus, mothers who had more education displayed more cognitive and emotional stimulation toward their children. Results on permissiveness were in line with literature indicating that it is a widely used child-rearing practice by Turkish parents until their children pass the preschool years (Kagitcibasi, 2007). In Muslim families indulgence in the early years of childhood is seen as a way of establishing strong emotional bonds between the child and the parents (Khounani, 2000). Therefore, mothers of the Turkish preschoolers in our study reported more use of permissiveness than the Dutch mothers.

Findings regarding the relative predictive value of background variables (culture, education, type of residence, and immigration status) were remarkable. The regression analyses suggested that each of these has a unique contribution to make to developmental expectations and parenting practices; however, maternal education was the most consistent and strongest predictor of all variables. Maternal education had a significant predictive value for both negative and positive parenting practices and also developmental expectations. The path analysis confirmed that maternal education was the only background variable that was related to parenting. Yet, even this variable had a small regression coefficient (predicting only negative parenting). It can be concluded that when all variables are taken together and their intercorrelations are taken into account, their contribution is very modest at best.

Next to examining the comparative importance of all these background variables, our main goal was to investigate the relationship between parents’ expectations and practices. Parents’ beliefs about child development are found to be related to how they behave towards their children and what kind of child-rearing practices they use (Hastings & Grusec, 1998;
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Sigel & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 2002). The problem with this research area is that these relations between parenting aspects have been found to be low to moderate, and particularly studies focusing on developmental expectations of parents are very limited. The few studies that were conducted (Pomerleau, Malcuit, & Sabatier, 1991; Williams et al., 2000) pointed out that mothers who have earlier expectations vis-à-vis the development of a certain skill engage in parenting practices that foster those skills more and earlier than mothers with later expectations. Our study confirmed previous literature and found significant relations between mothers’ developmental expectations and their positive and negative child-rearing practices although these relations were not very strong. Earlier developmental expectations were associated with the use of more positive and fewer negative practices, across all groups. It is very important that this association between parenting beliefs and practices was confirmed in all five groups of participating mothers coming from diverse backgrounds. We can argue that, despite the low correlations, the general pattern of associations is the same across mothers from different cultures, educational backgrounds, and residences.

Another striking finding was that being an immigrant or a mainstreamer was not highly predictive. This last finding may seem unexpected and inconsistent with previous findings, but in our view, the presence of this effect in previous studies may be due to the confounding of immigrant status with maternal education or culture. We know that immigration, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status are often positively correlated, yet confounded in research which creates a problem in understanding findings and drawing conclusions about parenting across cultural groups (Hill, 2006). A zero or weak relationship of immigrant status with the parenting variables of our study is probably to be expected after other background variables were accounted for. It can be concluded that when correlations or simple regressions are studied, various associations are found that may seem to be in line with expectations. However, when background variables, developmental expectations, and
parenting variables are all included in the model, the contribution of background variables is limited whereas child variables (child’s age and sex) seem to matter more.

In our study, finding out the relation between developmental expectations and parenting practices as well as the relatively more importance of mothers’ educational background gives us a useful hint as to how we can incorporate these into practice. Moreover, a comparison of the regression analyses and the path model suggests that when examined separately (as done in the regression analysis), independent and dependent variables show significant associations. However, when all variables are examined in combination, it is clear that few direct effects remain significant; for example, residency predicts negative parenting (more common in rural areas) in the regression analysis, but the effects of residency in the path analysis are no longer significant. Its effect is accounted for by other variables, such as urban-rural differences in developmental expectations.

Our study is not free from limitations. This study only examined mother’s expectations and self-reported parenting practices, and does not imply any reference to actual child-rearing practices of these mothers. Parents’ self-reports can often be different from how they engage in and interact with their children in reality. Hence, examination of observed parenting practices of mothers would provide us with a more complete understanding of the parenting dynamics.

This study derives its importance particularly from the fact that there are so few studies in the literature that pay attention to several factors in relation to parenting beliefs and practices. Studies trying to disentangle cultural influences from other social and economic factors are needed to develop a better understanding of parenting processes across cultures. Findings of such research are required for the development of the most appropriate policies
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and intervention programs, especially in multicultural societies where many ethnic minorities experience difficulties in adjusting to the host culture.
CHAPTER 6

Developmental Expectations and Self-Reported and Observed Parenting Practices of Turkish-Dutch and Dutch Mothers

Abstract

We examined the relations between parenting beliefs, self-reported parenting practices, and observed child-rearing behaviors among 33 Dutch and 35 Turkish immigrant mothers living in the Netherlands. Cultural comparisons showed that the two groups of mothers did not significantly differ in their developmental expectations. Turkish-Dutch mothers reported more use of demanding child-rearing behaviors than Dutch mothers. Observational data came from recorded mother-child interactions during free play and book reading. Turkish immigrant mothers were more responsive than the Dutch mothers both in play and book reading sessions; however, the two groups did not differ in any other parenting behavior observed. We found Turkish mothers to be more interactive with their children in general which may lead to more responsiveness. These findings were explained particularly by sample characteristics. Finally, the correlations between self-reported beliefs and practices on the one hand and actual behavior on the other hand were nonsignificant, which suggests that the links between actual and self-reported practices were weak at best.
Relationship between parents’ beliefs and how they behave towards their children has been an important topic in the research area of parenting and child development (Goodnow, 1988; Kochanska, Kuczynski, & Radke-Yarrow, 1989). Another related point that has been examined in the developmental literature is the relation between self-reported and observed parenting behaviors. The few studies focusing on the relation between parenting beliefs, expressed parenting behaviors, and observed child-rearing behaviors showed fairly low correlations (Goodnow; Sigel, 1986). Miller (1988) pointed out that what parents believe and report about their parenting is related to how they actually interact and behave towards their children; however, this relation is very modest at best. Thus, the predictive value of beliefs and self-reported parenting behaviors on the actual child-rearing behaviors remains troublesome. Nevertheless, in many developmental studies, researchers employ self-report measures to assess parenting behaviors in relation to child development, tacitly assuming the existence of associations between self-reported and actual behaviors. In previous studies we addressed cross-cultural differences in developmental expectations and self-reported parenting, notably differences between Turkish and Dutch mothers (Durgel, Leyendecker, Yagmurlu, & Harwood, 2009; Durgel & Van de Vijver, submitted), and found that Turkish immigrant mothers endorse their children to be compliant and have close family ties more and be autonomous less than the Dutch mainstream mothers. Another study which examined the relationship between mothers’ developmental expectations and their self-reported parenting practices showed that Turkish mothers expect certain developmental skills develop at a later age compared to the Dutch mothers; and those who had later expectation reported to use more demanding parenting and less positive parenting practices like inductive reasoning, warmth (Chapter 5; Durgel & Van de Vijver, submitted). In this study, we examined the associations between developmental expectations, self-reported child-rearing practices, and
actual parenting behaviors observed during mother-child interaction in an acculturation context. More specifically, the main goals of this study were 1) to examine group differences in Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers’ developmental expectations, self-reported and observed parenting practices, and 2) to study the correlations between these three aspects of parenting.

**Parenting Beliefs and Developmental Expectations**

Parenting beliefs (i.e., parents’ ideas about child rearing and development) have an impact on how parents interact with their children (Dix, 1992) and vary widely across cultures (Harkness, Super, & Van Tijen, 2000; Harwood, Schoelmerich, Schulze, & Gonzalez, 1999). In this study, developmental expectations are examined as an aspect of parenting beliefs. Developmental expectations refer to the age that parents believe particular developmental skills should be reached by the child (Goodnow, Cashmore, Cotton, & Knight, 1984). Studying expectations has great importance since it has been shown that parents’ expectations regarding certain milestones are significantly related to the actual age their children achieve those skills (Hopkins & Westra, 1990).

Developmental expectations have been found to be associated with parents’ socioeconomic status (SES) (Hess, Kashiwagi, Azuma, Price, & Dickson, 1980); parents from a higher SES tend to expect earlier ages of mastery than parents from a lower SES. However, Willemsen and Van de Vijver (1997) investigated the relative contribution of SES and cultural background to mothers’ developmental expectations and found that culture has its unique impact on mothers’ expectations beyond the role of SES. Knowledge of the relations between parents’ cultural background and expectations is particularly important in multicultural societies where cultural groups with their own expectations reside together.

The earliest cross-cultural developmental studies on parental expectations showed that mothers from Western, individualistic societies tend to have earlier expectations of mastery
Self-Reported and Observed Parenting

of assertiveness whereas mothers from non-Western, collectivistic cultures expect their children to master earlier in the social domain like compliance and social courtesy (Goodnow et al., 1984; Hess et al., 1980). Willemsen and Van de Vijver, on the other hand, found (Western) Dutch mothers to expect earlier ages of mastery regardless of the domain of the skills compared to (non-Western) Zambian and Turkish immigrant mothers. They attributed this finding to the individualistic structure of Dutch families in which children are considered to be individuals with an overall capability and potential compared to the collectivistic cultures where children are seen as “babies” (Triandis, 1994).

Several studies showed that there is a significant association between parents’ beliefs and child-rearing behaviors (Sigel & McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 2002). Hopkins and Westra (1990) examined English and Jamaican mothers’ developmental expectations, child-rearing practices, and the actual development of their infants. They found that Jamaican mothers expected their infants to be able to sit alone without any help earlier than the English mothers did. At the same time, Jamaican mothers displayed certain behaviors which promote the attainment of this particular skill earlier. More importantly, the infants’ actual achievement of sitting alone was in line with their mothers’ expectations and supportive practices; Jamaican infants were able to achieve the skill earlier than English infants. Similarly, in Chapter 5 (Durgel & Van de Vijver, submitted), we showed that Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers differed in their developmental expectations, with Dutch mothers having earlier expectations across all skill domains compared to Turkish immigrant mothers. Moreover, both for Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers, it was found that those who had earlier developmental expectations reported that they use positive parenting practices more and negative practices less in child rearing.

In summary, parents from different cultural backgrounds vary in terms of their expectations regarding the age children can achieve certain developmental milestones. There
is also support for the assumed association between developmental expectations and parenting practices.

**Parenting Practices**

Developmental researchers have been mostly interested in parenting styles which can be defined as parent’s general attitude towards the child (Baumrind, 1991). Four parenting styles have been described in the literature: Authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and neglectful (Baumrind; Maccoby & Martin, 1983); especially authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles attracted attention. However, although parenting styles are informative for understanding general principles of child rearing, they provide little information on the proximal aspects of parenting that have a direct impact on child development. Darling and Steinberg (1993) argued that parenting practices, which are specific, goal-directed behaviors through which parents perform their parental duties towards their children, directly affect children’s developmental outcomes (Wade, 2004).

Some of the most frequently studied parenting behaviors include responsiveness, warmth, induction, power assertion, cognitive stimulation, and demandingness (Dekovic & Janssen, 1992; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2004; Yagmurlu & Sanson, 2009). Although some practices like caring and nurturing the child are found to be intuitive and universal (Bornstein, Tal, & Tamis-LeMonda, 1991), most practices are found to vary with cultural background. In general, parents from collectivistic cultures are found to display a more authoritarian parenting with high levels of parental control, demandingness, and restrictiveness than the parents from individualistic cultures who display authoritative parenting more (Chao, 1994; Kagitcibasi, 1970; Rudy & Grusec, 2006). Non-Western mothers are found to use more negative parenting, punishment, and control (Cardona, Nicholson, & Fox, 2000; Kelley & Tseng, 1992) and less praising and verbal encouragement (Bradley, Corwyn, & Whiteside-Mansell, 1996) than Western mothers. For example, studies with African and Chinese
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Americans in the US revealed that parental control is much more common in the ethnic minority groups than in the mainstream Caucasian families (Kelley & Tseng, 1992). It was also shown that parents from collectivistic background engage in child-rearing practices that support connectedness and relatedness with others more and behaviors that stimulate autonomy of their children less than parents from individualistic backgrounds (Liu et al., 2005).

Parenting practices are often assessed by self-reports of parents. This method is indeed very informative; however, self-reported parenting practices reflect the attitudes and perception of parents about themselves which may not be reflected in their actual parenting behaviors (Liu et al., 2005). The literature confirms the relationship between what parents report they do and what they actually do; however, the predictive value of the self-reports for observed parenting practices is very low in magnitude (Goodnow, 1988; Kochanska, Kuczynski, & Radke-Yarrow, 1989; Miller, 1988; Sigel, 1986).

In summary, it can be concluded that parenting practices have a direct relation to the children’s developmental outcomes and can differ across varying cultural settings. In this study, we examined developmental expectations and parenting practices of Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers residing in the Netherlands. On the basis of our previous studies (Chapter 5), we decided to focus on self-reports of the following parenting practices: warmth, responsiveness, autonomy-granting behaviors, and demandingness. Observed parenting practices examined in this study were positive affect, responsiveness, autonomy encouraging behaviors, negative control, and connectedness.

Turkish and Dutch Parenting Patterns

The Turkish society is an interdependence-oriented culture (Hofstede, 2001) that is high on conservatism and hierarchy and low on autonomy and egalitarianism (Schwartz,
As can be expected from a collectivistic culture, the Turkish society is characterized by interdependence, close interpersonal relationships, and loyalty (Aygun & Imamoglu, 2002). Parenting patterns of Turkish parents focus mainly on obedience to parents and on having close ties with family members which are highly endorsed in many layers in the society, particularly in rural and low-SES settings. In such contexts, parents show obedience-oriented parenting and low levels of autonomy granting (Kagitcibasi, 2007; Sunar, 2002). On the other hand, well-educated Turkish parents in urban cities in Turkey display more autonomy-oriented values and child-rearing practices (Imamoglu, 1998; Kagitcibasi, 2007). Studies showed that Turkish parents display authoritarian parenting style with high levels of power-assertive discipline techniques and strict control; however, these parenting practices do not exclude emotional closeness and warmth between parent and child (Kagitcibasi, 1970).

Obedience-oriented parenting and controlling behaviors are also common among Turkish immigrant parents in the Netherlands (Gerrits et al., 1996; Nijsten, 2006). Turkish-Dutch mothers are found to display low levels of supportive parenting, autonomy granting, and to provide fewer stimulating materials (e.g., toys, books) that are conducive to the child’s cognitive development compared to Dutch mothers (Leseman & Van den Boom, 1999). Another study which compared Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers’ parenting practices used observational methods. Mothers of 2-year-old children were observed during problem-solving and clean-up tasks and the findings showed that Turkish immigrant mothers were less sensitive and more intrusive than the Dutch mothers (Yaman, Mesman, Van IJzendoorn, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & Linting, 2010). In Yaman et al.’s study sensitivity referred to the mother’s expressions of emotional support and positive regard by encouraging and acknowledging the child’s accomplishments on the tasks. Intrusiveness referred to the mother’s lack of respect of the child’s autonomy by interfering with the child’s needs and interests.
The Netherlands is a prototypical culture of independence (Hofstede, 2001) that is high on egalitarianism and autonomy and low on hierarchy and conservatism (Schwartz, 1999). Independence and assertiveness are highly endorsed goals in Dutch families, and even infants are expected to be able to play alone and take care of themselves (Pels, 1991; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997). Dutch mothers often display parenting styles that support both emotional and material independence of the child (Georgas et al., 2006), use less controlling and more autonomy-oriented parenting behaviors (Gerrits et al., 1996) with higher levels of authoritative control (Yaman et al., 2010).

The Present Study

We had two main goals in this study. Firstly, we were interested in group differences in developmental expectations and child-rearing practices between Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers in the Netherlands. Secondly, we aimed to address the relations between self-reported parental aspects and observed parenting practices. These research questions were tested in the following three hypotheses:

**Developmental expectations.** Based on previous studies (Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997) and earlier studies described in Chapters 4 and 5, we hypothesized that Dutch mothers expect earlier achievement of developmental skills than Turkish immigrant mothers, regardless of the domain of the skills (Hypothesis 1).

**Child-rearing practices.** We expected Dutch mothers to report and display more use of positive parenting (i.e., responsiveness, warmth) and less use of negative parenting (i.e., demandingness), compared to Turkish-Dutch mothers (Hypothesis 2).

**Relation between developmental expectations and child-rearing practices.** A significant, yet small overall association between mothers’ developmental expectations and
parenting practices in the same (corresponding) domain is expected (Hypothesis 3). For example, we expected autonomy-granting reports of mothers to positively correlate with their observed autonomy-encouraging behaviors.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants of the study comprised 33 mainstream Dutch and 35 Turkish immigrant mothers living in the Netherlands. All participating mothers had at least one child aged 3 to 5 who was the target child in this study. A mother was classified as Turkish immigrant only if both her parents were born in Turkey and either her parents or she had migrated to the Netherlands; and mothers were classified as Dutch if they were born in the Netherlands, as were their parents and grandparents.

Of the Turkish immigrant sample, mean age of the mother was 33 years ($SD = 3.86$) and mean age of the target child was 57 months ($SD = 13.39$). Ninety one percent of the mothers were born in the Turkey and 9% were born in the Netherlands. The mean age of migration to the Netherlands was 11.96 years ($SD = 8.76$). Of these Turkish-Dutch mothers, 17% were primary school, 14% were middle school, 40% were high school, and 29% were university graduates. The mean years of education Turkish-Dutch mothers had was 12 years ($SD = 3.86$). Sixty two percent were at-home mothers, 32% were working at a part-time job, and 6% had a full-time job. All Turkish-Dutch mothers were married and 9% of them had only one child who was the target child in this study. Forty six percent of the target children were girls.

Among the mainstream Dutch mothers, the mean age was 37 years ($SD = 4.48$) and the mean age of the target child was 51 months ($SD = 12.67$). Thirty one percent of the Dutch
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mothers were middle school, 49% were high school, and 21% were university graduates. Mean years of education Dutch mothers had was 16 years (SD = 2.86). Twenty one percent were at-home mothers, 70% were working at a part-time job, and 9% had a full-time job. Regarding the marital status of Dutch mothers, 53% were married, 41% had partnership, and 6% were divorced. Eighteen percent of the Dutch mothers had only one child who was the target child in this study. Fifty one percent of the target children were girls.

An analysis of variance revealed that Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers were significantly different from each other in terms of age and years of education. Turkish-Dutch mothers were significantly younger than Dutch mothers, $F(1, 68) = 17.523, p < .001, \eta^2 = .21$. Moreover, Dutch mothers showed a higher level of education than Turkish-Dutch mothers, $F(1, 68) = 23.50, p < .001, \eta^2 = .27$.

Materials

Developmental Expectations Scale. The Developmental Expectations Scale, which was developed by Durgel and Van de Vijver (2008) based on scales used in previous studies (e.g., Goodnow et al., 1984; Hess et al., 1980; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997), was used to measure maternal developmental expectations. Mothers were asked to indicate the age they expect a child to achieve certain skills for the first time (a score of 0.5 was given to ages below 1 year and a score of 7 to ages above 6). The scale consisted of eight subscales: Psychomotor Skills (e.g., “Stand without support more than 1 minute”), Cognitive Skills (e.g., “Tell what is left and right”), Self-control (e.g., “Keep playing according to game rules even if she loses”), Social Skills (e.g., “Share toys with other children”), Autonomy (e.g., “Decide what to wear”), Obedience (e.g., “Give up reading/TV when mother asks for help”), Family Orientation (e.g., “Help with simple chores”), and Manners (e.g., “Say ‘thanks’ at the appropriate time”). For each subscale, average scores of mothers’ reported age expectations
for the particular skill were calculated. Low scores indicated earlier expectations for a particular domain, while high scores indicated later expectations. Reliability analysis showed that the alpha coefficients for the total sample were .86 for Physical Skills, .84 for Cognitive Skills, .84 for Self-control, .88 for Social Skills, .84 for Autonomy, .86 for Obedience, .81 for Family Orientation, and .88 for Well-mannered. Values for the Turkish-Dutch and Dutch samples separately were found to be similar to those reported for the total sample.

**Parenting Practices Questionnaire (Self-Reported).** Mothers completed a Parenting Practices Questionnaire developed by the authors based on the previous parenting practices scales (Barber, 1996; Darling & Toyokawa, 1997; Deater-Deckard, 2000; Landry et al., 2001; Power, 2002). The questionnaire consisted of 32 items where parents indicate the frequency of each behavior on a 5-point scale, where 1 describes *Never* and 5 describes *Always*. The measurement has four subscales which are: Warmth (e.g., “When I think about my child, I feel happy”), Responsiveness (e.g., “I calm down my child when s/he is upset”), Autonomy-granting (e.g., “I let my child make decisions independent of me”), and Demandingness (e.g., “I tell my child how to behave”).

Internal consistency scores for subscales were .73 for Warmth, .66 for Responsiveness, .68 for Autonomy, and .65 for Demandingness. Reliability values of subscales for the two samples were also examined separately and found to be fairly similar to those reported for the total sample (ranging between .65 and .78, except for .55 for Demandingness in the Dutch sample).

**Observed Parenting Behaviors.** Mothers’ parenting behaviors were measured by observation of the interaction between the mother and the child during 10-minute free-play and 10-minute joint book reading sessions. Observed maternal behaviors were coded using the Parent-Child Affect, Responsiveness, Connectedness, and Autonomy Scale developed by
Durgel and Van de Vijver (2010) on the basis of coding schemes by Liu et al. (2005), Tamis-LeMonda et al. (2004), and Rubin and Cheah (2000). An event-sampling approach was used in this study. Maternal behaviors were coded into six subscales of the Parent-Child Affect, Responsiveness, Connectedness, and Autonomy Scale. These subscales assessed the following parenting behaviors: Positive Affect which reflects the mother’s displays of warm and positive affect, attitudes, and emotions towards the child (e.g., “using pet names when calling the child”), Responsiveness which refers to the mother’s responding to the child’s verbal and nonverbal requests (e.g., “suggesting an activity/drawing attention to a toy when child is unoccupied/bored”), Negative Control which reflects the degree to which the mother is intrusive during interaction and the amount of control the mother exerts over child (e.g., “pulling the book/toy away when the child reaches for it”), Autonomy which refers to the degree to which the mother is willing to let the child direct an activity, initiate an activity and explore (e.g., “letting the child decide about game rules/turns/role assignments”), Connectedness which refers to the mother’s behaviors dealing with child’s cooperation, emotional closeness, physical/behavioral proximity (e.g., “kissing the child or getting a kiss from the child”), and Number of Sentences Uttered. For Responsiveness, the criteria for the mother to get a score was that the child needed to initiate a request and the mother needed to respond to it within 5 seconds after the child’s initiation; these criteria were based on previous coding schemes (Rubin & Cheah, 2000).

The main difference of the coding scheme used in this study compared to the existing coding manuals is that many of the existing coding schemes (e.g., Erikson et al., 1985; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2004) use rating systems. In these schemes, coders rate the maternal behaviors on a Likert scale in terms of the degree of the category being assessed. This procedure may not clearly outline what and how should be coded. In the coding manual we developed for this study, we created an almost exhaustive list of behaviors for each category
based on existing manuals and pilot studies. We tried to list all the possible types of verbal
and non-verbal behaviors for each subscale that can occur during mother-child interactions,
thereby minimizing the need for more subjective interpretations by the coders. The coding of
the observational data was carried out by the main researcher and Turkish, Dutch, and
Turkish-Dutch graduate student assistants. We scored the number of times these behaviors in
the list happened during the recorded session. The sessions of free-play and joint book
reading were coded in blocks of 20 seconds by scoring a behavior each and every time it
happened. The principal researcher trained coders until acceptable interrater agreement was
maintained. Interrater reliabilities were calculated based on six randomly selected
observations for each sample (20% of the cases). Codings of the principal researcher and the
student coders were checked for the percentage agreement for play and book sessions
separately. The interrater agreement ranged from 74% to 87% for Positive Affect, from 81%
to 90% for Negative Control, from 72% to 89% for Responsiveness, from 79% to 91% for
Autonomy, and from 83% to 95% for Connectedness. Subscale scores were computed by
dividing the sum of the frequencies of listed behaviors under each category by the length of
the recorded interaction since some of the observations took less than 10 minutes. Coding of
the recording of one session of a child took approximately 7 hours.

**Procedure**

All participants were recruited from preschools and Turkish associations in and around
Tilburg, the Netherlands as well as through snowball sampling. Mothers were given
information on the study and asked whether they were willing to participate. Those who
agreed to take part were visited at their home and the data collection lasted about one and a
half hours. Dutch mothers were interviewed by a Dutch researcher and Turkish immigrant
mothers were interviewed by a Turkish interviewer in either Dutch or Turkish, according to
the participants’ preference.
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The first ten to fifteen minutes of the visit were spared for a warm-up between the researcher and the mother and the child. The researcher conversed with the mother casually about their life in general and initiated chatting with the target child. After the warm-up, the researcher explained the procedure of the study to the mother and once again got permission for the videotaped data collection. After collecting background information, 10-min free play between the mother and her child was recorded after giving the instruction to ‘play with the provided toys as you usually play together at home’. The toy set included a piano, a telephone, a baby doll, Lego blocks, a doctor kit, an ambulance, a police car, and a fire truck. After 10 minutes of free play, the mother and the child were asked to put the toys back into the bag so that they could start with the joint book reading session. The session used the book ‘Frog, where are you?’ (Mayer, 1969) brought by the researcher. This book had only pictures in it (except for the cover) to eliminate the cultural differences that might arise from language issues. The instruction was to ‘read the Froggie book as you usually read a book together at home’. The home visits ended by mothers filling in the Developmental Expectations and Parenting Practices Questionnaires after the video recording.

Results

Group Comparisons on Developmental Expectations

One of the aims of this study was to examine differences and similarities between developmental expectations of Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers. We employed a one-way MANCOVA with group as independent variable, developmental expectations as dependent variables, and maternal age and education as covariates (see Table 1). Neither multivariate nor univariate tests were significant, Wilks’ lambda = .79, $F(1, 66) = 1.87, p = .084, \eta^2 = .21$. This finding is not in line with our hypothesis which referred to earlier expectations by Dutch mothers compared to the Turkish-Dutch. We can conclude that hypothesis 1 was rejected.
Group Comparisons on Parenting Practices

Another goal of the present study was to examine group differences in parenting practices of the participating mothers. First of all, we examined self-reported parenting practices by a one-way MANCOVA with group as independent variable, self-reported parenting practices subscales as dependent variables, and maternal education and age as covariates. MANCOVA results (see Table 1) showed that overall group differences were nonsignificant, Wilks’ lambda = .88, $F(1, 68) = 2.07, p = .096$, $\eta^2 = .12$. Individual analyses of the subscales indicated that the only significant difference in Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers’ self-reported parenting practices was in Demandingness. Turkish immigrant
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mothers reported significantly more frequent use of demanding child-rearing behaviors than Dutch mothers, $F(1, 68) = 6.073, p < .05, \eta^2 = .09$.

Table 2

*Observed Parenting Practices During Free Play and Book Reading: Means, Standard Deviations, MANOVA and MANCOVA Results (Maternal Education and Age as Covariates)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish-Dutch</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$\eta^2$ before covariates</td>
<td>$\eta^2$ after covariates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative control</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.133**</td>
<td>.117**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.067*</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.070*</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sentences</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.152**</td>
<td>.074*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative control</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.287***</td>
<td>.216***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.091*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sentences</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>.166**</td>
<td>.077*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Secondly, similarities and differences in observed parenting practices during free-play setting were analyzed. A one-way MANCOVA was conducted with group as independent variable, observed parenting practices subscales as dependent variables, and with maternal education and age as covariates (see Table 2). MANCOVA results showed that two groups significantly differed in the ways they interacted with their children during free-play, Wilks’ lambda = .80, $F(1, 68) = 2.89, p < .05, \eta^2 = .18$. Univariate analyses indicated that, after accounting for maternal age and education, Turkish-Dutch mothers displayed more
Responsiveness than Dutch mothers while playing with their children, $F(1, 68) = 8.38, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$.

Additionally, group differences in observed parenting practices during joint book reading session were analyzed. A one-way MANCOVA was conducted with group as independent variable, observed parenting practices subscales as dependent variables, and with maternal education and age as covariates. MANCOVA results (see Table 2) showed that two groups significantly differed in their parenting practices while reading a book with their children, Wilks’ lambda $= .77$, $F(1, 68) = 3.43, p < .01, \eta^2 = .24$. Univariate analyses indicated that Turkish-Dutch mothers displayed Responsiveness significantly more frequently than the Dutch mothers, $F(1, 68) = 16.54, p < .001, \eta^2 = .22$.

Lastly, we checked the overall level of interaction during free play and book reading sessions by analyzing the number of sentences uttered by the mothers. It was found that Turkish immigrant mothers used significantly more sentences as they interacted with their children than did the Dutch mothers, both in the free play ($F(1, 68) = 5.07, p < .05, \eta^2 = .07$) and in book reading sessions ($F(1, 68) = 4.98, p < .05, \eta^2 = .08$).

Overall, results showed a complex pattern of parenting practices. Turkish-Dutch mothers reported to use more demanding behaviors; however, when observed behaviors were analyzed, scores on demandingness (negative control) did not differ significantly. Instead, Turkish-Dutch mothers were found to engage more in responsiveness compared to Dutch mothers across the two different settings (play and book reading). Thus, our Hypothesis 2 was confirmed where self-reported parenting practices were concerned. Turkish mothers reported that they use negative parenting practices like demandingness more than the Dutch. However, when observed parenting practices were concerned, Hypothesis 2 was rejected and the opposite pattern was indeed found.
Relations between Developmental Expectations and Parenting Practices

We examined the correlations between developmental expectations, self-reported and observed parenting practices. The combination of the relatively large number of subscales for both developmental expectations and child-rearing practices and the relatively small sample sizes per group created a problem in the analyses and could lead to inflated Type 1 error probabilities. Therefore, we first used an exploratory factor analysis of the subscale scores to reduce the dimensionality. A factor analysis of the eight subscales of the Developmental Expectations was conducted to analyze these correlations. All subscales formed one major factor that explained 61% of the variance. A factor analysis of the self-reported parenting subscales showed that the Warmth, Responsiveness, and Autonomy scales formed a factor that explained 45% of the variance, and Demandingness constituted a separate factor that explained 22% of the variance. The correlation between the two factors was nonsignificant ($r(68) = .23$). Therefore, we created a Positive Parenting variable with mean score of Warmth, Responsiveness, and Autonomy-granting and another variable named Negative Parenting by taking mothers’ score of Demandingness.

Regarding the observed parenting practices, factor analyses showed that Parental Affect, Responsiveness, Autonomy, and Connectedness formed one factor that explained 49% of the total variance for free play and 41% for book reading sessions, and Negative Control formed a single category that explained 21% of the variance for free play and 27% for book reading sessions. The correlation between the two factors for the play session was weak and
nonsignificant, \( r(68) = .12, \text{ ns} \); for the book reading session the correlation was significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Correlations between Mothers’ Developmental Expectations, Self-Reported Parenting Practices, and Observed Parenting Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Expectations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Observed Parenting Practices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-reported parenting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychomotor</td>
<td>-.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-manner</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Reported Parenting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Warmth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Parenting</strong></td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Parenting</strong></td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demanding</strong></td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note</strong></td>
<td>Numbers in italics represent the correlation values for observed parenting practices during book session, and numbers non-italic represent the observed practices during play session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and negative, $r(68) = -.27, p < .05$. Thus, we created a Positive Parenting variable with mean score of Parental Affect, Responsiveness, and Autonomy, and Connectedness, and another variable named Negative Parenting by taking mothers’ score of Negative Control.

Correlational analyses based on these factors pointed out that there were no significant relations between mothers’ observed parenting practices and their reports of developmental expectations and parenting practices. When correlations between the individual subcategories were examined (rather than the aggregated factors), the result did not change much (see Table 3). The only significant correlation was between mothers’ expectations regarding self-control and their display of negative control during free play session, $r(68) = .32, p < .01$. Mothers who had late ages of expectations of the achievement of self-control skills displayed more negative control and intrusiveness while playing with their children. Overall, we can conclude that Hypothesis 3 was not confirmed because there were hardly any significant correlations between the parenting beliefs, self-reported and observed parenting practices.

**Discussion**

Turkish immigrant families form one of the largest immigrant populations in the Netherlands and their adaptation to and performance in the Dutch society have been attracting major academic and public interest; however, there are not many observational studies investigating family dynamics and parenting patterns in this community. We examined developmental expectations and self-reported and observed parenting practices of Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers in the Netherlands. One of our major aims was to examine group differences in mothers’ expectations, self-reported parenting behaviors, and observed parenting behaviors. The second and more important goal was to understand the relations between parents’ reports and behaviors.
First of all, differences and similarities in Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers’ self-reported parenting beliefs were examined. We expected Dutch mothers to have earlier expectations than Turkish-Dutch mothers based on earlier studies (Goodnow, 1984; Hess, 1980; Willemsen & Van de Vijver, 1997). Nevertheless, we did not find any significant difference in expectations across groups. As expected, Dutch mothers had earlier expectations of ages that a child can achieve developmental tasks than Turkish-Dutch; however, this difference did not reach significance. In our earlier studies (Chapters 4 and 5) examining differences in Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers’ developmental expectations, we found a significant and consistent group difference which did not show up in this study. In order to explore possible reasons for this outcome, samples of the previous studies and the current study were compared. Firstly, the educational background of the two Turkish immigrant data was examined and no difference in number of years of education mothers’ received was found. Secondly, the migration history of the Turkish immigrant mothers who participated in the two studies was investigated and it was found that the two groups of immigrant mothers differed significantly in the mean age they moved to the Netherlands. The Turkish-Dutch sample of the current study was found to move to the Netherlands at a significantly younger age than the Turkish-Dutch sample of the previous studies described in Chapters 4 and 5. When explored in detail, more than half of the mothers participated in the current study moved to the Netherlands at an age which they could enroll in the primary Dutch educational system whereas in the previous studies the rate of Turkish immigrant mothers enrolled in the Dutch primary school was significantly lower. Literature shows that second-generation immigrants display parenting patterns that are similar to those of the mainstream parents (Leyendecker, Schoelmerich, & Citlak; 2006; Durgel, Van de Vijver, Yagmurlu, & Leyendecker, submitted); and in these studies second-generation immigrants are defined as those who were either born in or moved to the host culture at an age that they
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could enroll in the local primary education system. Parents who get the mainstream education from very early ages on seem to adjust their parenting beliefs and practices towards those of the host culture. In summary, the reason why we did not find a significant difference in Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers’ expectations in this study although we did in earlier studies might be related to the sample characteristics.

Regarding another self-reported parenting aspect examined in this study, child-rearing practices, we expected Dutch mothers to report more positive and fewer negative parenting practices than the Turkish-Dutch mothers. Although we did not find the expected difference in positive parenting patterns of the mothers, we found that, in line with our expectations, Turkish mothers reported higher levels of demandingness. Turkish-Dutch mothers expressed that they want their children to follow family rules and obey the parents more than the Dutch mothers did. This finding is in line with previous studies on Turkish parents’ child-rearing patterns which showed that Turkish parents endorse obedience and compliance of their children (Gerrits et al., 1996; Kagitzibasi, 2007; Nijsten, 2006). It is generally accepted that parents from non-Western, traditional, collectivistic cultures display authoritarian parenting with high levels of obedience and demandingness more than parents from Western, individualistic backgrounds (Chao, 1994; Rudy & Grusec, 2006). Turkish-Dutch mothers’ self-reported parenting practices were found to reflect this general cultural attitude. However, when mothers’ observed parenting behaviors were examined, the difference in negative parenting practices between the Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers did not show up. One can argue that the different results from group comparisons of self-reported and observed practices may be associated with how much culture relates to both aspects. There is an extensive literature in psychology which shows that culture reflects itself in people’s attitudes and beliefs more than in their behaviors and that cross-cultural differences in attitudes and beliefs are often larger than in behaviors (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2008; Van de Vijver,
2007). We know that when people are asked to express their beliefs they tend to bring in their cultural background in an expected way. However, when behaviors are concerned, the cultural differences tend to decrease or even disappear. Similarly, in this study we found that when asked to report how mothers think they engage with their children Turkish-Dutch mothers, in line with cultural expectations, they expressed that they engage in more demanding child-rearing behaviors. Nevertheless, when actual behaviors were examined, this was no longer the case.

Additionally, the reason we did not find a difference in observed negative parenting practices between the two samples might be related to the nature of the interactions triggered by the experimental conditions. We observed mothers’ child-rearing practices in two different conditions; first in a free-play setting in which the mother and her child were playing with the toys we provided, and secondly in a book reading session in which mother and child were asked to explore a picture-based book jointly. None of these sessions were task or performance related which would require disciplining and specific guidelines from the mothers toward their children. Mothers might use control as a discipline technique when they particularly need to guide and lead their children. However in this study neither free play nor book reading sessions were performance related, and mothers were not explicitly asked to guide or lead their children. Thus, we can speculate that the ways mothers’ parenting practices were observed in this study did not give much opportunity to capture negative parenting and parental control.

Turkish-Dutch mothers were found to display more responsiveness compared to the Dutch mothers, both in free-play and in book-reading settings. This finding diverges from our expectations based on the previous literature stating the similar (Leseman & Van den Boom, 1999; Yaman et al., 2010). One of the reasons as to why in this study we found Turkish mothers display more responsiveness might be related to the way responsiveness is defined in
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this study. Our definition of responsiveness referred to mother’s responding to the child’s verbal and non-verbal requests and it consisted of items such as “helping child when s/he needs help”, “reacting to child’s excitement/boredom/interest”, and “responding to child’s expressions of love and affection”. However, in one of the very few observational studies comparing Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers’ parenting practices, Dutch mothers were found to display more sensitive parenting than the Turkish-Dutch immigrants (Yaman et al., 2010). In this particular study, maternal sensitivity was defined as mother’s expressions of emotional support and positive regard by encouraging child’s accomplishments on the tasks (during a problem-solving task session). It is generally accepted that praising and encouraging the child’s task-related accomplishments are more Western, individualism-oriented parenting practices (Kagitcibasi, 2007; Liu et al., 2005). It can be tentatively concluded that the cross-cultural differences between Dutch and Turkish-Dutch mothers in responsiveness may be restricted to task-related situations.

This finding may also be related to the way responsiveness was coded in this study. We gave a mother a score for responsiveness, if she responded to child’s requests within 5 s after the child’s initiation. Any response later than the first 5 s was not counted. For instance, if the child was struggling with opening the Lego box or undressing the baby doll and the mother helped within 5 s, then a score was given. When looked at this way of coding, one can think of many reasons leading to the observed group difference. Firstly, it might be that Dutch children initiated fewer requests than the Turkish children which led to more opportunities for the Turkish mothers to response (note that responsiveness was considered only if the child initiated a request from the mother). This could well be related to the notion of Western children being more autonomous and assertive than non-Western children (Kagitcibasi, 2007). Thus, Dutch children might solve their needs more without involving
their mothers as compared to the Turkish-Dutch children. However, in order to make sure this was the reason, we would need to recode the child’s behaviors.

Secondly, we gave mothers a responsiveness score only if they displayed a reaction towards their children’s needs within 5 s. It could be that Turkish mothers reacted immediately whereas Dutch mothers gave more time for their children to find out the solution themselves before they interfere with the issue. This argument is again in line with Western parenting patterns which support children’s self-sufficiency and autonomy (Kagitcibasi, 2007). The use of a more liberal time limit might change the findings.

Thirdly and lastly, we found that Turkish-Dutch mothers uttered more sentences while interacting with their children compared to the Dutch mothers which means Turkish mothers were more verbally interactive than their Dutch counterparts. One can argue that since Turkish mothers talked more and engaged more verbally with their children, they were also more likely to respond to their children’s requests. These explanations amount to a picture that is in line with a view of the Turkish culture as interdependent. Helping the child and using verbalizations to support these actions is probably an effective tool in developing and maintaining a close relationship between caregiver and child. Focusing on praise as has been done in previous studies may restrict responsiveness to a specific domain that is not appropriate to do justice to the way Turkish-Dutch mothers interact with their children.

Other than examining differences in Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers’ parenting beliefs and practices, we also aimed to study the relations between parenting beliefs and behaviors. The social-psychological literature suggests zero or very weak correlations between beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors in general (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; LaPiere, 1934; Wicker, 1969). Relations between beliefs and behaviors have become a controversial and very popular topic in psychology from very early on with one of the earliest studies by
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LaPiere which showed that self-reports are largely irrelevant to behaviors. Few studies examining this relation specifically in the area of developmental psychology came out with similar results pointing to low correlations (Kochanska, Kuczynski, & Radke-Yarrow, 1989; Miller, 1988; Sigel, 1986). It is fairly well established in the field that self-reported beliefs and behaviors do not have a strong predictive value on the actual behaviors of parents. In line with this, results of the present study did not show strong and significant correlations between developmental expectations, self-reported and observed parenting practices. The only significant correlation pointed to a relationship between mothers’ expectations about self-control skills and the negative control they displayed while they engaged freely with their children. Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers who expected children to be able to control and regulate themselves earlier, played with their own children in a way that involves less external control imposed by the mother. In other words, mothers who reported that self-control skills develop early were also the mothers who let their own children structure and control the interaction as they played together.

There might be a final reason for the absence of relations between parenting beliefs and actual behavior. The latter are often concrete behaviors, in which the display of beliefs may be blurred by situational demands and contingencies. The association between beliefs and actual behavior might be larger if behaviors would be observed in a wide variety of situations so that the impact of situational demands would be attenuated and parenting beliefs might be easier to observe in the behaviors.

This study is not free from limitations. Most importantly, the manual used to code mothers’ observed parenting behaviors as they were interacting with their children was developed by the authors specifically for this study and was used for the first time in this study. As a consequence, we cannot compare our results to the findings of previous studies with various cultural groups. Secondly, the sample size of this study was not adequate to
employ sophisticated analyses to examine the direct and meditational relations between parenting beliefs and practices. Lastly, differences found in responsive parenting behaviors might be related to child’s behaviors as well, as discussed earlier in the discussion. For the next studies, it is important to code and analyze children’s behaviors as they interact with their mothers as well.

To conclude, although Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands receive much academic and public interest, there are not many studies focusing on their family dynamics and parenting patterns. The present paper has significance in this regard, since it is one of the very few in-depth studies examining Turkish-Dutch parents’ child-rearing beliefs and practices. Moreover, observational studies in this cultural context are scarce even though they provide us with a better understanding of what is going on in the day-to-day interactions between parents and their children. More observational studies on Turkish immigrant parents’ child rearing and linking it to the developmental outcomes of their children would be very helpful to further develop prevention and intervention studies focusing on Turkish immigrant children who are reported to be behind their Dutch counterparts.
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CHAPTER 7

General Discussion

The main question this research project addressed was how the cultural and socioeconomic background of mothers is related to their way of child rearing: What do they expect from their children and how do they interact with them? This project focused on the role of culture and maternal education on Turkish immigrant, Dutch, and German mothers’ socialization goals, developmental expectations, and child-rearing practices. Another research question of this project was how immigrant mothers’ parenting patterns vary depending on their relation with the host culture.

This dissertation set out to contribute to the cross-cultural developmental research by focusing on parenting patterns of Turkish immigrant families mainly in Western Europe. Turkish immigrants form the largest non-Western population in Germany and the Netherlands and their performance in the host European societies have been subject to major academic and public interest. Nevertheless, there is not much research on their family dynamics, parenting beliefs, and child-rearing practices. This project helped us develop a better understanding of parenting beliefs and practices of Turkish immigrant mothers and their German and Dutch counterparts. In this chapter main findings of this dissertation and their implications are discussed.

Conceptual Model and General Findings

This dissertation’s major goal was to examine how cultural and socioeconomic background of Turkish immigrant and Western European mainstream mothers is related to their parenting beliefs and practices. A conceptual mediation model (introduced in Chapter 1) relating parents’ socioeconomic and cultural background to their parenting practices via
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parenting beliefs formed the theoretical core of this project. Some chapters focused only on some parts of the conceptual model and looked for a relation between mothers’ cultural background and their parenting beliefs; specifically socialization goals or developmental expectations. Some chapters investigated the full model by including parenting practices as well.

What were the main findings? First of all, this project clearly confirmed that there is a direct relation between Turkish immigrant, Turkish mainstream, Dutch, and German mothers’ cultural and educational background with their child-rearing beliefs as well as practices. This dissertation showed that the culture and educational background of mothers individually and directly contribute to their parenting beliefs and practices. The direct associations between distal factors described in the conceptual model and parenting beliefs and practices show us that parents’ cultural and educational background is deeply embedded in every parenting aspect, ranging from beliefs to self-reported and observed parenting practices.

Secondly, the clear relation between Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers’ developmental expectations and their parenting practices showed us that at what age parents think certain developmental milestones should be reached is associated with how they interact with their children. I claim that there is an underlying understanding which could explain this relationship. Based on the findings regarding developmental expectations, I argued that Dutch mothers see children as individuals from very early ages on and they believe in their potential; however, Turkish immigrant mothers do not recognize this potential and believe that children grow at later ages. This understanding certainly represents itself in mothers’ child-rearing practices; those who perceive children as an individual engage in more positive parenting practices with their own children, whereas mothers who perceive children as dependent on adults use more negative parenting practices to structure and discipline their
children since they themselves cannot, according to mothers’ believes. Another important point was that this relationship showed a similar pattern in Turkish-Dutch, and Turkish and Dutch mainstream groups, which suggests that the pattern of relationships can be generalized to different cultural groups although cross-cultural differences exist in how often certain parenting beliefs and practices are manifested.

It is interesting that this relation between parenting beliefs and practices was confirmed only for self-reported measures. Observed parenting practices, though related to mothers’ cultural and educational background, were not directly related to self-reported parenting variables. These two different findings draw a picture which suggests that what parents’ think and believe they do is not necessarily related to how they actually interact with their children. This is of course very important both in terms of research and applications. Many developmental studies have been conducted using self-report measures, and although they provide us with significant information they may not fully reflect the actual parenting patterns.

**Applicability of the Family Change Model in an Immigration Context**

Many cross-cultural developmental studies rely on the well-known Individualism-Collectivism framework (Triandis, 1994) to explain and understand differences observed between cultural groups. My findings confirmed this two-fold categorization by showing that parents from collectivistic, traditional, and mainly non-Western societies value close family ties, respect to elderly, and obedience to authority, whereas parents from individualistic, urbanized, and mainly Western societies endorse autonomy, assertiveness, and self-efficacy. However, this dichotomy of cultures is not enough to understand parenting in groups that undergo major socioeconomic and cultural transformation like immigrant populations. Immigration is generally from non-Western to Western societies and immigrants experience a
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great deal of changes in the host country. Kagitcibasi’s (2007a) Family Change model provides us with a framework to examine the immigrant groups since it mainly addresses how sociocultural and economic changes in a society might affect family functioning and parents’ child rearing. The Family Change model was initially intended to describe the transformation of families and parenting patterns as the society families live in becomes more urbanized and modern. Later on, it was thought that the model might be applicable in acculturation contexts as well (Kagitcibasi, 2007b). With this dissertation, I aimed to apply Kagitcibasi’s model to the Turkish immigrant context in Western Europe and formulize my understanding of parenting in this acculturating group.

The Family Change model describes three family patterns: Independence, interdependence, and psychological interdependence. The independence family pattern is assumed to be prevalent in Western, urbanized societies where endorsed values are centered on autonomy and personal wellbeing. The family pattern of interdependence, on the other hand, is assumed to be common in traditional, non-Western societies where family members depend on each other both financially and emotionally. Highly endorsed values in this context are hierarchical and tight family relations and obedience to authority and elderly. The third family pattern, psychological interdependence, might be applicable to immigrant families who are from non-Western, traditional origins but live in Western, urbanized, affluent societies. In this context, families and parents accommodate with valued characteristics of the modern, urban society such as assertiveness and yet retain the close family ties. Obedience and compliance, no longer needed and wanted in the new setting, become less important in families (Kagitcibasi, 2007a; Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005).

What did my project reveal about the feasibility of the Family Change model? First of all, findings of this dissertation showed that the model’s assumptions are applicable and valid in, at least, Turkish-Dutch and Turkish-German contexts. Particularly findings of Chapters 2
and 3 where socialization goals of parents are studied can be interpreted in the light of the Family Change model. These studies showed that Turkish immigrant mothers value their children to have close family ties and respect their authority more than to be autonomous in their decisions. In contrast, German and Dutch mainstream mothers found their children to be autonomous, happy, and able to control own behaviors more important than being compliant. This pattern clearly matches with Kagitzcibasi’s interdependence and independence family patterns, respectively for Turkish immigrant and mainstream mothers. Moreover, when the role of acculturation orientation and generational status on Turkish immigrant mothers’ goals was examined, it was seen that Turkish mothers’ endorsement of autonomy-oriented characteristics like self-control increases as they are more integrated with or as they spend more time in the Western host culture. At the same time, I found that even the mothers who spent a long time in the host country and adopted its values endorsed family closeness as an important aspect of child rearing. This is particularly in line with Kagitzcibasi’s (2007) view on families with traditional background undergo social and economic transformation. We can conclude that as Turkish immigrant mothers in Germany and the Netherlands acculturate towards the host culture, they seem to realize some of the functional values in these urbanized contexts and accommodate their socialization goals accordingly, however they still maintain the close family relations, which is the main argument of the Family Change model. In other words, socialization goal patterns of Turkish-Dutch and Turkish-German mothers who are integrated to the host culture, who have spent long time and got education in these cultures, tend to represent the family model of Psychological Interdependence.

However, it is important to point out to a finding which challenges the model. Findings of Chapter 2 showed that Turkish-German mothers, regardless of their acculturation orientation, valued close ties between family members as an important value to endorse in their child rearing. Chapter 3 showed a slightly different pattern in Turkish-German and
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Turkish-Dutch mothers’ goals; as these mothers adjusted towards the host culture, even though they still found family orientation and closeness as highly endorsed goals, they also reported a decrease in its importance. The latter finding points to a direction that is not in line with the Family Change model which argues that relatedness goals would not be influenced by the modernization and urbanization trend that traditional families are going through. A similar finding was found by Georgas et al. (2006) who pointed out that GDP level of countries, which is an indication of affluence and level of modernity, showed a negative relation with relatedness. It is interesting to raise the question of whether in future generations the Turkish immigrant population in Western Europe would still represent the Psychological Interdependence family model. Kagitcibasi proposes the family model of Psychological Interdependence as a healthy model which satisfies both relatedness and individualization needs of people and based on this project we can conclude that Turkish-Dutch and Turkish-German mothers represent this pattern. However, the trend of a decrease in family orientation might lead to an independence family model, like in Western host families, as Turkish immigrant families pass generations in Dutch or German host cultures. On the other hand, it is very common among the Turkish immigrants to marry either within their community or bring partners from Turkey where they originally migrated from (CBS, 2010). This tendency towards endogamy might facilitate Turkish-Dutch and Turkish-German families to keep their family ties and relatedness values.

Importance of Maternal Education

All chapters in this dissertation pointed to the importance of maternal education in parenting beliefs and practices. Chapters 2 and 3 clearly showed that both Turkish immigrant and mainstream German and Dutch mothers who had higher levels of education differed in their socialization goals from those who had lower levels of education. High-educated mothers realized the significance of their children to be autonomous and self-controlling
which are functional and needed characteristics in the Western urbanized contexts, and endorsed such goals more than low-educated mothers. Similarly, Chapters 4 and 5 addressed the prominent role of educational background in mothers’ developmental expectations. Particularly Chapter 5 revealed that maternal education is the best predictor of mothers’ developmental expectations and child-rearing practices compared to several other variables such as type of residence, cultural background, and being an immigrant parent or a mainstream parent.

Maternal education was shown to be the best socioeconomic status variable in predicting parenting and child development in the literature over the last couple of years (Bornstein, Hahn, Suwalsky, & Haynes, 2003). However, these studies mainly compared socioeconomic status indicators such as occupation and income, and found out that more than parents’ job type or how much money they make, how many years of education they have received adds to their parenting. In addition, my dissertation showed that, not only compared to other socioeconomic status indicators, but also to other socioeconomic and cultural background variables, maternal education makes a stronger contribution to parents’ parenting beliefs and practices. This finding is indeed important particularly in the developmental research field. Many studies with immigrant families focus on cross-cultural differences without considering for educational differences between immigrant and mainstream parents. This dissertation confirms that including and examining the role of educational background of parents in studies with immigrant populations might reveal a different picture of cultural differences in parenting.

**Developmental Expectations and Culture**

Developmental expectations refer to the age that parents believe particular developmental skills should be reached by a child (Goodnow, Cashmore, Cotton, & Knight,
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1984). Previous research has shown that parents’ developmental expectations are related to
how they raise their children (Pomerleau, Malcuit, & Sabatier, 1991; Williams, Soetjiningsih,
& Williams, 2000). Chapter 5 in this dissertation also showed that mothers who expect
children to achieve developmental skills earlier engage in more positive and less negative
parenting practices which provide a healthier development for the children.

Regarding the cross-cultural differences in expectations, Chapters 4, 5, and 6 pointed
out that mothers in Western, urbanized settings (in this case, Dutch mothers) expect children
to develop at earlier ages across all skill domains compared to the mothers from traditional,
non-Western backgrounds (in this case, Turkish immigrant mothers). This finding is
important not only because it clarifies and sheds lights on the cross-cultural differences in
mothers’ expectations, but also relates to the applied side of developmental research.

Hopkins and Westra (1990) have shown that the age parents expect their children to
attain certain milestones is positively related to the actual age their children achieve those
skills. Thus, it is likely that cross-cultural differences in parents’ expectation regarding the
achievement of developmental milestones may be reflected and indeed results in differences
in children’s actual development. Although this relation might not be very strong, parents’
knowledge and expectations about children’s developmental milestones can play a predictive
role in children’s outcomes, and hence, they can explain the differences in cognitive and
social outcomes between immigrant and mainstream children.

Bornstein and Cote (2004a, b) state that parents’ knowledge and expectations of
developmental milestones are critical, particularly because these can guide us in the applied
area or in intervention programs. It can be assumed that parents who think and expect that
certain developmental skills develop at a late age may not be quick to recognize the actual
delays in their children’s developmental trajectory. Thus, it would not be easy to identify the problem in their children’s development and seek for a professional help or an intervention.

**Recommendations for Future Direction**

This project is one of the very few extensive studies on parenting patterns of Turkish immigrant mothers in Western Europe where Turks form the biggest immigrant population. Empirical studies in this project helped us understand cross-cultural differences between the Turkish immigrant and the Dutch and German mainstream mothers. Based on the findings of these studies the following recommendations can be made for the future research in the related topic and population. First, developmental expectations were one of the central theoretical concepts this project focused on, and it was shown that they are related to how parents interact with their children. It would be an interesting research topic to examine how parents’ expectations and practices relate to the actual ages their children develop certain milestones. This dissertation did not study how parenting beliefs and practices of Turkish immigrant, Dutch, and German mothers relate to their children’s actual social and cognitive developmental outcomes. It is recommended that future research should integrate children’s assessments of developmental milestones in parenting studies so that the link can be established between parental expectancies, beliefs and behaviors on the one hand and children’s developmental outcomes on the other hand.

In order to develop a better understanding of parenting patterns of immigrant populations, a comparison with their counterparts from where they have migrated would be very informative. This way we could learn more about what needs to be attributed to the cultural background and what to the acculturation context of the immigrant parents. The current project would be carried one step ahead if parenting patterns of Turkish mothers who live in Turkey were examined. Future studies are recommended to compare Turkish
General Discussion

mainstream mothers with the immigrants to understand the in-between situation of Turkish immigrant mothers much better. On a related topic, to capture the changes in acculturating mothers’ parenting beliefs and practices, future studies should employ a longitudinal design studying the role of acculturation orientations of Turkish immigrant mothers in their parenting over the time. Adopting these recommendations may boost the interests and quality of parenting research in an acculturation context.
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Summary

The main question this research project addressed was how the cultural and socioeconomic background of mothers is related to their way of child rearing: What do they expect from their children and how do they interact with them? This project focused on the role of culture and maternal education on Turkish immigrant, Dutch, and German mothers’ socialization goals, developmental expectations, and child-rearing practices. Another research question of this project was how immigrant mothers’ parenting patterns vary depending on their relation with the host culture. To address these questions, the role of generational status and acculturation orientations of Turkish immigrant mothers on their parenting beliefs and practices were examined. Five separate studies, each reported in a separate chapter, were conducted to shed light on these research questions.

Chapter 2 aimed to examine the role of Turkish-German and German mothers’ educational and cultural background on their socialization goals, and focused on the cultural differences and similarities in the characteristics endorsed from children in these two contexts. This study showed that two groups of mothers differed in major ways in the characteristics they find important for their children to have. As expected from the Individualism – Collectivism framework, German mothers endorsed self-control and autonomy goals more whereas Turkish immigrant mothers endorsed goals focusing more on family closeness, respect to authority, and financial and professional success in the host culture. One of the important findings of this chapter was that educational background of the mothers strongly correlated with their socialization goals. This chapter also dealt with the relation between acculturation orientation of Turkish-German mothers and their socialization goals. It was confirmed that Turkish-German mothers, even the ones that are well integrated in the German
Summary
culture, value family relatedness, close ties with family and friends, and financial security
more than their German counterparts who value autonomy-oriented goals.

The next study, described in Chapter 3, added to the earlier chapter mainly by
gathering more information on socialization goals from a different population, namely
Turkish immigrant and Dutch mainstream mothers in the Netherlands. The field of immigrant
studies is dominated by one-shot studies that examine one minority group in one host country.
Although one-shot studies are very informative, generalization of their findings to other
immigrant groups could prove difficult. Therefore, Chapter 3 aimed to go one step further
and examined Turkish immigrant and mainstream mothers in two different host cultures,
namely Germany and Netherlands. While doing so, Kagitcibasi’s Family Change model was
taken as a framework to explain socialization goals in an acculturation context. Results of the
earlier chapter regarding the cultural differences between Turkish immigrant and mainstream
mothers were mainly confirmed. Examination of the role of acculturation and generation
status revealed that as Turkish immigrant mothers spend more time in and adjust towards the
host culture, they endorse obedience goals less and autonomy goals more. The Family
Change model assumes that relatedness goals (i.e., close psychological ties in the family)
would not get affected by acculturation; however, this study showed the opposite.

Chapters 2 and 3 showed that parents’ socialization goals are related to their
socioeconomic background and culture to a significant extent. More specifically, maternal
education was found to make a large contribution to both Turkish immigrant and German and
Dutch mainstream mothers’ goals. Moreover, these cultural groups differed in important
characteristics they expect their children to have; these differences were in line with the
assumptions of Individualism – Collectivism. Relating these findings to the conceptual model
of this dissertation which was introduced in Chapter 1, it can be said that the direct
relationship between parenting beliefs and distal variables like culture and education is
Summary

confirmed. Moreover, immigrant mothers’ acculturation orientations as well as their generation status seemed to be associated with their goals; the relationship goes in the direction predicted by the Family Change model according to which mothers who adjust to the new culture realize the importance of autonomy and will value obedience less whereas relatedness remains important.

After having confirmed the relationship between mothers’ socioeconomic and cultural background and their parenting goals, I wanted to focus on another aspect of parenting beliefs, namely developmental expectations. These refer to the age parents expect certain developmental skills to develop. The literature does not show consistent findings vis-à-vis cultural differences in developmental expectations. Some studies showed that Western mothers expect autonomy-oriented skills to develop earlier whereas non-Western mothers expect earlier development in obedience-oriented skills. However, more recent studies showed that mothers’ expectations are not domain specific, and that Western mothers have earlier ages of expectations than non-Western mothers regardless of the domain of the skill. Chapter 4 showed that the latter argument is more likely to explain differences in Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers’ developmental expectations. In this study, mothers were asked to expect at what age a child can develop certain skills in domains such as physical skills, cognitive skills, self-control, social skills, autonomy, obedience, and family orientation. Findings pointed out that Dutch mothers reported earlier age expectations of mastery in every domain compared to the Turkish-Dutch mothers. This chapter confirmed that Western mothers perceive children more as individuals with a potential to develop at earlier ages compared to the mothers from traditional, non-Western backgrounds who do not necessarily perceive children as individuals with their own potential.

After finding out the pattern of cross-cultural differences in developmental expectations between Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers, my research became more focused
Summary

on the second half of the conceptual model of this dissertation: How do these expectations relate to child-rearing behaviors and what kind of background variables explain the group differences in parenting? Various studies showed the relation between parenting and socioeconomic and cultural background of the parents; yet, not many focused on the relative importance of these background factors. This issue is of great importance particularly in studies with immigrant parents since culture examined in these studies is confounded with so many other socioeconomic variables, such as education, income, and the type of neighborhood where the mothers live. The main focus of Chapter 5 was to disentangle the role of several background variables (ethnicity, immigration, type of residence, and educational background) that are often confounded in cross-cultural developmental research. This chapter showed that all the examined background variables had their own unique contribution to the developmental and child-rearing practices of Turkish immigrant, Dutch and Turkish mainstream mothers’. However, maternal education was the strongest and most consistent predictor of mothers’ parenting. This finding is particularly important when developmental studies compare different cultural groups without considering the amount and quality of the education parents receive in different cultural contexts. This study also pointed out that mothers’ developmental expectations have a relation with their self-reported parenting practices in all groups. Mothers who perceived children as individuals with a potential to develop from very early ages on were found to use more positive (e.g., warmth, inductive reasoning) and less negative (e.g., punishment) parenting practices when raising their children.

Finally, the study reported in Chapter 6 elaborated on the previous study by including observed parenting practices as the final component of the conceptual model of this dissertation. Turkish-Dutch and Dutch mothers’ parenting practices were observed in several domains while they were interacting with their children in two different settings: Free play
Summary

and joint book reading. Specific parenting practices assessed were positive affect, responsiveness, negative control, autonomy, and connectedness. Relating to the conceptual model that was introduced in Chapter 1, the assumed association between mothers’ beliefs and attitudes about their parenting, and their actual parenting practices was not confirmed in this study.

Integrating Chapters 5 and 6 points out that the relationship between parenting beliefs and practices depends on how parenting variables are assessed. Chapter 5 clearly showed a significant pattern between mothers’ self-reported developmental expectations and self-reported parenting practices; however, none of these variables were found to be related to the observed parenting practices.

To conclude, this dissertation’s main question was: How are culture, socioeconomic factors, and parenting related in a Turkish immigrant context? Cross-cultural comparisons between Turkish immigrant and mainstream Dutch and German mothers confirmed the strong relationship between culture and parenting. This dissertation showed that in a Turkish immigrant context, the core cultural values like the importance of close family ties and general understanding of child development as reflected in developmental expectations remain close to parents’ traditional cultural background, even in the second generation.

Cross-cultural developmental studies focusing on the differences between mainstreamers and immigrants generally base their point of view on the assumption that immigrants underperform compared to their mainstream peers or do not display the necessities of Western host culture. Many studies point to the differences between immigrant children at school, immigrant adults at work place, or immigrant parents at home compared to their host counterparts in the advantage of the hosts. However, this project examined Turkish-Dutch and Turkish-German mothers from a more neutral perspective; not trying to point to
Summary

what is ‘bad’ with their parenting compared to the Dutch and German but rather aiming to identify differences as well as similarities without linking them to any performance measurement. This project showed that Turkish immigrant mothers in Western Europe largely represent the family model of psychological interdependence which is proposed by Kagitcibasi as a healthy family environment as it satisfies both independence and relatedness needs of individuals. Moreover, it also showed that when parenting practices are examined based on neutral and behavior-based observational methods without leaving much room to interpretations of behaviors, mainstream and immigrant mothers reflect relatively similar parenting patterns.