

INTERGENERATIONAL PARENTING IN TRKİYE:
CHANGES AND CONTINUITIES IN PARENTING PRACTICES

RMEYSA FATMA ETİN

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2025

INTERGENERATIONAL PARENTING IN TÜRKİYE:
CHANGES AND CONTINUITIES IN PARENTING PRACTICES

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

Master of Arts
in
Psychology

by
Rümeysa Fatma Çetin

Boğaziçi University

2025

Intergenerational Parenting in Türkiye:
Changes and Continuities in Parenting Practices

The thesis of R meysa Fatma  etin
has been approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Deniz Tahiro lu
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Feyza  orap ı
(Thesis Co-Advisor)

Assoc. Prof. Ersoy Erdemir

Assoc. Prof. Nur Soylu Yal ınkaya

Prof. Fatma Umut Be pınar Akg ner
(External Member)

June 2025

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, R meysa Fatma  etin, certify that

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

Signature.....

Date.....

ABSTRACT

Intergenerational Parenting in Türkiye: Changes and Continuities in Parenting Practices

With the modernization and urbanization, Türkiye has witnessed significant sociocultural and demographic changes, reflecting itself in family dynamics and parenting practices. The current thesis examined the intergenerational (in)stability and (dis)continuity in two generations of Turkish parents' parental warmth/behavioral control, harsh discipline, psychological control, and sociocultural control in the light of Family Change Theory. Although previous literature had examined the intergenerational transmission of parental warmth/behavioral control and harsh discipline, studies from non-Western societies are scarce. The current thesis also contributes to the literature, given the limited research on the transmission of psychological control and sociocultural control. In the scope of a larger TÜBİTAK project (118K032), Data were collected from 1,365 nationally representative parents in Türkiye (57% mothers) with a child aged between 4 and 17 years. Parents reported both their current child-rearing practices and their perception of their own parents' child-rearing practices. Controlling for socioeconomic status and child age, results of mixed-design ANCOVAs and bivariate correlations revealed that Turkish mothers and fathers used significantly higher levels of parental warmth/behavioral control and lower levels of harsh discipline practices compared to their own parents. Discontinuities were especially remarkable in current fathers' parenting practices. However, parental psychological control and sociocultural control practices were found to continue across two generations. Results and implications were discussed considering the previous literature and Family Change Theory.

ÖZET

Türkiye'de Kuşaklar Arası Ebeveynlik:

Ebeveynlik Pratiklerindeki Değişimler ve Süreklilikler

Modernleşme ve kentleşmeyle birlikte Türkiye, aile dinamiklerine ve ebeveynlik pratiklerine de yansıyan önemli sosyokültürel ve demografik değişimler yaşamaktadır. Bu tez, Aile Değişim Kuramı çerçevesinde, iki kuşak Türk ebeveynlerinin ebeveynlik sıcaklığı/davranışsal kontrol, sert disiplin, psikolojik kontrol ve sosyokültürel kontrol pratiklerindeki kuşaklar arası değişimler ve süreklilik durumlarını incelemiştir. Önceki literatürde sıcaklık/davranışsal kontrol ve sert disiplinin kuşaklar arası aktarımı ele alınmış olsa da, Batı dışı toplumlara dair çalışmalar oldukça sınırlıdır. Bu tez aynı zamanda psikolojik kontrol ve sosyokültürel kontrolün aktarımına dair araştırmaların azlığı nedeniyle literatüre önemli bir katkı sağlamaktadır. Daha kapsamlı bir TÜBİTAK projesi (118K032) kapsamında, 4–17 yaş arası çocuğu olan Türkiye temsili 1365 ebeveynnden (% 57'si anne) veri toplanmıştır. Ebeveynler hem mevcut çocuk yetiştirme uygulamalarını hem de kendi ebeveynlerinin çocuk yetiştirme biçimlerine ilişkin algılarını bildirmiştir. Sosyoekonomik düzey ve çocuk yaşı kontrol edilerek yapılan karma desenli ANCOVA'lar ve ikili korelasyon analizleri, günümüz anne ve babalarının, kendi ebeveynlerine kıyasla anlamlı düzeyde daha yüksek sıcaklık/davranışsal kontrol ve daha düşük düzeyde sert disiplin gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur. Özellikle günümüz babalarının ebeveynlik pratiklerinde önemli değişimler gözlemlenmiştir. Ancak, ebeveynlerin psikolojik kontrol ve sosyokültürel kontrol uygulamalarının iki kuşak boyunca sürdüğü bulunmuştur. Bulgular ve sonuçlar, önceki literatür ve Ailede Değişim Kuramı bağlamında tartışılmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am sincerely thankful to my supervisor, Prof. Feyza orapı, for her continuous guidance and for allowing me the freedom to pursue my interests throughout this process. I also owe special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Deniz Tahiroėlu, who has accompanied my journey in developmental psychology since my undergraduate years and has always enriched my perspective. I would like to express my appreciation to my thesis committee members, Assoc. Prof. Nur Soylu Yalınkaya, Assoc. Prof. Ersoy Erdemir, and Prof. Umut Beřpınar, for their valuable contributions and feedback.

My studies were supported by the TBTAK Science Fellowship and Grant Programs Directorate (BDEB) under the 2210-A National MSc/MA Scholarship Program. I am sincerely grateful for the resources and opportunities they provided during my graduate education.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to my family and friends, who have stood by me through every phase of this journey. I'm thankful to Gonca Nesibe and Gnce, with whom I have walked a similar path, for their warm and sincere friendship.

I am truly grateful to my dear friend Saadet, who has been by my side since the early years of university and whose presence and inspiration helped me shape my path and identity; and to my dear friend Halide Sena, for the dreams we built together, the beauty we discovered along the way, and for being a lighthouse in my life.

I'm deeply thankful to İlayda Reyryan—my housemate, my sister, and my playmate—for witnessing my most stressful moments up close, for her patience, and for always making me laugh with her big hug.

To Hilal Şerife—my sister and my life coach—who has always made us feel her love with her big heart and was always just one call away whenever I faced uncertainty, I offer my heartfelt thanks.

And to my parents, who have been the greatest source of strength: to my mother Necla, who thinks of me more than I do myself, and to my father Reşat, who has always encouraged my ideas and inspired my work—I feel truly blessed for the endless support, the example of parenting, and the sense of family they have given us.

Lastly, I offer my deepest thanks to Allah, who inspired in me the desire to work in the field of parenting, who blessed me with countless gifts throughout this journey, and who reminds me that no state is ever permanent for the human heart. All praise and gratitude belong to Him alone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Focus and goal of the study	1
1.2 Importance of the study	1
1.3 Literature review	2
1.4 Current study	21
CHAPTER 2: METHOD	24
2.1 Participants	24
2.2 Measures	24
2.3 Procedure	27
2.4 Data analyses	28
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS	29
3.1 Intergenerational stability/instability in parenting practices	29
3.2 Intergenerational continuity/discontinuity in parenting practices	34
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION	40
4.1 Main findings of the study	40
4.2 Limitations and implications	47
4.3 Conclusions	49
APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC FORM	50
APPENDIX B: PARENTING PRACTICES SCALE (TURKISH)	52
APPENDIX C: PARENTING PRACTICES SCALE (ENGLISH)	54
APPENDIX D: PARENTING IN THE FAMILY OF ORIGIN SCALE (TURKISH)	56

APPENDIX E: PARENTING IN THE FAMILY OF ORIGIN SCALE (ENGLISH)	
.....	57
APPENDIX F: ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL.....	58
REFERENCES.....	59



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographics of the Study Sample.....	25
Table 2. Correlations of Perceived and Displayed Parenting Practices for Fathers..	32
Table 3. Correlations of Perceived and Displayed Parenting Practices for Mothers	33
Table 4. Mixed Design ANCOVA Results for Intergenerational Continuity in Fathers' Parenting	37
Table 5. Mixed Design ANCOVA Results for Intergenerational Continuity in Mothers' Parenting.....	38

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Focus and goal of the study

The current study aimed to understand how parenting practices (e.g., parental warmth, harsh discipline, psychological control, and sociocultural control) changed across two generations of parents in Türkiye, which has been experiencing significant socio-cultural transformations. The current study used data from a larger project on the predictors and consequences of childrearing attitudes and behaviors across generations, entitled *Examination of Socio-Cultural and Psychological Antecedents and Consequences of Parenting Attitudes in Turkey in the Context of Intergenerational, Intragenerational, and Developmental Periods* funded by the Scientific and Technological Research Institution of Turkey. For the present thesis, the parenting practices of the current generation of Turkish mothers and fathers will be investigated in comparison to their own parents' child rearing with a nationally representative sample.

1.2 Importance of the study

Given the scarcity of studies on the intergenerational transmission of parenting practices in non-Western countries, including Türkiye, this study is important in many ways. First, child-rearing practices and values evolve as a result of modernization and globalization all over the world (Greenfield, 2016). However, most of the intergenerational literature comes from Western countries, which is even more limited for paternal parenting across generations (Taraban & Shaw, 2018). Also, most studies on intergenerational continuity of parenting practices have

considered the contemporary parents, also known as G2 (e.g., second generation), in comparison to their mothers, also known as G1, neglecting G1 fathers' gender (Kerr & Capaldi, 2019). Yet, comparing G2 mothers and fathers in relation to their own mothers' and fathers' parenting would give crucial insights into our understanding of gender-specific and general continuities across generations. This is also valuable in a non-Western society experiencing important socio-cultural transformations since changes in fathering are more salient in non-Western societies compared to Western ones (Therborn, 2004).

Also, compared to the intergenerational transmission of warmth and harsh parenting, our knowledge about the change and continuity of parental psychological control across generations is limited (Scharf & Goldner, 2018). This thesis fills in a gap in the literature by comparing how current Turkish mothers' and fathers' use of psychological control is associated with their perception of G1 mothers' and fathers' use of psychological control. Also, an examination of culture-specific control strategies, such as parental control emphasizing the honor of the family, has been largely neglected in past research. Assessing the intergenerational transmission of such culture-specific control in a non-Western culture is valuable in terms of seeing the extent of change in such "normative" parental control practices.

1.3 Literature review

1.3.1 Parenting practices

Understanding parenting is one of the main research areas given its close relationship with the healthy psychological adjustment of children (Breiner et al., 2016; Repetti et al., 2002). Parenting practices are generally examined under two dimensions: responsiveness/parental warmth and demandingness/ control (Baumrind, 1996).

1.3.1.1 Parental warmth

Parental warmth refers to being aware of the children's needs and includes responses that are warm, supportive, and sensitive to those needs (Maccoby, 1984). While maternal warmth is positively associated with a child's psychological adjustment (e.g., self-esteem, emotional stability, independence,), it is negatively related to a child's hostile and aggressive behaviors (see for a meta-analysis, Khaleque, 2013), as well as depression and internalizing symptoms of children aged between 5-12 years old (see for meta-analyses, McLeod et al., 2007b; Pinquart, 2017; Yap & Jorm, 2015). The associations between maternal warmth and child outcomes were also found for fathers. In his meta-analysis, Khaleque (2013) examined both paternal and maternal warmth and concluded that paternal and maternal warmth are similarly crucial for child adjustment. Regarding play in childhood and infancy, an important way of parent-child interaction, maternal warmth and responsiveness during play is related to better behavioral adjustment and prosocial abilities (e.g., child's aggressiveness) and decreased behavior problems in children (see for a review, Schneider et al., 2022). Fathers' involvement in play was longitudinally associated with children's socio-emotional and cognitive development, as well as motor skills (Feldman, 2023; Maselko et al., 2019), and higher levels of synchrony in play were associated with lower levels of behavioral problems (Bureau et al., 2021). Increases in sensitive fathering during play in toddlerhood and middle childhood were also positively and longitudinally associated with children's later self-confidence and cooperation skills in middle childhood (Webster et al., 2013) and negatively associated with children's dysregulation symptoms (Gregory et al., 2019). Pinquart (2017) concluded that internalizing problems among children and adolescents are negatively associated with warmth and the other components of

authoritative parenting, namely behavioral control and autonomy granting. Although small effects exist, these associations were established with both concurrent and longitudinal data, for all ages from early childhood to adolescence. The relationships were stronger for older children and for the samples, which included more girls and both parents, rather than just mothers. Another meta-analysis (McLeod et al., 2007b) also concluded that lack of parental warmth (e.g., both maternal and paternal rejection and aversiveness) is associated with childhood depression. There is also a moderate and negative link between supportive parenting and child delinquency, with a stronger association for the same-sex child-parent pairs (e.g., father-son and mother-daughter) (see for a meta-analysis, Hoeve et al., 2009).

1.3.1.2 Parental control

Demandingness/parental control, on the other hand, is parents' expectations and practices to modify a child's behaviors with the aim of seeing the desired outcome. By inhibiting or directing the behavior, parents integrate their children into the family and society, also known as socialization (Schaffer & Crook, 1980). It includes different strategies: controlling the child's behaviors, setting limits, and applying harsh discipline methods (Baumrind, 1996; Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Physical or harsh control/discipline, one form of negative parental control, is defined as parents' coercive or power-assertive control behaviors towards children and includes yelling, hitting, hurting, and threatening (Barnes & Farrell, 1992; Strassberg et al., 1994). Behavioral control refers to creating a consistent and regulatory structure or discipline (e.g., setting expectations, limits, guidelines) for children that they need to learn self-regulation (Akçınar & Baydar, 2014; Aunola &

Nurmi, 2005; Barber et al., 2005). Psychological control, on the other hand, was defined as parents' control of children's behavior and emotions by different techniques such as invalidating feelings, constraining verbal expression, love withdrawal, and guilt induction. This form of control hinders children's psychological and emotional development and is theoretically associated with internalizing problems (Barber, 1996; Barber et al., 2005).

Although unified concepts previously, distinctions between behavioral and psychological control were made to examine parents' behavior in more detail. This distinction allows us to explore the conceptualizations under certain types of behaviors and their differential associations with child outcomes (Barber et al., 2005). The fact that children need both autonomy for their sense of self-competence and parents' guidance to be able to learn behavior regulation makes the distinction between behavioral and psychological control meaningful. While behavioral control helps children navigate how structures, limits, and rules shape social interactions and the functioning of society, parents' autonomy grants support to children's development of a sense of self and social competence (Barber et al., 1994).

Although psychological control or behavioral control were covered extensively in the literature, parental control behaviors emphasizing social and moral values are more limited. However, parental control behaviors may include different cultural components. For example, in Chinese culture, conceptualizing and instilling a sense of shame in a child and raising a child sensitively to moral and social norms are seen as parental responsibilities. However, studies investigating parental behaviors, including the use of shame, are scarce (Lieber et al., 2006). With the question of whether parental control measures developed based on Western populations are accurate measuring tools for non-Western countries, Shek (2007)

developed a measurement tool with a Chinese sample. It was found that some of the items emphasize the importance of honor, such as "My father expects me to have good behavior so that I will not bring dishonor to the family." A cross-cultural study reported that Korean and Asian American parents use parental control, including shame-induction, more than European American parents (Louie et al., 2013).

The qualitative research phase within the context of the larger project on childrearing attitudes and behaviors across generations (*Examination of Socio-Cultural and Psychological Antecedents and Consequences of Parenting Attitudes in Turkey in the Context of Intergenerational, Intragenerational, and Developmental Periods*) has revealed that Turkish parents commented on control practices that were not captured in the standardized and commonly used questionnaires. These controlling child-rearing practices were centered on social and moral values, such as warning the child about behaving properly or about avoiding behaviors that could bring disgrace to the family.

Literature on parental control revealed how different forms of parental control are important for child outcomes. Although different ways of parental control (behavioral, physical, or psychological) were not separated in their meta-analysis, van der Brugger and her colleagues (2008) reported a positive association with a medium effect size between child anxiety and parental control. It is important to note that the strength of the association was larger as the child's age increased, and also among the studies, those including fathers or both parents, rather than those including mothers. Researchers suggested that this interaction might come from the differential nature of the parent-child relationship, where fathers grant more autonomy and encourage their children's risk-taking and independent behaviors (van der Brugger et al., 2008). Given that van der Brugger and her colleagues (2008) did

not examine different types of control, Pinquart (see for a meta-analysis, 2017) separately concluded that increased levels of internalizing problems among children and adolescents are associated with both harsh and psychological control and parental psychological control is more strongly correlated with children's internalizing problems than harsh control. In contrast to this positive association, increased parental behavioral control is associated with decreased internalizing problems.

Although significant but small associations exist, parental control (e.g., overinvolvement and lack of autonomy granting) is associated with childhood depression and anxiety (see for meta-analyses, McLeod et al., 2007a; McLeod et al., 2007b) regardless of parent gender. Karreman and her colleagues (see for a meta-analysis, 2006) found that the self-regulation abilities of preschoolers (e.g., compliance) are positively associated with behavioral control and negatively associated with negative parental control (e.g., power assertion, coercive behaviors, hostility). A review including studies mostly conducted with mothers revealed that parental negative controlling and intrusive behaviors (e.g., harsh discipline and rejection) during play are positively associated with children's internalizing and externalizing behaviors, both concurrently and longitudinally (Schneider et al., 2022). Regardless of parent gender, child delinquency is positively related to psychological control and authoritarian control behaviors, including physical punishment, with moderate and small effect sizes, respectively (see for meta-analysis, Hoeve et al., 2009).

Findings from studies with Turkish children and adolescents also revealed that parenting practices are related to different child outcomes (Dost-Gözkan-2020). Sümer and his colleagues (2010) in their review of studies with Turkish samples

concluded that while adolescents' well-being was positively associated with authoritative parenting, it was negatively associated with authoritarian parenting. Similarly, while adolescents' well-being (e.g., higher levels of self-respect, prosocial behavior, and lower levels of aggression and risky behaviors) was positively associated with behavioral control (e.g., monitoring and setting limits), it was negatively associated with psychological control (Sayıl et al., 2012). When adolescents felt that their needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness were met in their relationship with fathers and mothers, they were more likely to have higher levels of life satisfaction, problem-solving confidence, and family cohesion and have lower levels of anxiety (Dost-Gözkan, 2020). Given the importance of parenting practices on children's adjustments and outcomes, it is important to understand how these parenting practices are transmitted from one generation to the next.

1.3.2 Predictors of parenting practices: developmental history of parents

A ground-breaking model to understand the determinants of parenting behaviors was proposed by Belsky (1984). According to his Process Model of Parenting (1984), parenting is shaped by three domains, mainly by parent characteristics (e.g., gender, age, developmental history), child characteristics (e.g., gender, temperament), and the family's social environment. From each of these domains, specific factors play a significant role in parents' behavior. Of particular relevance to the present thesis is parents' developmental history (e.g., intergenerational transmission). It has been suggested that how parents rear their children is affected by their experiences of being parented while growing up (Conger et al., 2012). However, developmental history has been examined less often than other parental determinants such as parental personality, psychopathology, or child characteristics (Taraban & Shaw,

2018). A number of longitudinal studies provide crucial insights into how a parent's (will be referred to as current G2 parents) experiences in their family-of-origin (grandparents will be referred to as G1 parents) have a role in shaping their parenting practices when they have a child (will be referred to as G3 child generation) the transmission of parenting practices across generations and the mechanisms of this transmission.

1.3.3 Intergenerational transmission of parental warmth and positive parenting

Various longitudinal studies on the transmission of parental warmth revealed that parental warmth and positive parenting are transmitted to the next generation with modest stability. In their longitudinal study examining how G1 mothers' and fathers' parenting is associated with G2 fathers' parenting, Hoffert et al. (2012) reported a direct association. Mothers' responsiveness and warmth (e.g., positive parenting) and harsh parenting (e.g., spanking) were measured during G2's childhood (3-5 years of age). G1 fathers' monitoring during G2 children's adolescence and paternal care in infancy (e.g., positive parenting) was measured through child and maternal reports, respectively. G2 fathers reported their harsh and positive parenting when their children (G3) were between 0 and 9 years of age. Results revealed that while G2 fathers' warm and positive parenting is directly associated with G1 fathers' positive parenting, it is not associated with G1 mothers' harsh or positive parenting. On the other hand, Kerr and his colleagues (2009) reported that G1 fathers' and mothers' constructive parenting, including positive relationships and parent involvement experienced by G2 boys in their late childhood, is transmitted to G2 fathers' constructive parenting to their children (G3) both in early and middle childhood (Kerr et al., 2009).

For daughter-mother dyads, G1 maternal warmth and affection towards their G2 girls is transmitted to G2 mothers' parenting practices of warmth and acceptance thirty-two years later (Savelieva et al., 2017). Similarly, Belsky and his colleagues (2005) reported that G2 mothers who had experienced less authoritarian parenting in their preschool years and more positive attachments with their parents (more communicative and trusting relationships) in their adolescence also used warm-sensitive-stimulating parenting to their young children more compared to other G2 mothers, even when the child behavior was controlled. However, this transmission of warm-sensitive-stimulating parenting was not found for G2 fathers' parenting. Other studies also showed that there is a modest association between G1 mothers' parenting quality during the first two years of G2 children's lives (higher levels of emotional investment and supportive presence, quality of instruction, and lower levels of hostility) and G2 mothers' and fathers' parenting quality when their G3 children were up to 2-years-old (Kovan et al., 2009; Raby et al., 2015).

Regardless of G2 adolescent gender, their reports of perceived parental acceptance, love, and receiving good parenting were positively associated with their constructive parenting (e.g., monitoring, communication, affection, and discipline) approximately 20 years later (Chen & Kaplan, 2001). The transmission of G1 positive parenting, consisting of paternal and maternal warmth during G2 adolescence of girls and boys to G2 positive parenting of their 3-5-years-old children is also true for families with adverse economic conditions and coming from rural areas (Jeon & Neppl, 2016; Schofield et al., 2014).

In short, regarding the transmission of positive parenting, results supported the transmission of positive parenting from G1 mothers and fathers to G2 mothers and fathers (Hoffert et al., 2012; Jeon & Neppl, 2016; Kerr et al., 2009; Schofield et

al., 2014). While some studies did not report any significant association between G1 mothers' and G2 fathers' positive parenting (Belsky et al., 2005; Hoffert et al., 2012), others found significant associations between G1 mothers' and G2 fathers' positive parenting (Kerr et al., 2009), constructive parenting (Chen & Kaplan, 2001), and parenting quality (Kovan et al., 2009; Raby et al., 2015).

1.3.4 Intergenerational transmission of parental control

Longitudinal studies reported small-to-modest stabilities between G1 and G2 parents' control practices, both for G2 fathers and mothers, and during different developmental periods of G2 children. G1 parents' monitoring and efficacious discipline (constructive parenting) experienced by G2 boys in their late childhood is transmitted to G2 fathers' constructive parenting to their children (G3), both in early and middle childhood (Kerr et al., 2009). G1 parents' (consisting mostly of mothers) monitoring during G2 adolescence is associated with the parental monitoring G2 adults applied when they became parents with a child aged between 6 and 14 years old (Bailey et al., 2009).

Intergenerational stability was also reported for harsh parenting practices. G1 mothers' and fathers' negative discipline (e.g., poor and harsh discipline) during G2 boys' middle childhood is longitudinally associated with G2 fathers' use of poor and harsh discipline towards their G3 children during early childhood (Capaldi et al., 2008). Although a small association, a similar transmission also exists from adolescence to parenthood, where G2 adolescents who were exposed to harsh parenting (spanking, yelling, and threatening) and aggressive parenting (e.g., threatening or argumentative attitudes, disapproval) applied harsh and aggressive parenting practices more when they became parents (Bailey et al., 2009; Hops et al.,

2003). G1 mothers' use of hostility and angry coercion towards their G2 adolescent child is longitudinally associated with G2 mothers' and fathers' use of the same harsh parenting practices towards their preschool-age G3 children (Neppl et al., 2009). In another study, the same association was reported only when the partner of G2 parents' relationship with G3 children was poor (lack of warmth and support), but not when the relationship between G2's partner and G3 had a strong relationship (Conger et al., 2012).

Although the term “continuity” was dominantly used in the literature, all of the studies mentioned above examined the associations between G1 and G2 parenting, but not the mean level change. However, parental practices can be examined with respect to stability (i.e., whether the rank ordering in warm or harsh parenting has changed from one generation to another) and continuity (i.e., whether the mean levels have changed across generations). Therefore, it is important to distinguish the type of intergenerational transmission in question.

Besides prospective longitudinal studies, retrospective studies also provide evidence of intergenerational transmission. Regarding the intergenerational stability and continuity, an important study was conducted to examine how authoritative (higher levels of parental warmth and reasonable level of demandingness) and authoritarian parenting (lower levels of warmth and higher levels of obedience, demanding, and power assertive control strategies) changed across generations (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007). Australian G2 mothers and fathers with high levels of education reported their perception of being parented and their current parenting practices. Results revealed that both stability and continuity exist in permissive and authoritarian parenting. Although current parents keep using authoritarian and permissive parenting practices with their children, they (G2 parents) see themselves

practicing authoritarian parenting less and permissive parenting more compared to their parents. Also, today's parents perceive themselves as more authoritative than their parents were in the past. These changes have been explained by social and cultural changes taking place all over the world, from obedience-demanding to child-centered and autonomy-supportive parenting (Campbell & Gilmore, 2007).

A similar result was reported by O'Brien (2010), concluding that Irish immigrant G2 mothers perceived themselves as higher on authoritative and permissiveness, yet lower on authoritarian parenting compared to their G1 mothers. The researcher explained this discontinuity by attributing socio-demographic changes across generations (e.g., increased education and socioeconomic status). This intergenerational change from authoritarian to authoritative parenting and decrease in directive parenting (e.g., physical discipline, strictness, and demanding obedience) was also reported in different studies (Garcia et al., 2020; Ghorbani et al., 2022; Trifan et al., 2014). Regarding harsh discipline, European American mothers who experienced physical punishments more in their childhood used harsh parenting on their children more. Similarly, when fathers report higher levels of overall discipline during their childhood, they are more likely to use physical discipline methods (Lunkenheimer et al., 2006). Chinese mothers' and fathers' (G2) reports of psychological aggression and corporal punishment towards their preschool children (G3) are associated with their perceived parenting with the same practices as their G1 parents (Niu et al., 2018).

On the other hand, Madden and her colleagues (2015) reported that in the UK, while G1 fathers' parenting did not predict any G2 parenting, G1 mothers' affection was positively associated with fathers' responsiveness. As the level of control (e.g., harsh and manipulative parenting) perceived by G2 mothers regarding

their G1 mothers increases, G2 mothers' positive engagement decreases (Madden et al., 2015).

The intergenerational transmission of psychological control, on the other hand, was examined less compared to other types of parental control (Otterpohl et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2023), and mostly considered with concepts such as intrusiveness or overprotection (Scharf & Goldner, 2018). Limited retrospective studies from Asian countries supported the transmission of parental psychological control with different gender-specific paths. In their retrospective study with Chinese children from elementary and middle school and their mothers and fathers (Sun et al., 2023), both G2 parents and G3 children reported their perceived psychological control from their parents (G1 and G2, respectively). Results revealed a gender-specific transmission of psychological control, where the psychological control G2 mothers perceived from their G1 mothers was related to their control practices towards G3 children. This association was also found between G1 and G2 fathers (Sun et al., 2018). Ong (2010) conducted a similar study of college students and their parents in Malaysia. She reported an opposite pattern of results where psychological control perceived by G2 mothers from their parents was related to the level of psychological control these mothers showed towards their boys and vice versa.

Although limited retrospective evidence exists, intergenerational transmission of psychological control was also reported in Western countries. Belgian mothers reported their perceived psychological control from their mothers and also their psychologically controlling behaviors towards their toddlers. Researchers reported a positive association between the experiences of psychological control in the family-of-origin and mothers' current practices of using psychological control (Brenning et al., 2020). A study conducted in the US with Mexican adolescent mothers also

showed that adolescent mothers' report of their mothers (G1) as highly psychologically controlling is associated with adolescent mothers' potential of abuse towards their children when G3 is 4 years old and use of punitive parenting when their G3 child is 5-year-old (Seay et al., 2016).

A few studies looking at the mechanisms of this transmission reported mothers' deterred strategy of regulating their emotions (Brenning et al., 2020) and traditional parenting beliefs (Sun et al., 2023) as the mediators behind the intergenerational transmission of psychological control. Regarding how other negative and positive parenting practices are transmitted to the next generations, Kerr and Capaldi (2019) reviewed different intergenerational studies and concluded that both positive and negative parenting attitudes of G1 and G2 are modestly correlated, and there are different moderators and mediators in this transmission besides the direct association. More specifically, harsh, abusive, and generally negative parenting practices displayed by G1 can be attributed to the behavioral and emotional difficulties experienced by G2 during their adolescence. These psychological problems, in turn, are closely related to the risks in later life choices and experiences, such as the "premature transition to parenthood" of G2, thereby leading to more negative parenting practices.

On the other hand, positive parenting attitudes shown by G1 during the childhood or adolescence of G2 are related to the development of social competency, self-efficacy, and success for G2. These outcomes also increase the likelihood of a positive and mature transition to parenting and the implementation of such practices by G2 (Kerr & Capaldi, 2019). Similarly, G2 academic attainment (Neppl et al., 2009) and positive adjustment (academic skills, self-esteem, and peer relationships, Kerr et al., 2009) in adolescence, active participation in social life in G2's late

adolescence (Chen & Kaplan, 2001) are explaining how G1 parents' warmth, positive and constructive parenting keeps its stability in G2 parents' warmth. Studies also suggested that there is still stability of parenting practices, even modestly, after accounting for the effect of mediators, implying that social role modeling is one of the important mechanisms underlying stability (Chen & Kaplan, 2001; Neppl et al., 2009).

In his review of 31 intergenerational studies, Rothenberg (2019) also reported a modest continuity, at best, of parenting practices, including parental warmth, hostility, and control across generations. This implies that although the stability of parenting practices across generations can be seen, there are other factors that play a role in the change in parenting. Besides the effect of family of origin, one of the important factors related to parenting practices is cultural context.

1.3.5 Intergenerational parenting in Türkiye

The development and interpretation of parenting practices, attitudes, and beliefs vary depending on the culture (Harkness & Super, 2002), and the cultural context should be considered for a comprehensive understanding of parenting (Cabrera & Volling, 2019). Societal changes, including urbanization, increased education levels, technological improvements, and social and physical mobility, take place all over the world. These social changes are closely linked to the changes in cultural values and social norms, values emphasized for individual development, socialization, and child-rearing (Greenfield, 2009).

The Family Change Model developed by Kağıtçıbaşı (1990) is crucial to understanding how urbanization is related to the changes in societies with a collectivistic cultural base, such as Türkiye, which is witnessing important changes

in socioeconomic conditions, the level of urbanization, and industrialization (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2003; 2006). Migration from rural to urban areas is crucial in terms of easier access to complex and diverse opportunities for education and occupation. While the work conditions, such as intense and long hours of work, were related to lower levels of paternal involvement, with the evolving labor roles including more structured and various opportunities enabled parents to be more involved in childcare. Compared to the previous generation, changes from extended families to nuclear families, increased education level, and socioeconomic status are other mechanisms behind differences in parenting across generations in Türkiye (Boratav et al., 2014; Çorapçı et al., 2025; Ayçiçeği-Dinn & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2010), similar to other cultures (Ee et al., 2022; Juhari et al., 2012).

It suggests that shifts towards modernization have reflected themselves in many aspects of family life, parenting practices, and important values in child-rearing (Ayçiçeği-Dinn & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2010). Children are now coming to the fore with their psychological values rather than being seen as an economic resource and value for parents. Independence and autonomy of a child are considered more important by parents than they were four decades ago (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Although being connected to the family is still emphasized, families give more importance to supporting the independence and autonomy of their children compared to the previous generations (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2003). As a result, changes in child-rearing practices and values would be expected, with implications for intergenerational parenting.

Regarding the studies on intergenerational parenting practices in Turkey, an important study was conducted by Sunar (2002, 2009), which included children, their parents, and grandparents from the urban middle class. All participants from three

generations reported their parents' parenting, and results highlighted intergenerational changes towards more affectionate, less controlling, and disciplinarian parenting across three generations in Türkiye. In another study, Turkish mothers' and fathers' (G2) reported on their parents' (G1) parenting and their own parenting. Parents' perception of their parents as being over-permissive and abusive was negatively related to their effective limit-setting strategies when using with their children, regardless of G2 parent gender (Coşkun, 2022).

Ayçiçeği Dinn & Kağıtçıbaşı (2010) conducted a cross-cultural study where they compared Turkish and American emerging adults' perceptions of their parents' parental role and also their future parental roles by imagining themselves. Since urbanization is an important factor in shaping child-rearing motivations and practices, they included Turkish participants from both urban and rural areas to compare. Results revealed that motivations to have children varied based on socioeconomic condition or across generations. While social/cultural value attributed to the child decreased across two generations in all groups, Turkish young adults living in rural areas were more likely to endorse this value compared to those living in urban areas, as well as American young adults. Similarly, economic value attributed to children decreased across generations in all groups. Also, both young Turkish adults from rural areas and American participants had higher levels of this expectation than Turkish participants living in urban areas. Regarding the psychological value attributed to children, young adults rated themselves higher compared to their parents. Aligning with the Family Change Theory, Turkish students from urban groups had higher levels of psychological value compared to those from rural groups.

The decrease in economic value and increase in psychological value were also obtained from a similar research. Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca (2005) conducted a Value of Children (VOC) study where they included three generations from both rural and urban areas: Turkish adolescents, their G2 mothers, and their G1 grandmothers. Although a decrease in material benefits of children was reported, this decrease was more salient among the participants with higher socioeconomic levels. When they compared their results with those obtained in the original VOC study in 1975, although expectation of obedience from children was more important in 1975, it is seen as a more important parental role among the rural parents or low SES parents from urban areas compared to high SES parents residing in urban areas in 2003. Importantly, although not being evaluated as important in 1975, children's independence and autonomy were emphasized as an important child quality, especially among the high SES mothers from urban areas in 2003. The co-existence of obedience or (e.g., control) and autonomy support highlights an important aspect of emotional interdependence (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005).

Qualitative studies also shed light on the continuity and discontinuities. A qualitative study revealed that parents from middle to high socioeconomic status tried to embrace the value of connectedness from their family of origin. Instead of harsh and hierarchical control, they try to adopt different discipline and control mechanisms (e.g., more protective control) to maintain communication with their adolescent children, which is in line with societal changes (Akyıl et al., 2014).

Although continuities still exist, there has also been a slow change from traditional to new fatherhood concepts, where current Turkish fathers see themselves as less authoritarian than their fathers (Boratav et al., 2014). In a study with nationally representative Turkish fathers who had a child aged between 4 and 11, it

was revealed that a significant portion of the fathers try to explain the reason behind the rules they enforce, and also they reinforce their children's positive behavior by appreciating it. Among the punitive practices, on the other hand, prohibition, such as restricting access to a computer or toys, was found to be the most frequent method used by one-third of fathers. This was followed by verbal violence and parents' distancing the child from themselves. Although fathers did not prefer to use harsh physical discipline (Mother Child Education Foundation, 2017), it seems that they sometimes apply psychological control.

Another qualitative study with three Turkish families, including fathers(G2), grandfathers(G1), and grand-grandfathers (G0, fathers of G1 fathers), revealed that societal beliefs and traditions were important in shaping the father-child relationship, especially among the first generations (G1 fathers and their G0 fathers). In other words, showing love and affection explicitly was not approved in previous generations. However, this was not the case for today's fathers, as they have closer relationships with their children. Also, findings indicated that there was a change from authoritarian to more permissive parenting (Ördek & Aktaş-Arnas, 2020).

Within the scope of the TUBITAK Project, from which the current thesis was derived, a qualitative analysis was conducted to examine the intergenerational changes and continuities in fathering as well as the mechanisms behind those changes and continuities (Çorapçı et al., in press). G2 fathers with children between the ages of 0-6 from both high and low socioeconomic status were interviewed about their current parenting practices and their recollections about their own fathers' (G1) parenting during childhood. Regarding the similarities and continuities between G1 and G2 fathers' parenting, intergenerational continuity to instill moral values was more common among low SES fathers. On the other hand, compared to the low SES

group, high SES fathers were more likely to continue to support their child's autonomy and explicitly show love and affection as they had experienced in their relationship with their fathers. Regarding the discontinuities across two generations of Turkish fathers, unlike their G1 fathers, current fathers expressed their effort to spend time and be involved with their children through different activities. Also, compared to their G1 fathers, current fathers expressed having more open communication with their children and using less harsh and physical discipline methods. Importantly, these changes were more common in low SES fathers' expressions. Both high and low SES G2 fathers also expressed encouragement of their children's autonomy and more emotionally close relationships with their children than they perceived from G1 fathers during childhood.

1.4 Current study

The current study aimed to understand how parental warmth, harsh discipline, psychological control, and sociocultural control practices are subject to change among Turkish mothers and fathers compared to their own parents, relying on retrospective data. This study will contribute to the literature by examining the transmission of different parenting practices among both G1 and G2 mothers and fathers, as well as assessing the transmission of psychological and sociocultural control, which are subjects that have been little addressed. Furthermore, the stability of child rearing across generations will be examined by examining the associations between G1 and G2 parenting practices, as well as the intergenerational continuity by examining the mean level changes between G1 and G2 parenting practices among Turkish mothers and fathers of 4- to 17-year-old children.

Also, the literature revealed the importance of parental socioeconomic status (SES) as a significant predictor of parenting. A recent meta-analysis examining how different indicators of SES (e.g., education, income, or occupational status) are associated with parenting practices reported positive relationships between SES and parental warmth, behavioral control, and negative relationships between SES and parental psychological control, regardless of child gender or age. Although the effect sizes were small, these findings support Belsky's model of predictors of parenting (Ayoub & Bachir, 2023). As the level of SES or education increases, parents use higher levels of authoritative parenting with egalitarian parent-child relations (Hoff et al., 2019) and less authoritarian parenting practices both in collectivistic and individualistic cultures (Lansford et al., 2021). Therefore, SES will be controlled as a covariate in the analyses.

Past research findings (see reviews, Kerr & Capaldi, 2019; Rothenberg, 2019) reported modest, at best, associations between G1 and G2 parenting practices. Therefore, regarding the stability of intergenerational parenting, the first hypothesis is that there will be low to moderate correlations between G2 parents' (both mothers and fathers) endorsed parenting practices and their perceived parenting practices from their own parents (G1) with regard to the intergenerational stability of parenting. This would be expected for all the parenting practices in question (e.g., warmth/behavioral control, harsh discipline, psychological control, and sociocultural control).

Although studies reporting the intergenerational continuities (mean level change between generations) or examining the transmission of psychological and sociocultural control are limited, based on the emphasis on the emotional connectedness and child's autonomy in the Family Change Model (Kağıtçıbaşı,

1990; 2006) and also past research (Boratav et al., 2014; Çorapçı et al., in press; Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005; Sunar, 2002; 2009), the second hypothesis is that G2 parents will report using significantly higher levels of parental warmth compared to their G1 parents (H2a), G2 parents will report significantly lower levels of harsh discipline compared to their G1 parents (H2b), G2 parents will report significantly lower levels of psychological and sociocultural control compared to their G1 parents (H2c). Although significant transformations take place, keeping and instilling social norms and values, which are an important socialization goal, are still important in Turkish culture. Therefore; the effect size of the changes in parental warmth/behavioral control and harsh discipline would be larger compared to those in psychological and sociocultural control across two generations (H2d).

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

The current sample consisted of nationally representative 780 Turkish mothers and 585 Turkish fathers. The average age was 40.43 ($SD = 6.43$) for fathers and 37.05 ($SD = 6.29$) for mothers. Fathers were significantly older than mothers, $t(1363) = 9.724$, $p < .001$. Parents' children included 651 girls (48%), 708 boys (52%), and children aged between 4 and 17 years old ($M = 9.77$, $SD = 4.03$). On average, boys were 9.82 years old ($SD = 4.06$), and girls were 9.70 ($SD = 4.02$) years old, and boys' and girls' ages were not significantly different from each other, $t(1358) = -.507$, $p > .05$. Demographics are presented in Table 1.

2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Demographic form

Parents reported demographic information about themselves regarding age, marital status, number of children, level of education, current employment status, and subjective socio-economic status. They also reported their children's age and gender. (For the full version of demographic questions, see Appendix A).

Table 1. Demographics of the Study Sample

Characteristics	Mothers (N = 780)	Fathers (N = 585)
Age (years)	37.05 (6.29)	40.43 (6.43)
Education (%)		
Below High School	44%	36%
High School	37%	40%
2-year degree	10%	7%
Graduate	9%	17%
Number of children	1.99 (.98)	1.95 (.92)
Age of the child (years)	9.55 (4.04)	10.06 (4.03)
Socioeconomic status (1-10)	5.25 (2.10)	5.57 (2.05)
Work status		
Employed	29%	97%
Unemployed	71%	3%
Marital status		
Married	92%	95%
Widowed	2%	1%
Divorced/Separated	5%	3%

2.2.2 Parenting practices scale

Participants' current parenting practices were assessed using a measure created within the scope of the larger TUBITAK Project. This scale included items from (1) the warmth and control dimensions of the EMBU (Perris et al., 1980), which was adapted into Turkish by Sümer and his colleagues (2009), (2) the Psychological Control Scale developed by Barber (1996) and adapted into Turkish by Sayıl and Kındap (2010), (3) the Parental Monitoring Scale (Kerr & Stattin, 2000), and (4) the pilot qualitative analysis based on semi-structured interviews with parents about their child rearing (Sümer et al., 2025). Parents were asked to indicate how often they use

each parenting behavior. The scale consisted of 34 items that were rated on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = Never, 6 = Always). Based on the factor analysis, items that were cross-loaded on different factors and those loaded on the factors with less than 0.3 loading were excluded, and the final version of the scale revealed four factors: Warmth/Behavioral Control (13 items), Psychological Control (9 items), Harsh Parenting (3 items), and Sociocultural Control (3 items).

For the intergenerational comparison to be conducted in this thesis, those items that matched those in the Parenting in the Family of Origin Scale (described below) were used. These items consisted of five warmth/behavioral control items (e.g., “I show my love for my child through my words and actions.”), four psychological control items (e.g., “When my child upsets me, I make sure to tell them and make them feel guilty.”), two harsh parenting items (e.g., “I have hit my child when they made me angry.”), and three sociocultural control items (e.g., “I caution my child to act with proper manners.”).

Cronbach's alpha was .73 for the warmth/behavioral control, .68 for the psychological control, .53 for harsh discipline, and .56 for sociocultural control. McDonald's omega was .73 for the warmth/behavioral control, .69 for the psychological control, and .54 for sociocultural control. See Appendix B and C for the full version of the scale.

2.2.3 Parenting in the family of origin scale

Parenting in the Family of Origin Scale was developed within the scope of the TUBITAK Project to examine the intergenerational transmission of parenting based on G2 mothers' and fathers' retrospective reports of their G1 parents' child rearing. Participants were asked about their perceptions of their own parents' parenting

during childhood. The scale consists of 15 items from the Parenting Practices Scale. Items were rated on a 6-point scale (1 = Never, 6 = Always). The confirmatory factor analysis yielded four factors: Warmth/Behavioral Control (6 items), Psychological Control (4 items), Harsh Parenting (2 items), and Sociocultural Control (3 items). For the intergenerational comparison to be conducted in this thesis, five items for warmth/behavioral control, four items for psychological control, two items for harsh parenting, and three items for sociocultural control were used.

Regarding the perceived maternal parenting, Cronbach's alpha was .78 for the perceived warmth/behavioral control, .72 for psychological control, .37 for harsh discipline, and .55 for sociocultural control. McDonald's omega was .79 for the warmth/behavioral control, .73 for the psychological control, and .56 for sociocultural control. For perceived paternal parenting, Cronbach's alpha was .77 for the warmth/behavioral control, .72 for the psychological control, .43 for harsh discipline, and .56 for sociocultural control. McDonald's omega was .78 for the warmth/behavioral control, .72 for the psychological control, and .56 for sociocultural control. See Appendix C for the full version of the scale.

2.3 Procedure

The ethical approval of the current study was provided by Boğaziçi University-Institutional Review Board for Research with Human Subjects (see Appendix D). Data was collected between February and June 2022 by the research company. Written consent was collected from participants recruited for the scope of the TÜBİTAK Project (118K032). To classify the regions, the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics-II (NUTS-II) was employed, and participants were chosen randomly. Also, developmental stages of children, parent and child gender,

and age were considered to have approximately similar numbers of quotas to represent Türkiye. In this method, based on geographical, social, and economic characteristics, Türkiye was divided into regions. In 26 different cities, the responsible research company administered surveys to participants in face-to-face interviews. Participants were not offered any incentives for their participation and were informed that they had the right to withdraw at any time they wanted. After their consent, participants answered questions regarding demographic questions, their parenting practices, and perceived parenting during childhood.

2.4 Data analyses

To examine the extent of intergenerational stability and continuity in mothers' and fathers' parenting practices, bivariate correlations for mothers and fathers separately, and MANCOVA and mixed-design ANCOVAs were conducted. Assumptions (e.g., normality, linearity, homogeneity of variances) were checked and met before all the analyses. Assumptions were noted when violated. Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 29).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Before conducting the analyses, participants were compared based on their children's age. Since different developmental periods might induce different parenting practices, two groups were created: parents of 4- to 11-year-old children and parents of 12- to 17-year-old adolescents. There were only two differences between the two groups of parents in terms of displayed and perceived parenting practices.

Mothers with adolescents reported using harsh discipline more than mothers of 4-11-year-old children, $t(775) = -2.32, p < .05$, Cohen's $d = -.174$. On the other hand, mothers of 4- to 11-year-old children reported higher levels of perceived paternal warmth/behavioral control compared to mothers of adolescents, $t(768) = 2.87, p < .01$, Cohen's $d = .217$. All other displayed and perceived parenting practices were similarly reported among both groups of mothers and fathers, all $ps > .05$. Since the effect sizes of the differences were negligible, all analyses were conducted by including all participants from both age groups together.

3.1 Intergenerational stability/instability in parenting practices

Bivariate correlation analyses were conducted to understand the extent to which stability exists in intergenerational parenting of Turkish mothers and fathers. As seen in Table 2, SES was significantly correlated with G2 fathers' all displayed parenting practices and also perceived maternal warmth and maternal sociocultural control, all $ps < .05$. Also, as seen in Table 3, SES was significantly correlated with G2 mothers' displayed and perceived maternal and paternal sociocultural control, displayed and perceived maternal and paternal harsh discipline, displayed and perceived maternal

psychological control, all $ps < .05$. Socioeconomic status was partialled out in preliminary analyses; however, the correlations remained unchanged. Therefore, the zero-order correlations were reported for both G2 mothers and fathers.

As seen in Tables 2-3, perceived and displayed parenting practices were significantly and positively correlated in each parenting practice, all $ps < .01$. This was true for both fathers and mothers. In other words, G2 parents who experienced higher levels of positive (e.g., warmth/behavioral control) and negative parenting (e.g., harsh discipline, psychological and sociocultural control) from their own fathers and mothers in their childhood were more likely to use the same practices when they became parents. However, the strength of the associations varied.

More specifically, G2 fathers' use of warmth/behavioral control towards their children was significantly and positively correlated with G1 mothers' and G1 fathers' warmth/behavioral control, $ps < .001$. The correlations were low ($r = .306$) and negligible ($r = .176$), respectively. Similarly, G2 fathers' use of harsh discipline was significantly correlated with G1 mothers' and G1 fathers' harsh discipline. The correlations were low ($r = .345$) and negligible ($r = .237$), respectively. There were low-to-moderate correlations between G2 fathers' use of sociocultural control and G1 mothers' ($r = .448$) and G1 fathers' sociocultural control ($r = .405$), $ps < .001$.

Similarly, G2 fathers' use of psychological control was significantly correlated with G1 mothers' and G1 fathers' psychological control, all $ps < .001$. The correlations were moderate ($r = .505$) and low-to-moderate ($r = .422$), respectively. In other words, among fathers, the strongest correlation was obtained for the stability of psychological control from G1 mothers to G2 fathers ($r = .505$). Correlations between the perceived paternal warmth and displayed warmth ($r = .176$) and perceived paternal harsh discipline and displayed harsh discipline ($r = .237$) were

negligible. Other than these, all correlations were low-to-moderate, with r values ranging from .306 to .505, all $ps < .01$.

Regarding the intergenerational stability for G2 mothers, G2 mothers' use of warmth/behavioral control towards their children was significantly correlated with G1 mothers' and G1 fathers' warmth/behavioral control, $ps < .001$. The correlations were low ($r = .360$) and negligible ($r = .206$), respectively. Similarly, G2 mothers' use of harsh discipline was significantly correlated with G1 mothers' ($r = .245$) and G1 fathers' harsh discipline ($r = .238$), all $ps < .001$. The correlations were negligible.

There were low-to-moderate correlations between G2 mothers' use of sociocultural control and G1 mothers' ($r = .414$) and G1 fathers' sociocultural control ($r = .391$), $ps < .001$. Similarly, G2 mothers' use of psychological control was significantly correlated with G1 mothers' ($r = .431$) and G1 fathers' psychological control ($r = .382$), all $ps < .001$. The correlations were low to moderate.

Among mothers, similar to fathers, the strongest correlations were obtained for the stability of psychological control from G1 mothers to G2 mothers ($r = .431$). The correlations between perceived paternal warmth and displayed warmth ($r = .206$) and displayed harsh discipline and perceived both maternal ($r = .245$) and paternal harsh discipline ($r = .238$) were negligible. Other than these, all correlations were low-to-moderate, ranging r values from .360 to .431, all $ps < .01$.

Table 2. Correlations of Perceived and Displayed Parenting Practices for Fathers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. G1 Mothers' Warmth/Behavioral Cont.	—													
2. G1 Fathers' Warmth/Behavioral Cont.	.449**	—												
3. G2 Fathers' Warmth/Behavioral Cont.	.306**	.176**	—											
4. G1 Mothers' SC	.132**	.026	.151**	—										
5. G1 Fathers' SC	.119**	.042	.174**	.655**	—									
6. G2 Fathers' SC	.055	-.033	.084*	.448**	.405**	—								
7. G1 Mothers' HD	-.212**	-.154**	-.135**	.325**	.224**	.130**	—							
8. G1 Fathers' HD	-.028	-.259**	-.008	.201**	.345**	.160**	.410**	—						
9. G2 Fathers' HD	-.099*	-.079	-.310**	.107**	.043	.088*	.345**	.237**	—					
10. G1 Mothers' PC	-.152**	-.028	-.263**	.278**	.135**	.214**	.419**	.239**	.331**	—				
11. G1 Fathers' PC	-.074	-.118**	-.150**	.236**	.350**	.267**	.315**	.458**	.269**	.591**	—			
12. G2 Fathers' PC	-.113**	-.082*	-.263**	.197**	.088*	.464**	.266**	.160**	.311**	.505**	.422**	—		
13. SES	-.108*	.041	-.085*	-.092*	-.024	-.110**	-.060	-.025	-.085*	-.040	-.062	-.123**	—	
14. Child age	-.003	-.052	.016	.057	.072	.098*	.047	.055	.074	.022	.031	.083*	-.048	—

Note: SC: Sociocultural control, HD: Harsh discipline, PC: Psychological control, SES: Socioeconomic status.

* $p < .05$ (2-tailed), ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

Table 3. Correlations of Perceived and Displayed Parenting Practices for Mothers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. G1 Mothers' Warmth/Behavioral Cont.	—													
2. G1 Fathers' Warmth/Behavioral Cont.	.538**	—												
3. G2 Mothers' Warmth/Behavioral Cont.	.360**	.206**	—											
4. G1 Mothers' SC	.342**	.202**	.288**	—										
5. G1 Fathers' SC	.297**	.209**	.229**	.705**	—									
6. G2 Mothers' SC	.214**	.131**	.193**	.414**	.391**	—								
7. G1 Mothers' HD	-.121**	-.091*	-.087*	.203**	.094**	.045	—							
8. G1 Fathers' HD	-.065	-.166**	-.107**	.194**	.315**	.084*	.498**	—						
9. G2 Mothers' HD	-.043	-.114**	-.184**	.040	.017	.039	.245**	.238**	—					
10. G1 Mothers' PC	-.103**	.002	-.114**	.205**	.136**	.118**	.408**	.293**	.177**	—				
11. G1 Fathers' PC	-.066	-.044	-.159**	.168**	.238**	.094**	.328**	.432**	.139**	.602**	—			
12. G2 Mothers' PC	-.024	.011	-.202**	-.057	.069	.257**	.233**	.212**	.238**	.431**	.382**	—		
13. SES	.007	.061	-.037	-.149**	-.079*	-.088*	-.200**	-.079*	-.197**	-.151**	-.064	-.164**	—	
14. Child age	-.049	-.105**	.040	.032	.068	.025	.035	.085*	.144**	.019	.054	.028	-.068	—

Note: SC: Sociocultural control, HD: Harsh discipline, PC: Psychological control, SES: Socioeconomic status.

* $p < .05$ (2-tailed), ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

3.2 Intergenerational continuity/discontinuity in parenting practices

To examine overall differences in parenting practices while controlling for child age, and socioeconomic status, a 4 (parenting: warmth/behavioral control, harsh discipline, psychological control, and sociocultural control) $\times$ 3 (generation: G2 parent, G1 mother, G1 father) repeated-measures MANCOVA was conducted. Results revealed significant main effects of parenting, Wilks' $\Lambda = .920$, $F(3, 1316) = 37.97$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .080$, and generation, Wilks' $\Lambda = .976$, $F(2, 1317) = 16.39$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .024$. Additionally, a significant parenting type $\times$ generation interaction was observed, Wilks' $\Lambda = .956$, $F(6, 1313) = 9.99$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .044$, indicating that differences in parenting practices varied across generations.

To follow up the multivariate effects, four separate 3 (generation) $\times$ 2 (parent gender) mixed ANCOVAs were conducted to examine whether G2 parents' child rearing practices were significantly different from G1 mothers' and fathers' parenting practices, namely warmth/behavioral control, sociocultural control, harsh discipline, and psychological control. The within subject factor was parenting, given that parents reported their own as well as their mothers' and fathers' child rearing practices (G2 practice, G1 mother's practice, G1 father's practice). Parental gender was a between-subjects factor. As seen in Tables 2-3, SES and child age were significantly correlated with some of the parenting practices, either perceived or displayed. Therefore, these two variables were included as covariates in the analyses. Effect sizes were calculated based on the partial eta squared statistic, and multiple post hoc comparisons were adjusted with Bonferroni corrections.

The assumption of sphericity was violated in each mixed ANCOVA, all $ps < .001$. Therefore, the Greenhouse-Geisser estimates were used to correct the degrees of freedom. Homogeneity of variance assumption was violated for perceived paternal

harsh discipline, perceived maternal psychological control, and perceived maternal and paternal sociocultural control, all $ps < .05$. However, analyses were conducted relying on having a large sample size and robustness of mixed-design ANCOVAs to such violations.

Starting with the intergenerational continuity in parental warmth, as seen in Tables 4-5, there was a main effect of generation in parental warmth/behavioral control, $F(1.89, 2503.24) = 17.85, p < .001, \eta^2 = .013$. Interaction between G2 parent gender and transmission of parental warmth was not significant, $F(1.89, 2503.24) = 1.05, p = .347, \eta^2 = .001$, suggesting that the pattern of continuity/discontinuity was the same for G2 fathers and mothers. Results revealed that both G2 fathers and G2 mothers reported using higher levels of warmth/behavioral control compared to their G1 fathers and G1 mothers, all $ps < .001$. However, both G2 mothers and G2 fathers reported that their G1 fathers showed less parental warmth/behavioral control than G1 mothers. Regarding this, paired sample t-tests revealed different effect sizes based on the transmission from G1 fathers or mothers. Although, G2 fathers' use warmth/behavioral control significantly more than both their G1 mothers (Cohen's $d = -.276$) and fathers (Cohen's $d = -.560$), $ps < .001$, the small effect size for the relationship between G1 mothers' and G2 fathers' warmth/behavioral control revealed mostly continuity across generations. On the other hand, the effect of the relationship between G1 fathers' and G2 fathers' warmth/behavioral control was moderate. Similarly, among G2 mothers, while the effect size was small for the relationship between G1 mothers and G2 mothers (Cohen's $d = -.346$), the effect size was moderate for the relationship between G1 fathers and G2 mothers (Cohen's $d = -.577$).

Regarding the intergenerational continuity in parental harsh discipline, there was a main effect of generation, $F(1.96, 2595.71) = 23.13, p < .001, \eta^2 = .017$. Both G2 fathers and G2 mothers reported using harsh discipline practices significantly less compared to their G1 fathers and G1 mothers, all $ps < .001$. Interaction between generation and gender was significant $F(1.96, 2595.71) = 34.09, p < .001, \eta^2 = .025$. While G2 mothers and G2 fathers were different from their G1 mothers and G1 fathers, G2 fathers reported their G1 fathers using higher levels of harsh discipline than their G1 mothers. G2 mothers, on the other hand, reported their G1 mothers as having higher levels of harsh discipline compared to their G1 fathers. Therefore, discontinuities were especially remarkable from G1 fathers to G2 fathers, and from G1 mothers to G2 mothers. For G2 fathers, moderate effect sizes were obtained from a paired sample t-test, indicating that there was a significant decrease in the use of harsh discipline by G2 fathers compared to their G1 fathers ($d = -.704$) and G1 mothers ($d = -.599$). For G2 mothers, the effect size was moderate for the difference between G1 and G2 mothers ($d = .534$) and small for the difference between G1 fathers and G2 mothers ($d = .351$).

Regarding the intergenerational continuity in psychological control, there was a main effect of generation, $F(1.93, 2545.83) = 5.74, p = .004, \eta^2 = .004$. However, there was also a significant interaction between G2 parent gender and generation, $F(1.93, 2545.83) = 14.57, p < .001, \eta^2 = .011$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that G2 fathers reported using similar levels of psychological control compared to the level they perceived from their G1 fathers and G1 mothers, all $ps > .05$. G2 mothers, on the other hand, reported using similar levels of psychological control compared to their G1 mothers but significantly higher levels of psychological control compared to

their G1 fathers, $p < .001$. However, the effect size of this difference obtained from the paired sample t-test was small ($d = -.239$).

Regarding the intergenerational continuity in sociocultural control, there was a main effect of generation, $F(1.78, 2354.77) = 3.88, p = .025, \eta^2 = .003$. There was also a significant interaction between G2 parent gender and generation, $F(1.78, 2354.77) = 14.18, p < .001, \eta^2 = .011$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that G2 fathers reported using sociocultural control significantly less than their G1 fathers ($d = .230$) and mothers ($d = .180$), all $ps < .001$. While G2 mothers reported using similar levels of sociocultural control with the levels of sociocultural control they perceived from G1 fathers, they reported using sociocultural control significantly less than G1 mothers ($d = .099$), $p < .05$. Although significant differences were observed, effect sizes were negligible or small, indicating a continuity in the transmission of sociocultural control.

Table 4. Mixed Design ANCOVA Results for Intergenerational Continuity in Fathers' Parenting

	G1 Mother	G1 Father	G2 Father				
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>df</i> (between,within)	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Variable							
Warmth/Beh. Control	3.97 (1.00) ^a	3.55 (1.06) ^b	4.27 (.99) ^c	(1.89, 2503.24)	17.85	< .001	.013
Harsh Discipline	2.91 (1.08) ^a	3.16 (1.19) ^b	2.22 (.92) ^c	(1.96, 2595.71)	23.13	< .001	.017
Psychological Control	2.93 (1.13) ^a	2.98 (1.06) ^a	2.92 (1.09) ^a	(1.93, 2545.83)	5.74	.004	.004
Sociocultural Control	3.83 (1.13) ^a	3.90 (1.17) ^a	3.60 (1.09) ^b	(1.78, 2354.77)	3.88	.025	.003

Note. Means in the same row that did not share alphabetical superscripts were different at $p \leq .05$ in the Bonferroni multiple comparisons.

Table 5. Mixed Design ANCOVA Results for Intergenerational Continuity in Mothers' Parenting

Variable	G1 Mother	G1 Father	G2 Mother	<i>df</i> (between, within)	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)				
Warmth/Behavioral Control	3.95 (1.03) ^a	3.61 (1.07) ^b	4.32 (.91) ^c	(1.89, 2503.24)	17.85	< .001	.013
Harsh Discipline	2.98 (1.04) ^a	2.77 (1.08) ^b	2.34 (.91) ^c	(1.96, 2595.71)	23.13	< .001	.017
Psychological Control	3.09 (1.06) ^a	2.88 (1.05) ^b	3.15 (1.04) ^a	(1.93, 2545.83)	5.74	.004	.004
Sociocultural Control	3.85 (1.04) ^a	3.71 (1.05) ^b	3.73 (1.01) ^b	(1.78, 2354.77)	3.88	.025	.003

Note. Means in the same row that did not share alphabetical superscripts were different at $p \leq .05$ in the Bonferroni multiple comparisons.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 Main findings of the study

The goal of the current thesis was to examine the intergenerational stability/instability and continuity/discontinuity among two generations of Turkish parents' parenting. More specifically, we examined the extent to which intergenerational stability exists in Turkish mothers' and fathers' parental warmth/behavioral control, harsh discipline, psychological control, and sociocultural control practices. Also, I examined whether significant continuities exist between G1 parents' and G2 parents' childrearing practices by looking at the mean level change.

The first hypothesis was supported by the findings. Regarding the intergenerational stability, results revealed that G1 mothers' and fathers' positive (e.g., warmth/behavioral control) and negative parenting (e.g., harsh discipline, psychological and sociocultural control) were significantly associated with G2 mothers' and fathers' parenting. The effect size of the associations varied from $r = .176$ to $r = .505$, indicating mostly low or low-to-moderate associations. Associations for G2 fathers and G2 mothers were similar.

The second hypothesis was also partially supported. G2 fathers and mothers reported higher levels of parental warmth (H2a) and lower levels of harsh discipline (H2b) compared to their G1 parents. Regarding the psychological control (H2c), the only significant difference was observed between G1 fathers' and G2 mothers' use of psychological control. Other than these, the use of psychological control was similar across generations. Also, G2 fathers' sociocultural control (H2c) was different from that of their G1 mothers and G1 fathers, and G2 mothers' sociocultural control was

different from their G1 mothers but not their G1 fathers. However, the differences were low or negligible in terms of effect sizes.

To provide a more holistic presentation of the findings, both stabilities and continuities were discussed together for each parenting practice examined in the current thesis.

Starting with intergenerational transmission of parental warmth/behavioral control, although low or negligible, significant associations were obtained between G1 parents and G2 parents. G2 parents who experienced higher levels of parental warmth from their G1 mothers and fathers are also more likely to use warmth towards their children. However, the associations between G1 fathers and G2 parents' warmth were negligible, and the associations between G1 mothers and G2 parents were low. In terms of (dis)continuity, both G2 mothers and G2 fathers were different from their G1 mothers, with small effect sizes, and different from their G1 fathers, with moderate effect sizes. Although G2 parents are different from G1 parents, negligible associations in terms of stability and low-to-moderate effect sizes in terms of discontinuity revealed that current mothers and fathers are significantly different from their G1 parents, especially from their G1 fathers.

While some previous research reported that G2 fathers' warm and positive parenting is associated with G1 fathers' parenting but not with G1 mothers' parenting (Hoffert et al., 2012) our findings are consistent with most research suggesting that both G2 mothers and G2 fathers' positive, and constructive parenting is associated with both G1 mothers' and G1 fathers' parenting (Chen & Kaplan, 2001; Jeon & Neppl, 2016; Kovan et al., 2009; Kerr et al., 2009; Raby et al., 2015). Although associations are somewhat different from the literature reporting modest associations,

the findings are not surprising considering the sociocultural change Türkiye has experienced.

In line with Family Change Theory (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990), intergenerational parenting research in Türkiye suggested that current generation mothers and fathers reported more open expression of affection and love, and emotionally closer relationships with their children compared to their experiences in the family-of-origin, especially with their fathers (Çorapçı et al., in press; Sunar, 2009; Sümer et al., 2025). The current findings are consistent with the literature suggesting the “new fatherhood” concept, where fathers are emotionally closer and more actively involved in their children’s lives through different activities(see for a review, Diniz et al., 2023). Çorapçı and her colleagues (in press) also reported that current Turkish fathers put an important effort to be different from their fathers by having open expressions of affection and love, and emotionally closer relationships instead of being distant. Based on the modeling and compensation hypotheses, commonly discussed in the intergenerational transmission of parenting, especially fathering (Floyd & Morman, 2000), G2 parents either model the positive parenting they experienced from their G1 parents or try to compensate for what they lacked in their childhood. From a contextually similar culture, Chinese mothers residing in urban areas also reported having more open communication and supporting autonomy, granting more compared to their mothers (Liu et al., 2020). This was supported by the current findings for both G2 mothers and fathers.

Regarding the intergenerational transmission of harsh discipline, associations between G1 and G2 parents’ use of harsh discipline were small or mostly negligible. However, G2 parents were significantly different from their G1 parents, with mostly moderate effects. This suggests that although G2 parents who experienced higher

levels of harsh discipline from their parents in the family-of-origin were more likely to use the same practices towards their children, there was a remarkable decrease in parents' harsh discipline practices across two generations of Turkish parents. This change was more pronounced in the difference between G1 fathers' and G2 fathers' harsh discipline ($d = -.704$). The fact that the effect size between G1 mothers' and G2 mothers' harsh discipline ($d = .534$) was stronger than those between G1 fathers and G2 mothers ($d = .351$), and that the effect size between G1 and G2 fathers' harsh parenting ($d = -.704$) was stronger than those between G1 mothers and G2 fathers ($d = -.599$) is not surprising given that G2 mothers reported higher levels of harsh discipline from their G1 mothers compared to G1 fathers and that G2 fathers reported higher levels of harsh discipline from their G1 fathers compared to G1 mothers. These results, together with those obtained in parental warmth/behavioral control, point to the changing family and parenting dynamics in Türkiye.

As the Family Change Theory suggests, increases in education levels, socioeconomic status, and urbanization are closely related to the family dynamics and child-rearing practices in Türkiye. Children were seen as parents' old-age security, which requires dependency on the child, obedience to the parent, and connectedness to the family. Having an authority, expectation of obedience, and a fear-based relationship was a way to ensure this dependency and connectedness. With the transformations in children's values from economic to psychological and decreased expectations of material support from children in the future, the expectation of obedience to parental authority (especially paternal) decreases. Emotional connectedness to family, on the other hand, keeps its importance. This is accompanied by the emphasis on children's autonomy, and parents' effort to find different parenting strategies compatible with the requirements of sociocultural

changes (Akyıl et al., 2014; Çorapçı et al., in press; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007; Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005).

Regarding the transmission of psychological control, an underrepresented topic in the intergenerational parenting literature, results point to a continuity across generations. While G2 fathers were not different from their G1 mothers and G1 fathers, G2 mothers reported similar levels of psychological control with their G1 mothers but higher levels of psychological control compared to their G1 fathers. This result might be related to differences in G2 mothers' and fathers' perceptions of G1 mothers' psychological control. While G2 fathers reported that their G1 mothers and fathers were similar in terms of psychological control, G2 mothers reported experiencing higher levels of psychological control from their G1 mothers compared to G1 fathers. It can be said that G1 mothers' psychological control might be a more important predictor for G2 mothers' psychological control. This finding partially supports Sun and her colleagues' (2023) results, where they reported that associations exist only between G1 mothers' and G2 mothers' psychological control and G1 fathers' and G2 fathers' PC. Differently, G2 fathers' PC was associated with G1 mothers' PC in the current thesis. Also, given the low to moderate associations (r values changed from .38 to .51) between the use of psychological control practices in two generations, our results pointed to an intergenerational continuity and stability. This result is consistent with the limited literature on psychological control, suggesting stability (Brenning et al., 2020; Seay et al., 2016).

Although supporting children's autonomy is emphasized more compared to previous generations (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007), current findings revealed that psychological control practices, which may violate children's autonomy, are still commonly practiced among parents, similar to the previous generation. One reason

behind psychological control (PC), called dependency-oriented PC, is the parents' effort to keep the physical and emotional closeness with their children (Soenens et al., 2010). The current findings might be explained by this parental desire. As the Family Change Model suggests, by modernization and urbanization, Turkish families are more characterized by emotional interdependency, where connectedness to family is an important element of families. A similar finding was reported from an important collectivistic culture. Fung and colleagues (2017) compared Chinese mothers residing in different regions with different socioeconomic statuses. Chinese mothers residing in the US, meaning that they are more exposed to social change, are more likely to support autonomy as well as using parental control compared to those living in China. Researchers suggested that, aligning with the Family Change Model, although experiencing social change is closely related to autonomy and independence support, embracing traditional values such as relatedness is achieved by using psychological control (Fung et al., 2017). Similarly, in Türkiye, while modernization and social changes accompanied the decrease in some traditional parenting practices (e.g., cold-distant relationships or use of harsh discipline methods), some relation-based parenting (e.g., psychological control) practices might be embraced.

Regarding the transmission of sociocultural control, an important culture-specific parental control practice, the results were somewhat similar to the transmission of psychological control. Although G2 fathers use sociocultural control (SC) significantly less than their G1 mothers and fathers, effect sizes were small or negligible. G2 mothers, on the other hand, reported using SC significantly less than their G1 mothers but similarly with G1 fathers. However, the difference between G1 and G2 mothers was negligible in terms of effect size. Given the low to moderate

associations between G1 and G2 parents' SC (r values changed from .391 to .448), we can conclude that sociocultural control practices continued to be transmitted to the next generation of Turkish parents.

Current findings, overall, point to both a continuity and discontinuity in a relational/collectivistic culture witnessing important sociocultural transformations. Having close relationships with family members is an important value, aimed to be transmitted to next generations in Turkish culture (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007).

Current parents' greater use of parental warmth/behavioral control and less use of harsh discipline might be highly related to sociodemographic and cultural transformations. Çorapçı and her colleagues (in press) reported that discontinuities in Turkish fathers' parenting (e.g., lack of involvement, distant relationship, lack of open communication) are related to changes in lifestyle accompanied by urbanization, which also brings an increase in education level and improvements in working conditions. Also, the decrease in family sizes (e.g., having fewer children and not living together with grandparents) is related to increased parental involvement with children, in terms of either emotional, financial, or the amount of time. Other than these, fathers' conscious choice and effort to be fathers and develop their parenting are important in the intergenerational discontinuity.

Given that a moderate amount of psychological control is an important tool to protect this emotional connectedness (Cho et al., 2021; Sayıl & Kındap-Tepe, 2012), the continuity of psychological control and culture-specific control strategies (e.g., sociocultural control) might be expected. Although the values emphasized in control practices might be universal, such as respect for others, the reason behind it differs based on the culture. For example, while in American culture, parents suggest that their children be respectful for the sake of the notion of all parents' equality, in

collectivistic cultures, respect for others is crucial for societal norms and the structure of the community (Cho et al., 2021).

4.2 Limitations and implications

The current thesis has some limitations. First, we relied on only G2 parents' self-reports regarding both G1 and G2 parents' parenting. While evaluating their parenting practices, participants may be especially biased with concerns about social desirability, or they may have some biases in their recall (e.g., recall bias). However, given the significant cost of longitudinal studies, concurrent studies are important to highlight the intergenerational transmission.

Another limitation concerns the reliability of some parenting scales. Cronbach's alpha scores were low for harsh discipline and sociocultural control. However, this might be related to the lower number of items in those scales. Future research using different scales might be helpful to see whether the findings are similar.

Also, G2 parents were not from the same family systems. Therefore, attributions regarding the differences in G2 mothers' and fathers' current practices might be limited, given that there are lots of important contextual factors. Future research can recruit G3 children's parents to strengthen the ability to assess parenting practices within the same family dynamics.

Although some limitations exist, the current thesis is important in terms of recruiting a Türkiye-representative sample of both G2 mothers and fathers, who are generally underrepresented in research, and examining different aspects of positive and negative parenting practices.

Also, this study provides insightful implications. As the Family Change Model suggests, with the sociocultural and economic changes Türkiye has experienced, important transformations take place in child-rearing practices. It is a positive finding that there was a decrease in the use of parental harsh discipline and an increase in parental warmth/behavioral control across generations. However, the continuity of psychological control and sociocultural control implied that these parenting practices might be more hidden and embedded in culture and, therefore, are more resistant to change. Exploring these transformations in parenting practices is crucial to develop more effective strategies. First, this study shows the importance of culturally sensitive parenting programs. Given that psychological control and sociocultural control continue to be practiced, it is important to understand whether parents are aware of these negative parenting practices. Parenting programs should consider both decreasing negative parenting practices (e.g., harsh discipline) and also raising awareness about less distinguishable but potentially negative types of parental control. Since parents need control strategies to socialize their children, replacing psychological and sociocultural control practices with more age-appropriate and positive strategies would help to support positive child adjustment. Differently from more overt parenting practices (e.g., warmth and harsh discipline), parental control strategies influenced by cultural values and expectations of obedience, emotional connectedness, and family honor need to be examined further. Interventions should also consider cultural components existing in parenting practices, and it is also insightful to examine the factors behind the continuity in psychological and sociocultural control. So, more comprehensive and broader policies can also focus on different dynamics related to parenting practices, such as parental employment, work conditions, parents' well-being, and parenting stress. These dynamics are closely

related to parenting practices, and they can enhance or hinder the transmission of parenting practices.

In terms of sensitive and effective strategies, parents' gender is an important component to consider. Our results revealed that there was a remarkable change in especially fathers' parenting practices. Also, compared to G2 fathers, G2 mothers used higher levels of parental harsh discipline, psychological control and sociocultural control. This might be related to the amount of time spent with children. Mothers are still seen as primary caregivers, and they spend more time engaging in different child-related activities or tasks. Given this parental gender difference, gender-sensitive parenting interventions are crucial to increase the effectiveness of interventions and policies.

4.3 Conclusions

The current thesis aimed to examine the intergenerational (in)stability and (dis)continuity in parenting practices across two generations of Turkish parents. Our results revealed that current fathers and mothers (G2) reported having higher levels of parental warmth/behavioral control and lower levels of harsh discipline compared to their fathers and mothers (G1). G2 parents mostly continue to use psychological control as they perceive from their parents. On the other hand, G2 parents mostly differ from their G1 parents in terms of using sociocultural control, but the small effect sizes generally implied continuities across generations. Findings are important to provide insights into the transmission of positive and negative parenting practices in a relational-collectivistic culture, experiencing significant transformations.

APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC FROM

1. Year of birth:
2. Your gender: Female / Male
3. Your marital status: Married / Widow / Divorced / Separated
4. Your educational level:
 - Unable to read and write
 - Not a graduate, but able to read and write
 - Graduated from primary school
 - Middle school (or primary education school) graduate
 - High school or equivalent graduate
 - College (2-year) graduate
 - University (at least 4-year) graduate
 - Master's or doctoral degree holder
5. Your employment status
 - Working full-time (40+ hours per week)
 - Working part-time
 - Working irregularly / Seasonally
 - Unpaid family worker (working in the family business, farm, etc.)
 - Homemaker
 - Retired
 - Student
 - Unemployed but has income (Not working, not looking for a job, living off rental income, interest, etc.)

–Unemployed (Not working and actively looking for a job)

–Unable to work due to maternity leave, illness, or similar reasons

6. The number of children in total, including children not living in the household

7. The age of the child in question:

8. The gender of the child in question: Girl / Boy

9. Please imagine that the ladder shown represents the people living in our country.

At the top of the ladder are those who are best off and have the most money. At the bottom are those who are worst off and have the least money. On which step of the ladder do you see yourself? (1=People at the lowest position, 10= People at the highest position)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

APPENDIX B

PARENTING PRACTICES SCALE (TURKISH)

1. ocuğuma onun için yaptığım fedakârlıkları söylerim.
2. ocuğuma okulda gününün nasıl geçtiğine ilişkin sorular sorarım.
3. ocuğumu takdir ederim.
4. ocuğum bir şey söylerken konuyu değiştiririm.
5. ocuğumun ne yaptığını anlamak için çantasını, odasını ya da telefonunu kontrol ederim.
6. ocuğumun ödevlerini takip eder, farklı derslerdeki durumunu bilirim.
7. ocuğumun ne hissettiğini ne düşündüğünü sormam, zaten bilirim.
8. ocuğumun arkadaşları geldiğinde onlarla sohbet ederim.
9. ocuğum boş zamanlarında neler yaptığından bahsetmez.
10. ocuğuma bir yanlış yaptığında onu affetmeyeceğimi söylerim.
11. Arkadaşlarının yaptığı bazı şeyleri yapmasına başına bir şey gelmesinden korktuğum için izin vermem.
12. ocuğumun sıkıntılı olduğunu o söylemeden anlarım.*
13. Davranışlarının ocuğuma yakışmadığını söylerim.**
14. ocuğum okulda derslerinin nasıl gittiğini, gününün nasıl geçtiğini bana anlatır.
15. ocuğumu terbiyeli olması konusunda uyarırım.****
16. ocuğumun yaptığı hataları yüzüne vururum.**
17. ocuğumu olduğu gibi kabul eder, davranışlarına karışmam.
18. ocuğum arkadaşlarıyla neler yaptığını bana anlatır.
19. Beni üzdüğünde bunu mutlaka söyler, onu suçlu hissettiririm.**
20. Ailemize laf getirecek davranışlardan kaçınması için ocuğumu uyarırım.****

21. Sözlirim ve hareketlerimle çocuğumu sevdiğimi gösteririm.*
22. Yanlış bir davranışını gördüğümde bunun ayıp olduğunu söylerim.
23. Başına bir şey gelmesin diye arkadaşlarıyla okul dışında buluşmasına izin vermem.
24. Bazı yanlış davranışlarında günah işlediğini söylerim.***
25. Çocuğum yanlış yaparsa küserim.**
26. Çocuğumun boş zamanlarını nasıl geçirdiğini bilirim.
27. Çocuğumla şakalaşırız.*
28. Çocuğumun hissettiklerinin yanlış olduğunu söylerim.
29. Çocuğumun eğitim dışı teknoloji kullanımını takip ederim.
30. Birini kırdığında o kişinin duygularını anlamasını isterim.*
31. Bir sorunu olduğunda çocuğumu can kulağıyla dinlerim.*
32. Yanlış yaptığında çocuğumu azarlarım.***
33. Yanlış yaptığında çocuğumu cezalandırırım.
34. Beni kızdırdığında çocuğuma vurduğum olmuştur.***

*: Parental Warmth/Behavioral Control

** : Psychological Control

***: Harsh Discipline

****: Sociocultural Control

APPENDIX C

PARENTING PRACTICES SCALE (ENGLISH)

1. I tell my child about the sacrifices I make for them.
2. I ask my child questions about how their day at school went.
3. I appreciate and praise my child.
4. I change the subject when my child is speaking.
5. I check my child's bag, room, or phone to understand what they are doing.
6. I keep track of my child's homework and know their progress in different subjects.
7. I do not ask my child how they feel or what they think because I already know.
8. I chat with my child's friends when they come over.
9. My child does not talk about how they spend their free time.
10. I tell my child that I will not forgive them if they make a mistake.
11. I do not allow my child to do some things their friends do because I am afraid something might happen to them.
12. I can tell when my child is struggling without them saying it.*
13. I tell my child that their behavior is inappropriate.**
14. My child tells me about their school performance and how their day went.
15. I remind my child to be well-mannered.*****
16. I point out my child's mistakes.**
17. I accept my child as they are and do not interfere with their behavior.
18. My child tells me what they do with their friends.
19. When my child upsets me, I tell them and make them feel guilty.**
20. I warn my child to avoid behaviors that could bring shame to our family.*****
21. I show my love for my child through my words and actions.*

22. When I notice a misbehavior, I tell my child that it is inappropriate.
23. I do not allow my child to meet their friends outside of school to keep them safe.
24. I tell my child that certain behaviors are sinful.****
25. If my child does something wrong, I stop talking to them.**
26. I know how my child spends their free time.
27. My child and I joke and play around together.*
28. I tell my child that their feelings are wrong.
29. I monitor my child's use of technology outside of education.
30. When my child hurts someone, I want them to understand that person's feelings.*
31. When my child has a problem, I listen to them attentively.*
32. I scold my child when they do something wrong.***
33. I punish my child when they make a mistake.
34. I have hit my child when they made me angry.***

*: Parental Warmth/Behavioral Control

**: Psychological Control

***: Harsh Discipline

****: Sociocultural Control

APPENDIX D

PARENTING IN THE FAMILY OF ORIGIN SCALE (TURKISH)

1. Sıkıntılı olduğumu ben söylemeden anlardı.*
2. Beni sevdiğini sözleri ve hareketleriyle gösterirdi.*
3. Bir sorunum olduğunda can kulağıyla dinlerdi.*
4. Benimle şakalaşırđı.*
5. Geçmişte yaptığım hataları yüzüme vururdu. **
6. Davranışlarımın bana yakışmadığını söylerdi. **
7. Yanlış yaptığımđda küserdi. **
8. Onu üzdüğümde bunu mutlaka söyler, beni suçlu hissettirirdi.**
9. Bazı yanlış davranışlarımđda günah işlediğimi söylerdi. ****
10. Birini kırdığımđda o kişinin duygularını anlamamı isterdi.*
11. Terbiyeli olmam konusunda beni uyarırdı. ****
12. Kızdığında bana vurduđu olmuştur. ***
13. Beni olduğum gibi kabul eder, karışmazdı.
14. Yanlış yaptığımđda beni azarlardı.***
15. Ailemize laf getirecek davranışlardan kaçınmamı isterdi.****

*: Parental Warmth/Behavioral Control

** : Psychological Control

***: Harsh Discipline

****: Sociocultural Control

APPENDIX E

PARENTING IN THE FAMILY OF ORIGIN SCALE (ENGLISH)

1. They would understand when I was feeling distressed without me saying it.*
2. They would show their love for me through their words and actions.*
3. They would listen to me attentively when I had a problem.*
4. They would joke and play around with me.*
5. They would bring up my past mistakes.**
6. They would tell me that my behavior was inappropriate.**
7. They would stop talking to me when I did something wrong.**
8. When I upset them, they would make sure to tell me and make me feel guilty.**
9. They would say that I was committing a sin when I engaged in certain wrong behaviors. ****
10. When I hurt someone, they would want me to understand that person's feelings.*
11. They would remind me to be well-mannered.****
12. There were times when they hit me when they got angry.***
13. They would accept me as I am and not interfere with my actions.
14. They would scold me when I did something wrong.***
15. They would warn me to avoid behaviors that could bring shame to our family.****

*: Parental Warmth/Behavioral Control

**: Psychological Control

***: Harsh Discipline

****: Sociocultural Control

APPENDIX F

ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL



T.C.
BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (Sbınarek)

Sayı : E-84391427-050.04-217514
Konu : 2025-01T Kayıt Numaralı Başvurunuz
Hakkında

23.01.2025

Sayın Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Deniz TAHİROĞLU

Tez danışmanlığını yürüttüğünüz öğrenciniz Rümeysa Fatma Çetin'in "Türkiye'de Kuşaklararası Ebeveynlik: Aktarılan ve Değişen Ebeveynlik Tutumları / Intergenerational Parenting in Türkiye: Changes and Continuities in Parenting Practices" başlıklı projesi ile Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (SBİNAREK)'ye yaptığınız 2025-01T kayıt numaralı başvuru 17.01.2025 tarih ve 2025/01 sayılı kurul toplantısında incelenmiş ve projeye etik onay verilmesi uygun bulunmuştur.

Bu karar tüm üyelerin toplantıya on-line olarak katılımıyla ve oybirliği ile alınmıştır. Onay mektubu tüm üyeler adına Komisyon Başkanı tarafından e-imzalanmıştır. Bilgilerinizi rica ederiz.

Saygılarımızla,

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Işıl ERDUYAN
Kurul Başkanı

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu : 0HEP-AD9A-0481

Belge Doğrulama Adresi : <https://www.turkiye.gov.tr/bogazici-universitesi-ebys>

Adres: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi 34342 Bebek/ İstanbul
Telefon No: Faks No:
e-Posta: İnternet Adresi: www.bogazici.edu.tr
Kep Adresi: bogaziciuniversitesi@is01.kep.tr

Bilgi İçin: Nurjen MUNAR
Mühendis

Telefon No: 0 212 359-6740



REFERENCES

- Akçınar, B., & Baydar, N. (2014). Parental control is not unconditionally detrimental for externalizing behaviors in early childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 38(2), 118-127.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025413513701>
- Akyıl, Y., Prouty, A., Blanchard, A., & Lyness, K. (2014). Parents' experiences of intergenerational value transmission in Turkey's changing society: An interpretative phenomenological study. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 25(1), 42-65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08975353.2014.881690>
- Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behavior. *Child Development*, 76(6), 1144-1159.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00840.x-i1>
- Ayçiçeği-Dinn, A., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). The value of children for parents in the minds of emerging adults. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 44(2), 174-205.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/1069397109358389>
- Ayoub, M., & Bachir, M. (2023). A Meta-analysis of the Relations Between Socioeconomic Status and Parenting Practices. *Psychological Reports*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941231214215>
- Bailey, J. A., Hill, K. G., Oesterle, S., & Hawkins, J. D. (2009). Parenting practices and problem behavior across three generations: Monitoring, harsh discipline, and drug use in the intergenerational transmission of externalizing behavior. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(5), 1214-1226.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016129>
- Barber B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, 67(6), 3296-3319.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1131780>
- Barber, B. K., Olsen, J. E., & Shagle, S. C. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioral control and youth internalized and externalized behaviors. *Child Development*, 65(4), 1120-1136.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1131309>
- Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., Olsen, J. A., Collins, A., & Burchinal, M. (2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: Assessing relevance across time, culture, and method: Abstract. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 70(4), vii, 125-137.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5834.2005.00365.x>
- Baumrind, D. (1996). The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 45(4), 405-414.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/585170>

- Barnes, G. M., & Farrell, M. P. (1992). Parental Support and Control as Predictors of Adolescent Drinking, Delinquency, and Related Problem Behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54(4), 763. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353159>
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*, 55(1), 83–96. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129836>
- Boratav, H. B., Fişek, G. O., & Ziya, H. E. (2014). Unpacking masculinities in the context of social change: Internal complexities of the identities of married men in Turkey. *Men and Masculinities*, 17(3), 299-324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X14539511>
- Bornstein, M. H. (2016). Determinants of parenting. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), *Developmental psychopathology: Risk, resilience, and intervention* (pp. 180–270). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119125556.devpsy405>
- Breiner, H., Ford, M., & Gadsden, V. L. (Eds.). (2016). *Parenting matters: Supporting parents of children ages 0-8*.
- Brenning, K., Soenens, B., Van der Kaap-Deeder, J., Dieleman, L., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2020). Psychologically controlling parenting during toddlerhood: The role of mothers' perceived parenting history and emotion regulation style. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 29, 2257-2267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-020-01719-z>
- Bureau, J.-F., Trepia, P., Deneault, A.-A., & Boulerice, K. (2021). Stability of father-and mother-child synchrony in a playful setting from preschool to middle childhood: Associations with children's behavior problems. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 57, 167–177. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.ecresq.2021.04.009>
- Cabrera, N. J., & Volling, B. L. (2019). Moving research on fathering and children's development forward: Priorities and recommendations for the future. In P. J. Bauer (Ed.), *Advancing research and measurement on fathering and children's development* (pp. 107-117).
- Campbell, J., & Gilmore, L. (2007). Intergenerational continuities and discontinuities in parenting styles. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 59(3), 140-150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530701449471>
- Capaldi, D. M., Pears, K. C., Kerr, D. R., & Owen, L. D. (2008). Intergenerational and partner influences on fathers' negative discipline. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36(3), 347–358. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-007-9182-8>
- Chen, Z. Y., & Kaplan, H. B. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of constructive parenting. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1), 17-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00017.x>

- Cho, H. S., Cheah, C. S., Vu, K. T., Selçuk, B., Yavuz, H. M., Şen, H. H., & Park, S. Y. (2021). Culturally shared and unique meanings and expressions of maternal control across four cultures. *Developmental Psychology*, 57(2), 284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001136>
- Conger, R. D., Schofield, T. J., & Neppl, T. K. (2012). Intergenerational continuity and discontinuity in harsh parenting. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 12(2-3), 222–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2012.683360>
- Coşkun, M. (2022). Predictors of Parents' Ability To Set Limits on Children: Marital Quality, Parents' Schemas and Perceptions of Their Own Parents' Attitudes [Master's thesis]. TED University.
- Corapci, F., Beşpınar, F. U., Çetin, R. F., & Sümer, N. (2025). Changes and Continuities in Intergenerational Fathering in Türkiye. *Infant and Child Development*, 34(3), e70021.
- Deneault, A. A., Cabrera, N. J., & Bureau, J. F. (2022). A meta- analysis on observed paternal and maternal sensitivity. *Child Development*, 93(6), 1631-1648. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13832>
- Diniz, E., Brandao, T., & Verissimo, M. (2023). Father involvement during early childhood: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *Family Relations*, 72(5), 2710-2730. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12858>
- Dost- Gözkan, A. (2020). The Gratification of Psychological Needs and Well-Being Among Turkish Adolescents: An Examination of Direct and Indirect Links. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 31(1), 52–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12582>
- Feldman, R. (2023). Father contribution to human resilience. *Development and Psychopathology*, 35(5), 2402-2419. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579423000354>
- Floyd, K., & Morman, M. T. (2000). Affection received from fathers as a predictor of men's affection with their own sons: Tests of the modeling and compensation hypotheses. *Communication Monographs*, 67(4), 347–361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750009376516>
- Fung, J., Kim, J. J., Jin, J., Wu, Q., Fang, C., & Lau, A. S. (2017). Perceived social change, parental control, and family relations: A comparison of Chinese families in Hong Kong, Mainland China, and the United States. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1671. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01671>
- Garcia, O. F., Fuentes, M. C., Gracia, E., Serra, E., & Garcia, F. (2020). Parenting Warmth and Strictness across Three Generations: Parenting Styles and Psychosocial Adjustment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(20), 7487. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17207487>

- Ghorbani, S., Gharraee, B., Hosseini, F., Maghami Sharif, Z., & Aghebati, A. (2022). Changing parenting style between two generations and its impacts on the severity of behavioral and emotional symptoms. *Asia-Pacific Psychiatry: Official Journal of the Pacific Rim College of Psychiatrists*, 14(1), e12448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/appy.12448>
- Greenfield, P. M. (2009). Linking social change and developmental change: Shifting pathways of human development. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(2), 401–418. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014726>
- Greenfield, P. M. (2016). Social change, cultural evolution, and human development. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 84-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.10.012>
- Gregory, J., Kivisto, K. L., Perdue, N. H., & Estell, D. B. (2019). Father-child play, child emotional dysregulation, and adolescent internalizing symptoms: A longitudinal multiple mediation analysis. *Development and Psychopathology*, 31(4), 1325–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579418000767>
- Grolnick, W. S., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2009). Issues and challenges in studying parental control: Toward a new conceptualization. *Child Development Perspectives*, 3(3), 165-170. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2009.00099.x>
- Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. (2002). Culture and parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Biology and ecology of parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 253–280). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., Van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 37, 749-775. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-009-9310-8>
- Hoff, E., & Laursen, B. (2019). Socioeconomic status and parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Biology and ecology of parenting* (3rd ed., pp. 421–447). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429401459-13>
- Hofferth, S. L., Pleck, J. H., & Vesely, C. K. (2012). The Transmission of Parenting from Fathers to Sons. *Parenting, Science and Practice*, 12(4), 282–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2012.709153>
- Hops, H., Davis, B., Leve, C., & Sheeber, L. (2003). Cross-generational transmission of aggressive parent behavior: A prospective, mediational examination. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 31, 161-169. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022522224295>
- IBM Corp. Released 2023. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 29.0.2.0 Armonk, NY: IBM Corp

- Jeon, S., & Neppl, T. K. (2016). Intergenerational continuity in economic hardship, parental positivity, and positive parenting: The association with child behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(1), 22–32. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000151>
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1990). Family and home-based intervention. In *Applied cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 121-141). SAGE Publications, Inc..
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2003). Autonomy, embeddedness and adaptability in immigration contexts. *Human Development*, 46(2-3), 145–150. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000068584>
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2006). Theoretical perspectives on family change. In J. Georgas, J. W. Berry, F. J. R. van de Vijver, Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı, & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *Families across cultures: A 30-nation psychological study* (pp. 72–89). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511489822.004>
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theories and applications* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three-decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology*, 54(3), 317-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00213.x>
- Karreman, A., van Tuijl, C., van Aken, M. A. G., & Dekovic, M. (2006). Parenting and Self-Regulation in Preschoolers: A Meta-Analysis. *Infant and Child Development*, 15(6), 561–579. <https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.478>
- Kerr, D. C. R., & Capaldi, D. M. (2019). Intergenerational transmission of parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Being and becoming a parent* (3rd ed., pp. 443–481). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429433214-13>
- Kerr, D. R., Capaldi, D. M., Pears, K. C., & Owen, L. D. (2009). A prospective three generational study of fathers' constructive parenting: Influences from family of origin, adolescent adjustment, and offspring temperament. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(5), 1257–1275. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015863>
- Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology*, 36(3), 366–380. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.36.3.366>
- Khaleque, A. (2013). Perceived parental warmth, and children's psychological adjustment, and personality dispositions: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 22(2), 297–306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9579-z>

- Kovan, N. M., Chung, A. L., & Sroufe, L. (2009). The intergenerational continuity of observed early parenting: A prospective, longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(5), 1205–1213. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016542>
- Lansford, J. E., Zietz, S., Al-Hassan, S. M., Bacchini, D., Bornstein, M. H., Chang, L., Deater-Deckard, K., Di Giunta, L., Dodge, K. A., Gurdal, S., Liu, Q., Long, Q., Oburu, P., Pastorelli, C., Skinner, A. T., Sorbring, E., Tapanya, S., Steinberg, L., Uribe Tirado, L. M., Yotanyamaneewong, S., ... Alampay, L. P. (2021). Culture and Social Change in Mothers' and Fathers' Individualism, Collectivism and Parenting Attitudes. *Social Sciences*, 10(12), 459. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10120459>
- Laulik, S., Chou, S., Browne, K. D., & Allam, J. (2013). The link between personality disorder and parenting behaviors: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 18(6), 644-655. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.017>
- Lieber, E., Fung, H., & Leung, P. W.-L. (2006). Chinese child-rearing beliefs: Key dimensions and contributions to the development of culture-appropriate assessment. *Asian Journal Of Social Psychology*, 9(2), 140–147. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2006.00191.x>
- Liu, J. L., Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. (2020). Chinese mothers' cultural models of children's shyness: Ethnotheories and socialization strategies in the context of social change. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2020(170), 69-92. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.20340>
- Louie, J. Y., Oh, B. J., & Lau, A. S. (2013). Cultural differences in the links between parental control and children's emotional expressivity. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 19(4), 424. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032820>
- Lunkenheimer, E. S., Kittler, J. E., Olson, S. L., & Kleinberg, F. (2006). The intergenerational transmission of physical punishment: Differing mechanisms in mothers' and fathers' endorsement?. *Journal of Family Violence*, 21, 509-519. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-006-9050-2>
- Maccoby, E. E. (1984). Socialization and Developmental Change. *Child Development*, 55(2), 317–328. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129945>
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Madden, V., Domoney, J., Aumayer, K., Sethna, V., Iles, J., Hubbard, I., Giannakakis, A., Psychogiou, L., & Ramchandani, P. (2015). Intergenerational transmission of parenting: Findings from a UK longitudinal study. *European Journal of Public Health*, 25(6), 1030–1035. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckv093>

- Maselko, J., Hagaman, A. K., Bates, L. M., Bhalotra, S., Biroli, P., Gallis, J. A., O'Donnell, K., Sikander, S., Turner, E. L., & Rahman, A. (2019). Father involvement in the first year of life: Associations with maternal mental health and child development outcomes in rural Pakistan. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 237, 112421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112421>
- McLeod, B. D., Weisz, J. R., & Wood, J. J. (2007a). Examining the association between parenting and childhood depression: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27(8), 986–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2007.03.001>
- McLeod, B. D., Wood, J. J., & Weisz, J. R. (2007b). Examining the association between parenting and childhood anxiety: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27(2), 155–172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2006.09.002>
- Mother Child Education Foundation (2017). Involved fatherhood and its determinants in Turkey. AÇEV. https://www.acev.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/1_involved-fatherhood-and-its-determinants-in-turkey.pdf
- Neppl, T. K., Conger, R. D., Scaramella, L. V., & Ontai, L. L. (2009). Intergenerational continuity in parenting behavior: Mediating pathways and child effects. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(5), 1241–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014850>
- Niu, H., Liu, L., & Wang, M. (2018). Intergenerational transmission of harsh discipline: The moderating role of parenting stress and parent gender. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 79, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.01.017>
- O'Brien, H. G. (2010). The intergenerational transmission of parenting styles of Irish immigrant mothers. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 13(5), 395–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10522158.2010.514680>
- Ong, S. (2010). Predictors of psychological control: Marital conflict and intergenerational continuity of parenting. *International Journal of Learning*, 17(8), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9494/cgp/v17i08/47190>
- Otterpohl, N., Steffgen, S. T., Stiensmeier-Pelster, J., Brenning, K., & Soenens, B. (2020). The intergenerational continuity of parental conditional regard and its role in mothers' and adolescents' contingent self-esteem and depressive symptoms. *Social Development*, 29(1), 143–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12391>
- Ördek, S., & Aktaş Arnas, Y., (2020). Intergenerational Fatherhood and Father-Child Relationship. *Journal of Social Policy Studies*, 20(48), 687–714.

- Perris, C., Jacobsson, L., Linndström, H., von Knorring, L., & Perris, H. (1980). Development of a new inventory for assessing memories of parental rearing behaviour. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 61(4), 265-274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1980.tb00581.x>
- Pinquart, M. (2017). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with internalizing symptoms in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Marriage & Family Review*, 53(7), 613-640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2016.1247761>
- Raby, K. L., Lawler, J. M., Shlafer, R. J., Hesemeyer, P. S., Collins, W. A., & Sroufe, L. A. (2015). The interpersonal antecedents of supportive parenting: A prospective, longitudinal study from infancy to adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(1), 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038336>
- Repetti, R. L., Taylor, S. E., & Seeman, T. E. (2002). Risky families: Family social environments and the mental and physical health of offspring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(2), 330. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.2.330>
- Rothenberg, W. A. (2019). Intergenerational continuity in parenting: A review and theoretical integration. *Marriage & Family Review*, 55(8), 701–736. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2019.1589618>
- Savelieva, K., Pulkki-Råback, L., Jokela, M., Hintsanen, M., Merjonen, P., Hutri-Kähönen, N., Juonala, M., Viikari, J., Raitakari, O., & Keltikangas-Järvinen, L. (2017). Intergenerational continuity in qualities of the parent–child relationship: Mediating and moderating mechanisms. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(8), 2191–2201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0729-1>
- Sayıl, M., & Kındap, Y. (2010). Ergenin anne-babadan algıladığı psikolojik kontrol: Psikolojik kontrol ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirliği. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 13(25), 62-71.
- Sayıl, M., Kındap, Y., Bayar, Y., Bayraktar, F., Kurt, D., Tığrak, A., & Yaban, E. H. (2012). *Ergenlik döneminde ebeveynlik ve ergenin psikososyal uyumu*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Schaffer, H. R., & Crook, C. K. (1980). Child compliance and maternal control techniques. *Developmental Psychology*, 16(1), 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.16.1.54>
- Scharf, M., & Goldner, L. (2018). “If you really love me, you will do/be...”: Parental psychological control and its implications for children's adjustment. *Developmental Review*, 49, 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2018.07.002>
- Schofield, T. J., Conger, R. D., & Neppl, T. K. (2014). Positive parenting, beliefs about parental efficacy, and active coping: Three sources of intergenerational resilience. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(6), 973–978. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000024>

- Schneider, M., Falkenberg, I., & Berger, P. (2022). Parent-child play and the emergence of externalizing and internalizing behavior problems in childhood: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 822394. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.822394>
- Seay, D. M., Jahromi, L. B., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Updegraff, K. A. (2016). Intergenerational transmission of maladaptive parenting strategies in families of adolescent mothers: Effects from grandmothers to young children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 44, 1097-1109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-015-0091-y>
- Shek, D. T. L. (2007). Perceived Parental Control Based on Indigenous Chinese Parental Control Concepts in Adolescents in Hong Kong. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 35(2), 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926180600553480>
- Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Luyten, P. (2010). Toward a domain- specific approach to the study of parental psychological control: Distinguishing between dependency- oriented and achievement- oriented psychological control. *Journal of Personality*, 78(1), 217-256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00614.x>
- Strassberg, Z., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1994). Spanking in the home and children's subsequent aggression toward kindergarten peers. *Development and Psychopathology*, 6(3), 445-461. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400006040>
- Sun, L., Fu, Z., Li, P., & Gong, X. (2021). Chinese parenting beliefs in the intergenerational transmission of parental psychological control amongst Chinese families with adolescents. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02125-4>
- Sunar, D. (2002). Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family. In R. Liljestrom (Ed.), *Autonomy and dependence in the family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective* (pp.217-238). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203461129>
- Sunar, D. (2009). Mothers' and fathers' child-rearing practices and self-esteem in three generations of urban Turkish families. In S. Bekman & A. Aksu-Koç (Eds.), *Perspectives on human development, family, and culture* (pp. 126–139). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511720437.011>
- Sümer, N., Corapci, F., & Beşpınar, F. U. (2025). Uncovering parental ethnotheories in Türkiye: Parental beliefs and practices linkage. *Developmental Psychology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001967>

- Sümer, N., Gündoğdu Aktürk, E., & Helvacı, E. (2010). Anne-baba tutum ve davranışlarının psikolojik etkileri: Türkiye’de yapılan çalışmalara toplu bakış. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 13(25), 42-59.
- Sümer, N., Sayıl, M., Kazak-Berument, S., Doğruyol, B., Günaydın, G., Harma, M., Öztürk, A., Salman, S., Selçuk, E. (2009). Çocuğun gelişiminde bağlanma, ilgi-bakım ve aile dinamiklerinin etkisi. Fon no: TUBITAK-105K102
- Taraban, L., & Shaw, D. S. (2018). Parenting in context: Revisiting Belsky’s classic process of parenting model in early childhood. *Developmental Review*, 48, 55–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2018.03.006>
- Therborn, G. (2004). *Between sex and power: Family in the world, 1900–2000*. London: Routledge.
- Tepe, Y. K., & Sayıl, M. (2012). Ebeveyn Kontrolü ve Ergenin Sosyal İşlevselliği Arasındaki Bağlantıda İlişkisel Saldırganlığın Aracı Rolü. *Turkish Journal of Psychology/Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 27(70).
- Trifan, T. A., Stattin, H., & Tilton-Weaver, L. (2014). Have authoritarian parenting practices and roles changed in the last 50 years? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(4), 744–761. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12124>
- van der Bruggen, C. O., Stams, G. J., & Bögels, S. M. (2008). Research review: the relation between child and parent anxiety and parental control: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines*, 49(12), 1257–1269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.01898.x>
- Webster, L. L., Low, J., Siller, C., & Hackett, R. K. (2013). Understanding the Contribution of a Father's Warmth on His Child's Social Skills. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice About Men as Fathers*, 11(1), 90–113. <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/ed-facarticles/49>
- Yap, M. B. H., & Jorm, A. F. (2015). Parental factors associated with childhood anxiety, depression, and internalizing problems: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 175, 424-440. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2015.01.050>