

EXPECTATIONS AND CHILD REARING PRACTICES OF TURKISH
URBAN MIDDLE CLASS MOTHERS

MINE KAYRAKLI
105627009

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
PSİKOLOJİ YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

Prof. Dr. Diane Sunar
2008

Expectations and Child Rearing Practices
of Turkish Middle Class Mothers

Orta Sınıf Türk Annelerin Çocuklarından
Beklentileri ve Yetiştirme Biçimleri

Mine Kayraklı
105627009

Prof. Dr. Diane Sunar :

Dr. Zeynep Çatay :

Doç. Dr. Ayşe Ayçiçeği Dinn :

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih :

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı:

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Annelerin beklentileri
- 2) Çocuk yetiştirme biçimleri
- 3) Cinsiyet rol gelişimi
- 4) Cinsiyete ilişkin önyargılar
- 5) Annenin çalışması

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

- 1) Maternal expectations
- 2) Child rearing practices
- 3) Sex role identification
- 4) Sex role stereotypes
- 5) Maternal employment

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate expectations and child-rearing practices of Turkish urban middle class mothers along with some of their consequences. Maternal expectations were explored in the domains of sex preference, educational attainment, marriage age and marriage type. Parenting practices were compared on dimensions of control, affection, discipline and independence. A short, third-person form of Block's Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR) and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) were administered to 90 children, 13-16 years old, who were attending either eighth or ninth grade of two private high schools in Istanbul, and the "Expectations questionnaire" was completed by their mothers. The first hypothesis, proposing that mothers will prefer daughters over sons, was supported. As predicted, mothers were found to hold egalitarian attitudes toward both sexes in educational attainment and marriage patterns. Mothers expected both sexes to complete university education and encouraged sons and daughters to have a love marriage. The results also supported the universal pattern that girls are expected to marry at a younger age than sons. The impact of mothers' parenting styles on daughters' sex-role identification was also explored. As hypothesized, daughters of affectionate and controlling mothers were found to endorse more feminine characteristics. However, the hypothesis suggesting that mothers exert more

control over daughters was not supported. Boys are found to perceive more maternal control compared to girls. Lastly, sex-role stereotyping of children as a function of maternal employment was studied. No such effect of maternal employment upon children's stereotyping was found. The findings are discussed and suggestions are offered for further research.

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı orta sosyoekonomik düzeydeki şehirli annelerin beklentilerini ve çocuk yetiştirme biçimlerini incelemektir. Annelerin beklentilerinin eğitim ve evlilik alanlarında kız veya erkek çocuklarına göre farklılık gösterip göstermediği ve annelerin cinsiyet tercihleri araştırılmıştır. Çocuk yetiştirme biçimleri başlıca kontrol, şefkat, disiplin ve bağımsızlığın desteklenmesi boyutları üzerinden değerlendirilmiştir. İstanbul'daki iki özel okulun sekizinci veya dokuzuncu sınıflarına devam eden 13-16 yaşları arasındaki 90 çocuğa Çocuk Yetiştirme Biçimleri Raporu'nun (CRPR) üçüncü şahıs, kısa formları ve Bem Cinsiyet Rollerini Anketi (BSRI) uygulanmıştır. 'Beklentiler Anketi' bu çocukların anneleri tarafından doldurulmuştur. Annelerin tek çocukları olsa kız çocuğu tercih edeceklerine ilişkin ilk hipotez doğrulanmıştır. Beklenildiği gibi, annelerin eğitim düzeyi ve evlenme tipi olarak her iki cinsten de eşit beklentiler içinde olduğu bulunmuştur. Anneler hem kız hem de erkek çocuklarının mutlaka üniversiteyi bitirmelerini beklemekte ve kendi eşlerini kendilerinin seçmelerini desteklemektedir. Sonuçlar aynı zamanda kızların erkeklerden daha erken yaşta evlenmelerine ilişkin evrensel beklentiye doğrular niteliktedir. Annelerin tutumlarının kız çocuklarının cinsiyet rol gelişimi üzerindeki etkisi de araştırılmıştır. Şefkatli ama kontrolcü annelerin kız çocuklarının daha kadınsı özellikler gösterdiği bulunmuştur.

Diğer yandan annelerin kız çocuklarına daha kontrolcü yaklaştıklarına ilişkin hipotez doğrulanmamıştır. Kız çocuklarına oranla erkek çocukların annelerini daha kontrolcü olarak algıladıkları bulunmuştur. Son olarak, çocukların cinsiyetlere ilişkin önyargılarının annenin çalışma statüsüne göre farklılık gösterip göstermediği araştırılmıştır. Annenin iş hayatının çocukların cinsiyete yönelik önyargılarını etkilemediği bulunmuştur. Sonuçlar tartışılıp ileri araştırmalar için öneriler sunulmaktadır.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank many people whose contributions in various ways give me courage to go a step further until the completion of this thesis.

I would like to express my special thanks to Prof. Dr. Diane Sunar for her encouraging attitude, interest and supporting remarks she gave me in every step of the study.

I would like to thank to Dr. Zeynep Çatay for her helpful comments and contributions in the study.

I would like to thank to Doç. Dr. Ayşe Ayçiçeği Dinn for her valuable advice in this study.

I would like to express my thanks to the teachers and students of Avrupa Koleji and Taş Koleji for their participation and help in this study.

I would like to thank to Alev Çavdar for her help in the statistical analyses of the data.

I am grateful to my sister (Zeynep), Yücel Dikmen and Erhan Duman for their patience and eagerness to help me entering data.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents, Nefise and Orhan Kayraklı for their continuous support and encouragement all throughout my years of education and for supporting me in every step of this study.

Table of Contents

Title Page.....	i
Approval.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Özet.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Sex-Role Identification.....	2
1.2. Sex-Role Stereotypes.....	8
1.3. Gender Stereotypes and Sex Role Identification in Turkish Culture.....	14
1.4. Sex Typing in Expectations.....	16
1.5. Expectations in Urban Middle Class Turkish Family.....	21
1.6. Sex-typing in Child-Rearing Practices.....	27
1.7. Child Rearing Practices in Turkish Urban Middle Class Family.....	33
1.8. A Summary of the Literature and Hypotheses.....	37
2. Method.....	39
2.1. Respondents	39
2.2. Instruments.....	40
2.3. Procedure.....	44
3. Results.....	46
4. Discussion and Conclusion.....	51
5. References.....	62

6. Appendices.....	77
Appendix A: Block’s Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR)...	78
Appendix B: Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI).....	83
Appendix C: Expectations Questionnaire.....	93

List of Tables

Table 1. Frequency and percentages (in parentheses) of mothers' education level.....	39
Table 2. Frequencies and percentages (in parentheses) of maternal working status as a function of the sex of the child.....	40
Table 3. Means and standard deviations of each variable by sex of the child.....	46
Table 4. Sex preference of mothers as a function of sex of their children.....	47

1. Introduction

The impact of parents on children's psychological development is undeniable. Many parental variables such as gender, SES and education influence the values and attitudes of the parents toward their children. From birth, parents develop some expectations and attribute some stereotypic characteristics to their sons and daughters. Such gender stereotypes also affect childrearing practices of parents. However, the family does not exist in a vacuum. There is an interrelationship between the family and the culture (Brown, 1948; Stern, 1939). Many family values and norms have their roots in the culture. Thus, cultural changes always have an influence on the family and vice versa (Stern, 1939). In recent years, major economic and sociocultural changes have taken place in Turkey. Turkey is rapidly becoming a modern, urban, and industrial society (Ataca, 2006). This shift in Turkish society has also influenced the Turkish family, which plays a vital role in psychological and social development of children.

One way parents influence their children is through sex-role identification. Although both parents are involved in the development of children, various psychological theories put a special emphasis on the role of mother in children's gender-role development (Scott-Jones & Peebles-Wilkins, 1986; Starrels, 1992 as cited in Ex & Janssens, 1998; Thornton, Alwin & Camburn, 1983). This thesis aims to study mothers' expectations in the urban middle class Turkish family. In addition, maternal child-rearing practices and their impact on gender-role development will be

examined. The influence of culture, particularly gender stereotypes, will be also explored to gain a better understanding of parental expectations and child-rearing practices.

1.1. Sex-Role Identification

Sex-role identification refers to the internalization of the role typical of a given sex and to the unconscious reactions characteristic of that role (Lynn, 1966, p. 466). Sex-role identification can be easily confused with “parental identification,” so differentiation among these concepts is vital. “Sex-role identification” involves developing a feminine or masculine identity constructed within a particular culture (Lynn, 1963). Parental identification, on the other hand, involves internalization of a parent’s personality characteristics and behaving in a similar way (Lynn, 1966). Thus, a child can be poorly identified with the parent but well-identified with his/her sex-role or vice versa (Lynn, 1966).

Many theories have been formulated to account for the sex-role identification process. Psychodynamic theories claim that both sexes first identify with the mother and then around the age five, with the resolution of the Oedipal conflict, children identify with same sex parent (Lynn, 1961; Maccoby, 2000; Wittig, 1983). During this period, boys are expected to experience more difficulty than girls, because they have to shift from the initial mother identification and develop a new masculine identification (Lynn, 1976; Maccoby, 2000).

Another perspective on gender development is “social learning

theory". This theory suggests that children learn gender-appropriate behaviors through reinforcement, punishment and imitation (Mischel, 1966 as cited in Wittig, 1983). This theory assumes that parental identification precedes sex-role identification. According to social learning theory, children first identify with their mother since she is the first available role model and the primary reinforcer of the children. Then, as children are exposed more to the environment they begin to learn sex-role stereotypes (Meyer, 1980). One drawback of this theory is that it underestimates the child's capacity to construct his/her own meaning. In other words, it attributes a passive role to the child in his/her sex-role development process (Bem, 1983).

Cognitive-developmental theory (Kohlberg, 1966), on the other hand, assigns a primary role to the child in the gender-role development process. This theory assumes that first the child's cognitive development allows him/her to become aware of his/her gender and then, around the age of eight, the child starts to internalize the same-sex parent's behaviors (Helwig, 1998; Meyer, 1980; Wittig, 1983). Therefore, this theory assumes that gender identification precedes parental identification. The reasoning behind this theory is that children need more elaborated cognitive abilities to accomplish parental identification, so that they first have to develop gender identification. A study conducted by Meyer (1980) indicated that younger girls have more sex-typed behaviors than older girls and older girls are found to have sex-role attitudes very similar to their mothers. Thus, the research supported cognitive-developmental theory. O'Keefe and Hyde

(1983), however, found little evidence for Kohlberg's cognitive theory. In their study the stereotypical aspirations of children did not decrease with age (as cited in Helwig, 1998). Thus, the results of research on the validity of this theory are inconclusive.

Gender schema theory, developed by Bem (1981), emphasized the role of culture in sex-role development. Gender schema theory states that each society develops its own definitions of masculinity and femininity. Children learn about what it means to be feminine and masculine in that particular culture and they slowly develop a tendency to process information on the basis of these gender schemas. Therefore, the new incoming information is always biased since it is evaluated based on the preexisting views about gender. Such biased perceptions not only strengthen existing gender schemas, but also influence the development of the self-concept (Bem, 1981). In time, children start to choose their behaviors solely according to the gender role definitions of the society (Bem, 1983). Thus, the personality of the child also becomes consistent with the sex roles ascribed to his/her sex by the society (Bem, 1981; Bem, 1983).

Gender schema theory has some similarities with both social learning and cognitive-developmental theories. Like cognitive-developmental theory, it emphasizes the role of cognitive associations in acquiring sex-appropriate behaviors. However, gender schema theory further argues that it is the societal values and norms that lead to gender-schematic processing. Thus, like social learning theory, gender schema theory recognizes the role of learning in sex-role development (Bem, 1983).

In a way, gender-schema theory provides a synthesis of social learning and cognitive-developmental theories.

The emphasis on the role of culture in the sex-role identification process is evident in early studies. In his definition of sex-role identification, Lynn (1966) stated that in every society there are characteristics that are traditionally associated with males and those associated with females (Hoffman & Borders, 2001). Barry, Bacon and Child (1957) argued that female and male children are expected to develop feminine and masculine identities, which are already defined by the culture they live in.

Despite the recognition of the role of culture in sex-role identification, it is interesting that the concept of androgyny was developed in the 1970's (Hoffman & Borders, 2001). Androgyny means that a healthy woman or man can possess masculine and feminine characteristics simultaneously (Bem, 1975; Hoffman & Borders, 2001). Until the 1970's, femininity and masculinity were accepted as two distinct constructs and each sex was expected to internalize only the traits which are defined as desirable characteristics for that sex in that particular culture. Thus, women were expected to possess only feminine traits and men were expected to possess only masculine traits (Bem, 1975). The women's liberation movement in the 1960's led people to question these gender roles and "androgyny" was introduced as an alternative way of being (Bem, 1975).

Parents play an important role in sex-role identification of the children. Their personal beliefs, expectations and child-rearing attitudes are

very influential in shaping sex-role identity of the child (Lynn, 1963). However, mother and father are not involved in gender-role development of the child in the same way. A mother usually thinks of and accepts both sexes simply as “children” and acts towards them almost the same way. She adopts an expressive role and uses love-oriented techniques to control children. Usually a mother is understanding and solicitous so that she gives rewarding responses in order to receive rewarding responses (Johnson, 1955). Fathers, on the other hand, are usually more concerned with appropriate sex-role development of their children. By treating each sex in a different way, fathers significantly contribute to gender development of both sexes (Johnson, 1963; Lynn, 1976; Russell & Ellis, 1991). To accomplish this task, fathers adopt either expressive or instrumental roles depending on the sex of the child. They enhance femininity by adopting an expressive role toward their daughters’ and reinforce their sons’ gender role by adopting an instrumental role (Johnson, 1963). For instance, fathers show more affection, attention and praise to girls, whereas they put more pressure on boys (Bronfenbrenner, 1961 as cited in Lynn, 1976). It was found that attentive and protective fathers were more likely to enhance femininity in daughters. Less feminine women described their fathers as critical, distant and cold (Johnson, 1963). Several studies showed the correlation between masculinity in fathers and in sons (Lamb, 1987 as cited in Yang, 2000). Masculine-oriented boys also described their fathers as more punitive (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963 as cited in Lynn, 1976). However, it was also argued that fathers have only a small impact on their

sons' gender development. Lynn (1976) found that boys are "no more likely to imitate their fathers than they were to imitate their mothers or a man who was a stranger" (Lynn, 1976, p. 403).

Identification theory suggests that the roles of mother and father are equally important since children imitate both parents (Yang, 2000). Ideally both mother and the father should be involved in the gender role identification process (Biller, 1981 as cited in Yang, 2000). Therefore, the role of mothers in children's sex role development is no less important than that of fathers. Smith and Self (1980) found that maternal sex-role attitudes influence sex-role attitudes of their daughters. Russell and Ellis (1991) investigated sex-role development of children in single parent households. Results showed that when the single parent was the mother, both boys and girls were more likely to become androgynous individuals since mothers modeled non-traditional roles in the home. Therefore, mothers are influential in the sex-role development of both genders (Russell and Ellis, 1991).

In conclusion, various parental variables influence sex-role identification of children. Gender of the parent, parental beliefs, expectations, child-rearing practices and culture are all involved in this process. Therefore a further elaboration of these factors would be useful to gain a complete understanding of the gender-role development process.

1.2. Sex-Role Stereotypes

Gender or sex-role stereotypes are beliefs about characteristics, traits and behaviors that are accepted as appropriate for men and women (Berndt & Heller, 1986; Miller, Bilimoria & Pattni, 2000). These stereotypes are socially constructed (Draper, 1975; Harris, 1994; Hoffman & Hurst, 1990; Miller, Bilimoria & Pattni, 2000; Rosenberg, 1973; Sugihara & Katsurada, 1999; Vanfossen, 1977) and they are mainly transmitted through family and mass media (Martin & Ruble, 2004; Vanfossen, 1977). Advertisements, films, magazines, etc. implicitly communicate gender-roles (Kacerguis & Adams, 1979; Rosenberg, 1973; Vanfossen, 1977). Research indicates that children by the age of three have a good repertoire of stereotypes (Stoller, 1968 as cited in Goshen-Gottstein, 1981). Three year old children displayed toy preferences and they can successfully identify which activities are appropriate for each sex (Flerx, Fidler & Rogers, 1976).

Gender stereotypes are highly prescriptive (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Historically, in many societies men were associated with instrumental qualities whereas women were associated with expressive qualities (Bem, 1974). “Instrumentality” involves assertiveness, independence, engaging in performance-oriented behaviors and making decisions (Gerber, 1993; Spence, 1991). “Expressiveness” involves warmth, altruism, supportive behavior and ability to display emotions openly (Gerber, 1993; Spence, 1991). These stereotypes provide definite descriptions of male and female roles and both sexes are expected to show a strong compliance with these roles. The violation of these stereotypes can

result in some kind of punishment (Rudman & Glick, 1999 as cited in Prentice & Carranza, 2002). For instance, although “agentic” women were more likely to be hired for leadership positions, they were more disliked by other people since they do not fit the stereotype of “niceness” for women (Rudman & Glick, 2001). These stereotypes continue to exist in the society despite the fact that they limit the adaptability of men and women across different situations (Bem, 1975; Hoffman & Hurst, 1990; Rosenberg, 1973; Sharpe, Heppner, & Dixon, 1995). The reason is that these stereotypes give a sense of stability and security in the society (Hoffman & Hurst, 1990; Rosenberg, 1973).

Different theories have been developed to understand the development of gender stereotypes. Some of these theories such as social learning theory, cognitive-developmental theory and gender schema theory were mentioned above under sex-role development. These theories are also used to account for acquisition of gender stereotypes, so they are reexamined briefly here. Social learning theory argues that children develop gender role stereotypes by observing and imitating the selected role models in their lives. The rewards and punishments employed in response to children’s behaviors further enhance gender stereotypes. Cognitive developmental theory emphasizes the development of cognitive abilities in the acquisition of stereotypes (Albert & Porter, 1988). Gender schema theory synthesizes social learning and cognitive developmental models to some degree. This theory suggests that although cognitive structures

provide a basis for the acquisition of gender stereotypes, environment also contributes to its development (Albert & Porter, 1988).

Other theories have also been formulated to explain gender stereotype development in children. Evolutionary theory states that instrumental and expressive traits have their roots in human beings' efforts to adapt to environmental conditions. Prehistorically, men and women developed different strategies based on the differences in their reproductive roles. Males were not required to have a great investment in offspring, but they had to compete with other males to transmit their genes to as many offspring as possible. Thus, they adopted instrumental characteristics which ensured a more advantageous position in this competition. Females, on the other hand, were responsible for the survival of the offspring. Thus, they adopted more expressive traits such as altruism, nurturance, etc. (Lueptow, Garovich-Szabo & Lueptow, 2001). Social role theory states that stereotypes arise because men and women play different roles in society and these roles cause people to attribute different personality traits to each other (Eagly & Steffen, 1984 as cited in Hoffman & Hurst, 1990). The Rationalization Hypothesis, on the other hand, argues that stereotypes are simply the result of an effort to rationalize the division of labor in society. In other words, these stereotypes are developed to explain why men are the breadwinners and women are the homemakers. Attributing some inherent characteristics to both sexes provides a satisfactory explanation for this unequal distribution of responsibilities and it prevents people from further

questioning the rationale behind this division of labor (Hoffman & Hurst, 1990).

Gender stereotypes have always been an important area of interest in the field of psychology (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). However, systematic research on the content of gender stereotypes started with studies of sex-role identity (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). To construct masculinity and femininity scales, Bem (1974) asked male and female participants to rate a large pool of items on the basis of social desirability of these characteristics. Thus, Bem (1974) identified 20 feminine and 20 masculine traits which represent the gender stereotypes of the American society (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). The feminine traits are: affectionate, cheerful, childlike, compassionate, does not use harsh language, eager to soothe hurt feelings, feminine, flatterable, gentle, gullible, loves children, loyal, sensitive to the needs of others, shy, soft spoken, sympathetic, tender, understanding, warm and yielding (Bem, 1974, p. 156). The masculine traits are: acts as a leader, aggressive, ambitious, analytical, assertive, athletic, competitive, defends own beliefs, dominant, forceful, has leadership abilities, independent, individualistic, makes decisions easily, masculine, self-reliant, self-sufficient, strong personality, willing to take a stand and willing to take risks (Bem, 1974, p. 156).

Recent studies indicate that the stereotypes identified by Bem (1974) continue to exist in societies (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). A study conducted by Harris (1994) reveals that 19 of 19 masculine items (item “masculine” was not included) and 16 of 19 feminine items met Bem’s

criteria, suggesting the persistence of gender stereotypes in the U.S culture. Holt and Ellis (1998) also found that all masculine items and 18 of feminine items met Bem's criteria. However, they also found a decrease in the magnitude of difference scores for social desirability of the items for men and women. This finding shows that although these stereotypes prevail, they are not as rigid as before (Holt & Ellis, 1998).

Further studies of gender-stereotypes showed that not only desirable traits, but also socially undesirable qualities should be included in gender stereotypes (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Thus, certain feminine traits like "gullible" and some masculine traits like "arrogant" were also included (Prentice & Carranza, 2002).

The role of culture in the development of gender stereotypes has been already mentioned. Societal values and expectations are important determinants of sex-role stereotypes and they vary among different cultures and ethnic groups (Draper, 1975; Harris, 1994; Miller et al., 2000). Societies that hold more conservative religious beliefs are more likely to adopt traditional gender roles (Williams & Best, 1990 as cited in Miller et al., 2000). In addition, traditional cultures are found to maintain more conservative stereotypes compared to more modern cultures (Miller et al., 2000). Williams and Best (1990) also indicated that the difference between men and women on the variance of gender-stereotypes was smaller in highly developed countries (as cited in Özkan & Lajunen, 2005).

As the primary agent of socialization, parents transmit values and norms of the society to the child. Therefore, they also have a considerable

impact on the acquisition of sex-role stereotypes (Jones & Wilkins, 1986). Parents start to communicate gender differences beginning at birth and they continue to convey gendered messages through adolescence (Balswick & Avertt, 1977; Jones & Wilkins, 1986). Moreover, by acting as role models they further reinforce the development of gender stereotypes (Lynn, 1963). However, parental variables such as socioeconomic status and educational level influence the degree of these stereotypes (Johnson, Johnson & Martin, 1961). Parents from low SES are found to have a tendency to discriminate sex roles earlier and more strictly compared to parents from middle SES (Johnson, Johnson & Martin, 1961).

Many studies report that as the educational level and work status of the mother increases, children adopt more egalitarian sex-role beliefs (Spitze, 1988; Stephan & Corder, 1985; Thornton, Alwin & Camburn, 1983). Marantz and Mansfield (1977) studied the effect of maternal employment on the development of sex-role stereotyping in five to eleven year old girls. In this study, daughters of working mothers were found to have significantly less stereotypes than daughters of nonworking mothers. Another study on the effect of maternal employment on daughters' sex-role stereotypes revealed similar results. Daughters of employed mothers had less stereotyped views for both female and male roles (Hansson, Chernovetz & Jones, 1977). From the perspective of social-learning theory, the employed mothers would cause them to develop few gender stereotypes by providing a less traditional role model for their daughters (Hansson, et al., 1977).

Stereotypes also affect self-concept of individuals. Research indicates that individuals score higher on self-concept dimensions that are stereotypically associated with their gender (Jackson, Hodge & Ingram, 1994). Therefore, less stereotypic individuals are more likely to develop an androgynous self-concept and feel more comfortable enjoying cross-sex activities (Hansson, et al., 1977).

1.3. Gender Stereotypes and Sex Role Identification in Turkish Culture

Kağıtçıbaşı (1996) described Turkish culture as a “culture of relatedness” since it involves characteristics of both individualistic and collectivistic cultures (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985 as cited in Ataca, Kağıtçıbaşı & Diri, 2005). The Turkish family provides a good example of this synthesis. In the modern urban family, individuals are not economically, but emotionally interdependent with each other. Family members are emotionally very close to each other (Kağıtçıbaşı 1982, as cited in Ataca, Kağıtçıbaşı & Diri, 2005). These characteristics of Turkish culture suggest that there could be some stereotypes particular to Turkish society.

Turkish society can be identified as a culture containing highly prescriptive stereotypes. Turkish parents start to develop expectations before the child is born (Kağıtçıbaşı & Sunar, 1992). Therefore, socialization of gender roles starts very early.

Studies revealed that gender stereotypes in Turkish society are different from Western cultures (Özkan & Lajunen, 2005). Sunar (1982)

found that Turkish men evaluated Turkish women as more childish, more dependent, less intelligent, more emotional, more irrational, more submissive, less straightforward, more passive, more ignorant, more honest, more industrious and weaker than men. Gürbüz (1985) also studied gender stereotypes in Turkish society. She found that in Turkish society certain traits such as “affectionate”, “cheerful,” “gentle,” “sympathetic,” “soft-spoken,” “eager to soothe hurt feelings,” “sensitive to the needs of others” and “loyal” were equally descriptive for both men and women. The same research also revealed that while certain male-associated traits like “independent,” “aggressive”, and “individualistic” were undesirable characteristics for both sexes, “dependency” was defined as a desirable trait for both sexes.

Recently, Özkan and Lajunen (2005) examined the gender stereotypes in Turkish society. The BSRI was administered to 536 university students in Ankara. The results indicated a change in the values of Turkish society. For instance, characteristics like “affectionate,” “sympathetic,” and “sensitive to needs of others”, which were previously reported as desirable for both men and women were defined as feminine traits by this sample. In addition, the findings suggested that Turkish female students had developed a more masculine gender role within the last 10 years. Traits which were previously associated only with males became desirable also for females. Such change in gender roles of women can be explained by rapid urbanization and increased educational opportunities provided to females. However, there were also traits such as

“aggressiveness” which were still defined as undesirable for both sexes (Özkan & Lajunen, 2005). Therefore, despite the changes occurring in Turkish society, certain values continue to persist.

1.4. Sex Typing in Expectations

From birth, parents develop different expectations for their sons and daughters, and attribute some stereotypic characteristics to them (Chick, Heilman-Houser & Hunter, 2002; Goshen-Gottstein, 1981). Thus, expectations contained within the stereotypes form a part of the cultural background and guide the social construction of gender (Miller et al., 2000). Most parents start to develop some expectations as soon as they learn the gender of the infant (Sandnabba & Ahlberg, 1999). Rubin, Provenzano and Luria (1974) found that parents tend to describe their newborn sons as more alert, stronger, and firmer than daughters with equivalent size and weight (Kacerguis & Adams, 1979). The daughters, on the other hand, were perceived as delicate, softer and more awkward (Kacerguis & Adams, 1979). In another study, people are observed that they responded differently to the same 3-month old infant when the baby was labeled as boy or girl (Seavey et al., 1975 as cited in Goshen-Gottstein, 1981).

Although parents have many expectations, studying all of them is beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, three of them, namely, sex preference, educational attainment and marriage type will be discussed.

Sex preference is a parental expectation that has been extensively studied. Compared to developed countries, a strong boy preference is

reported in developing countries (as cited in Hank & Kohler, 2002) and in rural areas (Liu & Gu, 1998; Malhi, 1995 as cited in Gonzalez & Koestner, 2005). Improvements in women's rights and educational system, participation of women in the work force, and mass media significantly influence sex preference of parents (Coleman et al., 1989; Dinitz, Dynes & Clarke, 1954). Currently, well-educated, high SES parents value psychological reasons such as joy or love in having children, and show a daughter preference (Hank & Kohler, 2002). In rural settings, on the other hand, boy preference still prevails since parents put more emphasis on the economic benefits of children. These parents expect their male children to contribute to the family economy and support their parents in their old age. Preference for sons is also more prevalent in patriarchal societies, where the child is expected to continue the family name (Hank & Kohler, 2002). Although there seems to be a rural-urban difference in parental sex preference, there are also studies indicating that son preference prevails even in some developed countries. For instance, strong boy preference was found in the U.S. and Canada (Gonzalez & Koestner, 2005).

Educational attainment of children is influenced by several factors such as state policies, economy and family. It is the state that determines the duration of compulsory education and is responsible for the allocation of educational resources. Industrialization and urbanization also reinforce educational achievement since well-educated, skilled individuals are more likely to get good, high-paying jobs (Rankin & Aytac, 2006). Familial variables such as social and economic resources, size of the family and

family values also influence school attainment of children (Rankin & Aytac, 2006). Research indicates that in developing countries, girls are less likely to attend school (Knodel, 1997; Wils & Goujon, 1998). In these countries, lack of a social welfare system causes parents to expect their children to look after them when they get old. Daughters are not good candidates to support their elderly parents since they are not the breadwinners and they leave the family when they get married. Thus, males become the candidates for providing economic and social resources to the parents and, with that expectation, get the biggest share of the family resources including schooling (Wei, 2005). Secondly, the prevalence of patriarchal attitudes increases the gender gap in educational achievement. In patriarchal societies, boys are valued over girls, so parents are more willing to invest in boys' education (Lee, 1998; as cited in Wei, 2005; Rankin & Aytac, 2006). In all Asian countries, families invest more in their male children (Wei, 2005). However, research also shows that as the level of education and socioeconomic status of the society improves parents adopt a more egalitarian view (Knodel, 1997; Moore, 1987; Shu, 2004) and equal educational opportunities are likely to be provided for girls and boys (Knodel, 1997; Wils & Goujon, 1998). For instance, in the past more boys were attending primary and secondary schools in Taiwan. However, socioeconomic developments and cultural changes coupled with compulsory education policy of the state increased the number of female students (Wei, 2005). In the U.S, a developed, industrialized society with a high literacy rate, the number of girls is equal to the number of males who complete

college education (Mare, 1995; as cited in Carter & Wojtkiewicz, 2000). Therefore, educational and socioeconomic factors play an important role in parental attitudes toward education of sons and daughters.

Lastly, parents develop a set of expectations regarding the marriage type of their children. Basically there are two types of marriage: arranged marriage and love marriage. In arranged marriage older family members choose whom their child will marry (Fox, 1975; Xiaohe & Whyte, 1990). Thus, older people maintain control and do not let young people make their own decisions for marriage. In arranged marriage, mates are selected based on their family status and economic status (Xiaohe & Whyte, 1990; Pimental, 2000). Love marriage, on the other hand, encourages the independence of young people since it allows them to choose their own mate (Fox, 1975; Xiaohe & Whyte, 1990) and love is the primary criterion for choosing a mate (Pimental, 2000). Arranged marriage is common among rural, traditional families whereas love marriage is seen in modern, urban settings (Fox, 1975; Pimental, 2000). Although love marriage is more common in Western culture, the widespread availability of mass media has transmitted Western values to other cultures, which influenced marriage patterns in these cultures as well (Theodorson, 1965).

In almost every culture, women marry at a younger age than men (Bozon, 1991, Witwer, 1993). Different theories have been developed to account for this age gap between men and women. One theory states that women exchange their youth and beauty for men's social status and economic power. However, the age gap is also observed in relationships

where men have equal or less economic power than their mates. Therefore, an alternative explanation is needed. One possible explanation could be the fact that men and women feel ready for their “adult” roles at different ages (Bozon, 1991). In other words, women may reach emotional maturity earlier than men. Research also indicated that emotional maturity played an important role in marital adjustment of spouses (Cole, Cole & Dean, 1980).

Although this age gap continues to exist, the average age at first marriage is rising for both sexes in most industrial countries. For instance, in the United States the mean age at first marriage was 22.7 for men and 20.3 for women in 1968 (Bayer, 1968). In the period from 2000 to 2003, this age increased to 27 for men and 25 years old for women (Johnson & Dye, 2005). Such increase in individuals’ age at first marriage is not only evident in European countries, but also in other developing countries like Japan, Korea and Malaysia (Elm & Hirschman, 1979; Lapierre-Adamcyk & Burch, 1974; Retherford, Ogawa & Matsukura, 2001). Different factors such as increased educational attainment, women’s participation in the labor force, and urbanization influenced this increase in the age at marriage (Bozon, 1991; Lapierre-Adamcyk & Burch, 1974). High rate of school attendance is typically associated with delayed marriage since it can change one’s life view and provide employment opportunities (Bozon, 1991; Lapierre-Adamcyk & Burch, 1974). Employment status is also an important factor in a marriage decision, because partners need to earn necessary income to look after the household. Currently, more women participate in the workforce and contribute to the family economy (Lapierre-

Adamcyk & Burch, 1974). Lastly, urbanization enhances delayed marriage by providing more educational and occupational opportunities to individuals (Lapierre-Adamcyk & Burch, 1974).

Several studies report a decrease in the sex-typed expectations of parents. It is argued that parents have similar expectations from their children in terms of personality traits, interests and abilities (Minuchin, 1965). This tendency (less dichotomous sex-role standards) is especially common among middle class, well-educated parents (Minuchin, 1965). Fisher (1978) stated that in rural areas parents are more likely to hold conventional beliefs and their opportunity to adopt new values is quite limited due to the a limited relationship with people outside the family (as cited in Coleman, Ganong, Clark & Madsen, 1989). Thus, their existing values are further strengthened and cultural change occurs more slowly (Coleman, Ganong, Clark & Madsen, 1989). In urban areas, on the other hand, people are exposed to a variety of information, which renders them more open to new ways of thinking (Coleman, Ganong, Clark & Madsen, 1989). In recent years, improvements in technology, particularly mass-media lowered the urban and rural discrepancy. However, some difference still remained between these two settings (Hennon & Marotz & Baden, 1987).

1.5. Expectations in Urban Middle Class Turkish Family

Turkey is at the crossroads between Asia and Europe and this unique geographic position has a profound impact on social and cultural values and

norms (Ataca et al., 2005; Ataca, 2006). At present, Turkey's population is quite heterogeneous, including ethnic Turks, Kurds, Armenians, Greeks, Circassians, Laz, Gypsies, Syrians, and Sephardic Jews as well as other smaller groups. In other words, different subcultures coexist in Turkish society. In addition to this cultural multiplicity, for the past several years Turkey has been undergoing a rapid social change. Traditional, rural, patriarchal society has been transformed to a modern, urban, industrial and egalitarian one (Ataca et al., 2005). Thus, cultural diversity coupled with rapid socioeconomic changes in Turkey led to the emergence of various family types in Turkey (Ataca et al., 2005; Ataca, 2006). Now, more modern, western values exist in the urban setting, which influence middle class urban parents' expectations for their children including sex preference, educational attainment and type of marriage.

Research indicates that low-SES rural parents and middle class urban parents differ in their sex preference for children. Son preference is particularly widespread among rural parents (Ataca et al., 2005; Sunar, 2002, Ataca, 2006), whereas urban middle class families show a preference for daughters over sons (Ataca & Sunar, 1999). Such differences between rural and urban areas can be explained with the type of value parents attribute to their children.

Three types of values were defined to identify reasons for parents to have children, namely psychological, social and economic reasons (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; Klaus & Suckow, 2002). The economic/ utilitarian values involve children's material contribution to the family. For instance,

when they are young, children can help with housework and when they grow up they can fulfill old age security function for their parents.

Psychological value includes emotional reasons for having children such as love, joy, pride and companionship. Lastly, social values involve social benefits of having a child such as continuation of family name and social status (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005).

Kağıtçıbaşı (1982) emphasized the relationship between the developmental level of the society and type of value assigned to children. It is argued that the economic value of the child is heavily emphasized in less developed, rural settings; whereas psychological value of the child has priority in more developed, urban areas (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). Research supported this hypothesis and showed that as the SES and education level of the family improves the economic value of the child decreases and the psychological value of the child increases (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). This relationship between the developmental level of the society and type of value attributed to children also influence the sex preference of parents. In Turkey, son preference is more prevalent in rural areas, where the economic value of the children is the primary motivation behind childbearing (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982 as cited in Sunar, 2002). As breadwinners, sons are expected to contribute to family economy (Sunar, 2002) and act as old age security (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). Sons are also preferred because they can carry the male line and the birth of a son brings the mother considerable status and security within the family (Sunar, 2002). Urban middle class parents, on the other hand, stress psychological values as the primary motivation for

having children and they show a daughter preference (Ataca et al., 2005). A cross-generation study conducted by Sunar (2002) indicated that this tendency increased over three generations in upper-middle class families. Ataca and Sunar (1999) showed that urban class women emphasized psychological reasons such as “to love” and “to be loved” rather than financial expectations for having children (as cited in Ataca, 2006). Moreover, urban middle class mothers are found to perceive daughters as better supporters in the old age (Ataca & Sunar, 1999 as cited in Ataca, 2006). The reason is that with the term “support” these mothers perceived an emotional support from their children (Ataca, et al., 2005).

Parents’ expectations about educational attainment of their children also vary depending on the sex of the child. Following the establishment of Republic in 1923, several educational reforms were carried out in Turkey. In this period, the state strongly encouraged female attendance to school (Rankin & Aytaç, 2006). Although these reforms succeeded in reducing the illiteracy rate in the society, they did not eliminate gender inequality. Research indicates that although gender inequality in education continues to exist in Turkey, the degree of this gender gap varies with the level of industrialization and urbanization of the context in which the family lives.

Rankin and Aytaç (2004) studied the effect of region, city size and family background on junior high school attainment. In their study, they included 16 year-old adolescents. The results revealed that in economically developed Western regions and in metropolitan areas educational attainment of both girls and boys were higher and the gender gap was smaller

compared to rural, Eastern regions of Turkey. Their study also showed that parental education influences children's, particularly girls', school attendance in a positive way. Another study conducted by Rankin and Aytac (2006) examined the factors influencing post primary education of children. The results showed that living in an urban area and higher educational level of parents increased girls' chances of attending postprimary education. The emphasis on psychological value of children also encourages parents to treat their sons and daughters in a more egalitarian way (Ataca, 2006). Thus, urban middle class parents started to provide equal educational opportunities for boys and girls (Erkut, 1982).

Maternal employment and the presence of younger siblings, on the other hand, are among the factors which decrease girls' educational attainment. The reason is that girls were expected to look after younger siblings or complete household chores in the absence of the mother. Lastly, fathers who hold very traditional gender-role expectations or have religious traditional beliefs are likely to favor sons' education over daughters. Therefore, fathers' sex-role beliefs and religiosity also affect girls' educational attainment (Rankin and Aytac, 2004).

Socio-economic changes in Turkey also influence parental expectations regarding the marriage type of their children. The type of marriage usually varies between rural and urban settings. Arranged marriage is more common in rural areas, where the concept of honor is a highly valued cultural practice. Honor is about the sexual behavior of women and it is protected by the men of the family. In traditional families,

men are given the right to control females' behavior for protecting their honor. Such restriction in female behavior is also present in their decisions, including marriage decisions. In rural areas, women are expected to conform to marriage decisions taken by older members of the family (Ataca, 2006). In urban settings, on the other hand, honor is a less important value and more emphasis is put on love, personal fulfillment and happiness (Sunar, 2002). In addition, middle class urban families give more autonomy to young a person, which also enables them to choose their own marriage partners (Ataca, 2006). However, despite the relative freedom given to young people, cohabitation without marriage is still rare in Turkey (Sunar & Fişek, 2005).

According to the present Civil Code, the minimum age of marriage is 18 years and the consent of both bride and groom is required for legal marriage (Ataca, 2006). In Turkey, mean age at first marriage has also gradually increased over time. In 1995, the mean age at marriage was 22 for women and 25 for men (SIS, 1995; as cited in Ataca et al, 2005). In 2006, the averages were 23 for women and 26 for men (NVI, 2006). Turkey Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS), which was conducted in 2003, also showed a significant increase of the mean age at first marriage for both men and women. This research also indicated a high nuptiality rate in Turkey. Overall, 88% of women age 25-49 were found to marry before they reach their 30's and only 2% of these women have never married (TDHS, 2003). Another important finding of this study was the positive correlation between women's education level and mean age at first marriage. The mean

age of marriage of women with at least a high school education was found to be approximately 7 years higher compared to women with no education (TDHS, 2003).

1.6. Sex-typing in Child-Rearing Practices

To what extent parents treat girls and boys differently and its impact on children's psychosocial development has been an important area of interest of social scientists. In the literature, parents are repeatedly found to treat their sons and daughters differently (Coleman et al., 1989; Goshen-Gottstein, 1981; Lewis, 1972; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974 as cited in Lytoon & Romney, 1991; Scott-Jones & Peebles-Wilkins, 1986).

Cross-cultural studies also validate the existence of such differential treatment (Whiting & Whiting, 1975 as cited in Goshen-Gottstein, 1981). From birth, parents are found to behave in a gender-specific way (Campenni, 1999; Chick et al., 2002). For instance, they buy different toys and clothes for boys and girls (Scott-Jones & Peebles-Wilkins, 1986) or they simply decorate the rooms of male and female children differently (Rheingold & Cook, 1975). In addition, parents have a tendency to interact differently with girls and boys. For instance, parents use loving words such as "honey" to call girls while they call boys simply by their name (Chick et al, 2002).

Martin (1995) emphasized that parents' gender stereotypes influence their behaviors toward their children. Parents use these stereotypes as a reference point for evaluating children's behavior (Kohlberg, 1966 as cited

in Martin, 1995) and reward or punish them accordingly (Chick et al, 2002; Mischel, 1966 as cited in Martin, 1995). While girls were praised for their dress, hairstyle and helping behavior, boys were praised for their size and physical abilities.

Expectations contained in the stereotypes further influence the way parents interact with their children (Miller et al., 2000). Chick et al. (2002) conducted a study to investigate the variations in parental attitudes toward boys and girls. The results revealed that caregivers showed different reactions to boys and girls' high activity level. Boys' high activity level was not questioned by the caregivers and accepted as an inherent characteristic of boys. On the other hand, girls were repeatedly cautioned by caregivers and sometimes they were even asked to stop their play. Several studies also indicate that aggressiveness displayed by boys is more tolerated compared to girls' aggressiveness (Goshen-Gottstein, 1981). Parents also exert more control over girls (Pomerantz & Ruble, 1998).

Research indicates that caregivers believe that there are socially appropriate toys for each gender (Chick et al., 2002; Martin, 1995; Fisher & Thompson, 1990). For instance, girls were provided with kitchen sets and baby dolls, whereas boys were given cars and blocks. Langlois and Downs (1980) observed that parents not only encouraged their children to play with gender-appropriate toys, but they also reacted to them negatively when children showed interest in cross-sex toys. Caregivers even selected the color of the toys in a gender stereotyped way (Chick et al, 2002). Campenni (1999) argued that even though both sexes are provided gender appropriate

toys, parents put a special emphasis on boys' socialization with gender-appropriate toys.

The gender of the parent also influences their child-rearing practices. It seems that mothers and fathers put different emphasis on different domains of child development. While mothers focus on social and emotional development of children, fathers emphasize physical and intellectual development (Coleman et al., 1989). This division of labor between mother and father in raising their children also supports the expressive and instrumental role theory of gender roles (Coleman et al., 1989). Fathers are more concerned with the socialization of boys (Nye, 1976 as cited in Coleman et al., 1989; Harris & Morgan, 1991). Mothers, on the other hand, encourage more helping behavior in girls (Goshen-Gottstein, 1981) and they talk more to their daughters and encourage them to verbalize their experiences (Cherry & Lewis, 1976). Interestingly, mothers are usually unaware of their gender-typed behaviors (Goshen-Gottstein, 1981).

Parents' socioeconomic status and level of education also affect their child rearing practices (Coleman et al., 1989; Ex & Janssens, 1998). In the literature, the relationship between SES of the parents and their child-rearing practices has been repeatedly shown. Kohn (1963) suggested that social class of the family influences parental values, which cause parents to employ different child-rearing practices (as cited in Luster, Rhoades & Haas, 1989). Probably, economic factors influence the way masculinity and femininity are conceptualized in a particular family (Johnson, et al., 1989).

Children of working-class parents are found to adopt more traditional sex-role characteristics compared to children of middle class families (Rabban, 1950; Romer & Cherry, 1980). Low-SES parents have a tendency to emphasize conformity to external authority. These parents expect their children to be obedient and display good manners and they are more likely to differentiate between sex-roles (Johnson et al., 1989; Kohn, 1963). High-SES parents, on the other hand, value other qualities such as self-control and responsibility (as cited in Luster et al., 1989).

Culture is a very important factor since many principles about parenting are learned from cultural beliefs (Coleman et al., 1989). Cross-cultural studies showed that child-rearing practices may vary from one society to another since each society has some values and norms unique to that particular community. Karr and Wesley (1966) compared American and German child-rearing practices. They found that American and German parents were more controlling in different domains. German mothers were more controlling in toilet training, homework, and table manners, whereas American parents were more likely to exert control for personal hygiene, sex behavior, sports and church. Moreover, German parents were found to use more punishment compared to American parents (Karr & Wesley, 1966). Lin and Fu (1990) studied cultural differences in child-rearing practices among Chinese and immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. In this study, both Chinese, immigrant Chinese groups were found to exercise more control and put more emphasis on achievement than Caucasian-American parents. Therefore, cross-cultural studies also

confirmed the cultural variations in child-rearing practices (Ryback, Sanders, Lorentz & Koestenblatt, 1980).

Although child rearing practices vary both within culture and cross-culturally, it is possible to identify some general patterns in parenting styles. Baumrind (1966) described three parenting styles based on the degree of control exercised by parents and their responsiveness to children, namely “permissive”, “authoritarian”, and “authoritative” parenting. Permissive parents do not exert firm control over children’s behavior and impulses. Instead they are very tolerant of children’s desires and actions and they expect children to regulate their own behaviors. Authoritarian parents emphasize obedience to their strict rules. These parents are highly demanding, but rarely responsive to the needs of the child. They usually use punishment instead of rewards. Authoritative parents are able to exert firm control on children’s behavior. In addition, they share the reasoning behind their rules with children and allow children to exercise some independency within the existing limits (Baumrind, 1966; Carter & Welch, 1981).

Parenting styles have important consequences on children’s academic, social and psychological development. For instance, authoritarian parenting style is usually negatively related to academic achievement (Baumrind, 1966). A cross-cultural study conducted in Hong Kong, United States, and Australia revealed that children of over demanding and non rewarding authoritarian parents had poor academic performance (Leung, Lau & Lam, 1998). In another study, Asian American children who had

authoritarian parents were found to perform poorly at school (Dornbusch et al., 1987 as cited in Leung, Lau & Lam, 1998). Interestingly, permissive parenting style was also found to contribute to a significant decrease in the academic performance of children (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts & Fraleigh, 1987). Research indicates that children of authoritative parents had higher academic achievement than those whose parents adopted authoritarian or permissive parenting styles (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts & Fraleigh, 1987). Parenting styles play an important role in the development of self-concept formation and self-esteem of children. Parental evaluations create a basis for children to evaluate themselves. Klein, O'Bryant and Hopkins (1996) found that children of authoritative parents are likely to develop a more positive self-concept compared to children of authoritarian parents. In addition, maternal acceptance was strongly associated with child self-esteem (Burger, 1975). All children need to be loved and accepted by their parents and when such need is unmet, the child may have difficulty in psychological adjustment (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002).

Parenting styles also influence discipline strategies used by parents. These strategies have important consequences on children's development. For instance, punitive punishments, which are usually practiced by authoritarian parents may cause emotional problems such as personality disorders, acting out, hostile behaviors in children (Baumrind, 1966). It is important to differentiate firm parental control from punishment. For years, parental control has been described as a negative parental attitude, which

can cause psychological problems in children. However, the degree of parental control and how it is exercised are the most important criteria in predicting children's developmental outcomes. For instance, while rigidity may provoke passive aggressive behavior or rebelliousness, moderate control helps children to learn how to regulate their own behaviors (Baumrind, 1966).

Child-rearing practices also play an important role in the sex-role identification process of children (Hastings, Utendale & Sullivan, 2007 as cited in Hastings, McShane, Parker & Ladha, 2007). Mothers' authoritative style fosters femininity in daughters and masculinity in sons. In other words, mothers who were affectionate and able to exert firm control on their children have children who display more sex specific characteristics. Authoritative parents may enhance sex role development by creating a positive atmosphere in which children are willing to receive parents' values and messages (Hastings et al., 2007). Other studies also have shown the impact of parental variables such as nurturance and power on children sex-role development (Luetgert, Barry and Greenwald, 1972). McDonald's (1977) social power theory emphasizes that the parent who holds the power in the family is more likely to be chosen by the child as the sex-role identification figure (Acock & Yang, 1984).

1.7. Child-Rearing Practices in Turkish Urban Middle Class Family

In all societies parents mainly rely on their own socialization experiences in raising their children. In addition, they take cultural norms

and values as a reference point to determine their child-rearing goals regarding authority, affection (Smith & Mosby, 2003). Although each culture has some unique aspects, they can be mainly grouped as individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Individualism refers to a cultural organization where the individual's goals and desires have priority over the family or group needs and the "self" is described as independent of other group members. Collectivism, on the other hand, is marked by interdependence and the priority of group needs over individuals' goals (Brand, 2004; Sunar, 2002; Triandis, 1994 as cited in Gire, 1997). This individualistic or collectivistic nature of the society has certain implications for child-rearing practices. For instance, in an individualistic culture, parents are likely to encourage independence in children, whereas in a collectivistic culture, parents put more emphasis on interdependence in the family (Sunar, 2002). Although Turkey was first identified in the collectivistic spectrum, later studies indicated that both individualistic and collectivistic values are present in Turkish culture. Therefore, child-rearing practices of Turkish parents are expected to combine both individualistic and collectivistic values (Sunar, 2002).

As a small representative of the wider culture, the Turkish family provides a good example of this synthesis. In the modern urban family, individuals are not economically, but emotionally interdependent with each other. Although the family structure is predominantly nuclear, there are strong ties among extended family members. They are emotionally very close to each other and they frequently interact with each other (Kağıtçıbaşı

1982, as cited in Ataca, Kağıtçıbaşı & Diri, 2005). Such interdependence is also evident in child-rearing practices. For strengthening family unity, high emphasis is placed on conformity, obedience and dependence and characteristics like autonomy and assertiveness are discouraged in both sexes (Sunar, 2002). Thus, to maintain the harmonious functioning of the family, parents exert considerable control over their children, particularly their daughters. Research showed that parents allow more independence and aggressiveness for the boys (Başaran, 1974 as cited in Ataca, 2005) whereas they tend to be more protective of their daughters and limit their activities due to the honor tradition (Ataca et al, 2005; Sunar, 2002). Therefore, girls are expected to be more obedient and dependent on their parents compared to boys (Ataca, 2006).

Turkish mothers express their affection toward children in both word and action. Fathers are also affectionate to their children, but as children grow up they become the authority figure of the family, which prevents them from showing their affection openly. Although children are encouraged to express their positive feelings toward parents, they are not allowed to communicate their anger toward parents (Ataca, et al, 2005). In the traditional Turkish family, control tends to be expressed in anxiety or shame inducing terms (Sunar, 2002) and physical punishment is also used in disciplining children (Kağıtçıbaşı, Sunar & Bekman, 1988, as cited in Sunar, 2002).

In recent times, urban middle class, educated parents have been using less gendered child rearing practices. Significant increases in the

psychological value of the child and decreased importance of family honor have led urban parents to treat their sons and daughters in a more egalitarian manner (Sunar, 2002). In the urban setting, the economic value of the child has significantly decreased due to the presence of alternative old-age security sources. Moreover, raising a child itself became a major cost in the urban setting, which led urban parents to put less emphasis on loyalty to the family. Parents started to encourage independence of their children since success at school and work life also became important criteria (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Thus, urban parents started to give more autonomy to their children despite the relative control of daughters (Sunar, 2002). The increase in the psychological value of the child also strengthened the emotional ties in family, particularly between mother and children (Sunar, 2002). In the urban setting, parents, particularly mothers express their affection openly. In addition, use of physical punishment is also replaced by more supportive techniques such as reward and reasoning (Sunar, 2002).

A research conducted by Sunar (in press) investigated Turkish parents' child rearing practices based on four dimensions, namely affection, control, discipline, and autonomy. Results revealed that while mothers were perceived as more affectionate, fathers were perceived as exercising more control and discipline, but at the same time encouraging autonomy of children. The relationship between child rearing practices and sex-role development of children was also examined. Father's discipline was negatively related to girls' sex-role identification (Sunar, in press). Masculine sex-role identification, on the other hand, is reinforced in the

presence of a father who uses reasoning as a discipline method and encourages autonomy of the child. Masculinity is further reinforced in the presence of a critical, controlling mother since she does not represent a very inviting model for imitation (Sunar, 2002).

1.8. A Summary of the Literature and Hypotheses

From birth, parents develop different expectations for their sons and daughters, and attribute stereotypic characteristics to them. Such gender stereotypes also influence childrearing practices. In addition, expectations contained within sex-role stereotypes influence the social construction of gender. Therefore, there is an interplay between expectations, stereotypes, child rearing practices and the cultural norms and values of society.

For the past several years Turkey has been undergoing a rapid social change due to industrialization and urbanization together with expanded educational opportunities. Such socioeconomic changes influence existing gender stereotypes in the society. Now, more modern, western values exist in the urban setting, which influence urban middle class parents' expectations of their children including sex preference, educational attainment and marriage patterns. This study aims to study the following hypotheses:

Hypotheses Related to Maternal Expectations:

Hypothesis 1. Urban middle class Turkish mothers will prefer daughters over sons.

Hypothesis 2. Urban middle class mothers' educational aspirations will not differ for boys and girls.

Hypothesis 3. Urban middle class mothers will encourage both their sons and daughters to choose their own mates and have a love marriage.

Hypothesis 4. Urban middle class mothers will expect daughters to marry at a younger age than their sons.

Hypothesis Related to Child Rearing Practices:

Hypothesis 5. Compared to boys, girls will perceive their mothers as exerting more control over their behaviors.

Hypothesis Related to Maternal Expectations and Sex-Role

Identification:

Hypothesis 6. Daughters who perceive their mothers as more affectionate and controlling will endorse more feminine characteristics.

Hypothesis Related to Gender Stereotypes in Turkish Sample:

Hypothesis 7. Children of mothers with work experience will have less stereotypic, more egalitarian sex role stereotypes than children whose mothers have never had work experience.

2. Method

2.1. Respondents

A total of 90 students, 46 females and 44 males, and their mothers participated in this study. The respondents consisted of middle class individuals. Students were attending either eighth or ninth grade of Avrupa Koleji or eighth grade of Taş Koleji, two private secondary schools in Istanbul. The child respondents' ages ranged from 13 to 16. The mean age of the female students was 14.22 (SD = 0.59) and the mean age of male students was 14.39 (SD = 0.72). Mean age of mothers was 41.29 (SD = 4.25), ranging from 34 to 55. The mean number of years of education mothers had completed was 12.7 years. Table 1 shows years of education for mothers. Almost half of the mothers are working (47 %). Table 2 shows maternal working status as a function of the sex of the child.

Table 1. Frequency and percentages (in parentheses) of mothers' education level

	Education level of Mothers	
Elementary	3	(3%)
Middle School	4	(4%)
High School	37	(41%)
Vocational School	10	(11%)
University	27	(30%)
MA / PhD	9	(10%)

Table 2. Frequency and percentages (in parentheses) of maternal working status as a function of the sex of the child

Gender of Child	Mother Working Status	
	Yes	No
Female	20 (44%)	26 (56%)
Male	22 (50%)	22 (50%)

2.2. Instruments

Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR): The Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR) was developed by Block (1965) as an instrument to measure child-rearing attitudes, values and behaviors (Block, 1965; Dekovic, Janssens & Gerris, 1991). The CRPR is a Q-sort procedure that includes 91 socialization-relevant statements (Block, 1965; Roberts, Block & Block, 2007).

To meet different needs of researchers, two forms of the Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR) were developed. The first-person form of CRPR is administered to mothers and fathers to describe their child-rearing attitudes and values (Block, 1965; McNally, Eisenberg & Harris, 1991). A third-person form, on the other hand, is completed by young people and provides a description of the way they perceive the child-rearing attitudes of their mothers/fathers (Block, 1965).

Block (1965) conducted two test-retest studies to assess the reliability of CRPR. The results indicated that cross-time correlations were high for both the first and third-person forms of the CRPR. For the first-person form the average correlation between two tests ranged from .35 to .85. For the third-person form, the correlation ranged from .61 to .69. Thus the results suggest an adequate reliability for the test (Block, 1965).

The construct validity of the CRPR was also studied by Block (1965). The results indicated that there is a correspondence between actual child-rearing behaviors and descriptions of these behaviors (Block, 1965). Cross-cultural validity of CRPR has also been supported (Block and Christiansen, 1965 as cited in Block, 1966; Dekovic, Janssens & Gerris, 1991). A Turkish version of the CRPR was developed by Sunar (1989) using translation - back translation method.

In the present study, 33 items from the third-person (mother) Turkish form were used to measure children's perceptions of the child rearing orientations of their mothers. The CRPR items were presented in the form of a questionnaire, using a 7-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 1 = not at all descriptive to 7 = highly descriptive. Rickel and Biasatti (1982) suggested that using the CRPR in questionnaire form has practical value. They argued that as a questionnaire, CRPR is easier to administer and less time consuming than in the original Q sort format. In the present study the respondents were asked to describe their mothers' child-rearing attitudes when they were between 6 and 10 years old. The 33 items were those that comprised four factors derived from data from the CRPR in

an earlier study (Sunar, in press). The four factors were as follows: (1) Affection: this factor includes items that refer to the display of affection such as comfort, acceptance of child's feelings and negatively-loaded items like parental anger and parent-child conflict. Cronbach alpha for this factor in the current study was .78. (2) Control: this factor contains items which refer to rules, authoritarian parenting style, and discouragement of emotional expression of children. Cronbach alpha was .43. (3) Discipline: this factor refers to discipline methods, power exercised by parents and some negatively-loaded items, which refer to reward and induction. Cronbach alpha was .76. (4) Autonomy: this factor involves items referring to encouraging the child to explore, wonder and experience new things. Cronbach alpha for this factor was .81.

Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI): This inventory was developed by Bem (1974) as an instrument to measure gender-role orientation (Hoffman & Borders, 2001). The BSRI includes 60 items, of which 20 are stereotypically masculine, 20 are stereotypically feminine and the remaining 20 are neutral items. Ten of the neutral items represent desirable characteristics for both sexes and the other 10 items describe undesirable characteristics for both sexes (Hoffman & Borders, 2001).

The BSRI is used to measure sex-role identification as well as masculine and feminine stereotypes. To measure gender-role identification, the respondent is asked to indicate how well each of the 60 items describes herself/himself by using a 7-point scale (1 = almost never true, 7 = almost

always true). To measure gender stereotypes, the respondent rates the 60 items for how well they describe “women” and “men”.

The Turkish version of BSRI was prepared by using translation-back translation method (Gürbüz, 1988). Reliability of the Turkish version has been found to be satisfactory (Sunar, unpublished data); Cronbach’s alpha for self ratings was .81. Cronbach’s alpha for ratings of women was .71, and Cronbach’s alpha for ratings for men was .8.

Although the BSRI was standardized on adult (including university student) samples, Gürbüz (1988) included high school students in her development of the Turkish version of the inventory, and it was successfully used with 14-16 year old respondents by Sunar (1989). In the present study, this inventory was administered to children of ages 13-16.

Expectations Questionnaire: This questionnaire was designed for the present study. It includes demographic information as well as questions regarding mothers’ aspirations regarding education, sex preference, marriage patterns of children and occupational expectations. Mothers’ occupational expectations are not included in this report because of inadequate response. The questionnaire is shown in Appendix C.

Picture: An irrelevant task between BSRI for “women” and BSRI for “men” consisting of describing a picture was administered to all children. The picture contained several figures like a cat sitting in front of a red door, partial views of a tree and a bicycle, and people sitting around a table in the background.

2.3. Procedure:

The data were collected from students who were attending Taş Koleji or Avrupa Koleji and their mothers. All participants were informed about anonymity and confidentiality. Informed consent of parents was obtained for their children's participation.

A short form of the CRPR and the BSRI were administered to students in a 50 minute class period by the researcher and a teacher. At the beginning all students wrote demographic information including their age and sex. Then, students developed a four-digit code representing their identity and the scales were administered. First BSRI for "self" was administered to children. Then, CRPR items and BSRI for "women" were given. To minimize priming effects, a picture-description task was interpolated between the ratings of "women" and "men" on the BSRI. A picture including a number of figures and objects, printed on 64.5 x 48.5 paper was shown to the class for 10 seconds and the students were asked to write down whatever they remembered about the picture in the following 30 seconds. Lastly the BSRI for "men" was administered. Questionnaires were collected after all the subjects completed the tasks.

The expectations questionnaire was sent to children's mothers in a sealed envelope. Mothers were asked to fill out and return these questionnaires to the school. Those children whose mothers did not return the questionnaire to the researcher were excluded from the study. Mothers who responded to the questionnaire also used the same four-digit code

created by their children. Thus, questionnaires filled out by children and their mothers were matched for statistical analysis.

3. Results

Means were calculated for both “self” and “gender stereotypes” forms of BSRI and the “mother form” of the four CRPR factors. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of each variable by sex of the child.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations of each variable by sex of the child.

	Female (N = 46)		Male (N= 44)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Affection	5.95	1.00	5.84	1.40
Independence	5.17	0.90	4.84	0.88
Control	2.90	0.66	3.20	0.74
Discipline	2.52	1.06	2.91	1.17
Femininity	5.27	0.77	4.72	0.57
Masculinity	4.74	0.77	5.42	0.67
Female Stereotypes	5.79	0.51	5.51	0.75
Masculine Stereotypes	5.80	0.69	5.77	0.63

Hypotheses Related to Mother's Expectations

Hypothesis 1. Urban middle class Turkish mothers will prefer daughters over sons.

Although a majority of the respondents (59 %) indicated no sex preference, chi-square test revealed that the remaining respondents showed a girl preference ($\chi^2 = 15.36$, $df = 2$, $p = .0001$). All of the mothers who already had a daughter showed girl preference whereas only half of the mothers who had a son showed girl preference. Therefore the sex of their own children also influences mothers' sex preference.

Table 4. Sex preference of mothers as a function of sex of their children

Gender of Actual Child	Sex Preference of Mother (only mothers who expressed a preference; N = 30)	
	Female	Male
Female (n = 20)	100 %	0 %
Male (n = 10)	50 %	50 %
Total (n = 30)	83.3 %	16.7 %

Hypothesis 2. Urban middle class mothers' educational aspirations will not differ for boys and girls.

The data were analyzed by comparing mean years of schooling desired by mothers as a function of the sex of the child. Paired t-tests revealed no significant difference between boys' and girls' educational attainment

expected by mother ($t = 0.37$, $df = 72$, $p = .70$). Mothers' educational aspiration for girls was 15.99 years and 16.01 years for boys. These results indicate that mothers expect both their daughters and sons to get a university education.

Hypothesis 3. Mothers will encourage both their sons and daughters to choose their own mates and have a love marriage.

Chi-square test was carried out to investigate whether the type of marriage desired by the mother varies as a function of the sex of the child. The results showed that there is no significant difference between girls and boys regarding marriage type expected by mothers ($\chi^2 = 4.27$, $df = 4$, $p = .37$). About two thirds (67.8%) of mothers stated that children should be allowed to choose their own mates, but at the same time they should ask for the consent of the parents.

Hypothesis 4. Mothers will expect their daughters to marry at a younger age than their sons.

Paired t-test revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the age at which daughters and sons are expected to marry ($t = -14.76$, $df = 86$, $p = .0001$). The mean expected ages at first marriage for daughters and sons are 26.25 and 29.73 respectively. Therefore, girls are expected to marry at a younger age than boys. Chi-square analysis indicated that mothers emphasize completion of education and emotional maturity as two major determinants of marriage age for both daughters and sons ($\chi^2 = 3.86$, $df = 5$, $p = .57$).

Hypotheses Related to Child Rearing Practices

Hypothesis 5. Compared to boys, girls will perceive their mothers as exerting more control over their behaviors.

Independent t-test was carried to investigate whether perceived maternal control varies as a function of the sex of the child. Results showed that female and male children's perceptions of maternal control differ significantly ($t = -2.00$, $df = 86$, $p = .04$). Contrary to expectations, the results suggest that boys perceive more maternal control compared to girls. Mean score of perceived maternal control is 3.195 for boys and 2.898 for girls.

Hypothesis 6. Daughters who perceive their mothers as more affectionate and controlling will endorse more feminine characteristics.

Respondents' ratings of "self" on the femininity items of the BSRI were analyzed using multiple regression, with the four parenting factors (control, affection, independence, discipline) as the predictor variables. Mother's perceived affection was significantly positively related to femininity score of daughters ($\beta = .98$, $t = 4.2$, $p = .0001$). Mother's perceived control was also significantly positively related to femininity score of female participants ($\beta = .49$, $t = 2.33$, $p = .026$). The analysis indicated that affection and control explain 30% of the variance of the femininity score of female respondents.

Further analysis was carried out to investigate the interaction effect of affection and control on sex-role identification of daughters. Multiple

regression analysis revealed that the interaction of these variables had no significant effect on femininity score.

Hypothesis 7. Children of mothers with work experience will have less stereotypic, more egalitarian sex-role stereotypes compared to children whose mothers have never had a work experience.

Mothers who had worked in the past and those who were still actively working were labeled as “mothers with work experience”. Then, independent t-test was carried to investigate whether mother’s work experience influences the degree of stereotypes held by children. Results showed that mothers’ work experience had no significant effect either on stereotypes for males ($t = -1.57$, $df = 81$, $p = .118$) or female ($t = -1.93$, $df = 81$, $p = .118$).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to investigate maternal expectations in the urban middle class family. Mothers' child rearing practices and their relation to sex-role identification and sex-role stereotypes were also explored. Lastly, the relationship between mother's work experience and children's gender stereotypes was studied.

Expectations of urban middle class mothers were one of the major interests in this study. Although many parental expectations exist, covering all of them was beyond the scope of this thesis. Therefore, mothers' sex preference and their expectations regarding educational attainment and marriage patterns of their children were analyzed. Previous studies have demonstrated that various factors such as environment (rural vs. urban), socioeconomic status, and educational level of parents affect these expectations (Hank & Kohler, 2002; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; Minuchin, 1965).. For the past years, significant socio-cultural changes have occurred in Turkey. Turkish society is becoming a more modern, urban, industrial and egalitarian one (Ataca et al., 2005). Such changes also influenced urban middle class parents' views and led them to develop more egalitarian attitudes toward their children. Despite this more egalitarian approach, parents may behave in a gender specific way in some domains such as parental control (Ataca, 2006; Sunar, 2002).

Child-rearing practices also have important consequences for children's sex-role identification process. Investigating maternal involvement in the development of femininity of daughters was one the

goals of this study. Maternal variables also influence gender stereotyping of children. One of the maternal factors which is widely studied in the literature is maternal employment. In this study, the effect of maternal employment on children's level of gender stereotyping was explored. In this respect, the social learning perspective which emphasizes the role of reward, punishment and parental imitation was further tested.

The first hypothesis proposed that urban middle class Turkish mothers would prefer daughters over sons. The results supported this hypothesis. In this sample, mothers displayed either gender indifference or daughter preference. Pollard and Morgan (2002) argued that parents who hold more egalitarian attitudes towards boys and girls do not show any sex preference. Therefore, parental gender indifference can be explained on the basis of a high level of gender equality among urban middle class mothers. The finding on daughter preference is consistent with the findings of the Kağıtçıbaşı and Ataca (2005), who also reported a significant increase in daughter preference as a result of an increase in the psychological value of the child. In the urban setting, children no longer provide an economic utility; instead they become major economic costs. In other words, the economic value of children decreased in more developed, industrialized areas. Therefore, with socioeconomic development and urbanization, psychological reasons became the primary motivation behind childbearing, which enhanced daughter preference of parents (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Further support came from the study of Marleau and Saucier (2002),

who found that first-time pregnant women showed a daughter preference over sons (as cited in Hank & Kohler, 2002).

An interesting finding in this study was the influence of sex of the existing child on mother's sex preferences. All of the mothers who already have a daughter showed a girl preference, whereas only half of the mothers who have a son showed a girl preference. One reason could be that mothers of daughters enjoyed raising a girl. Probably these mothers also value psychological reasons, so that they preferred their only child to be a girl. Marleau and Saucier (2002) argued that women enjoy the companionship of girls more or they find it easier raising girls. Moreover, each parent usually prefers to have at least one child of their own sex, so mothers would prefer to have a daughter (Hank & Kohler, 2002). Mothers of sons who showed a daughter preference could also be the ones who value psychological reasons for having children, so that they would prefer to have a daughter. Zucker et al. (1994) also found that mothers' wish for a daughter was more common among mothers of boys. The mothers' preference for a son can be explained with the pleasure that mothers feel in raising a son. Son preference could also be the result of an effort to minimize dissonance. These mothers are already committed to raising their sons, so they may tend to focus on positive aspects of having a son and devalue positive sides of having a daughter.

The second hypothesis suggested that urban middle class mothers' educational aspirations will not differ for boys and girls. This hypothesis was also supported. Results indicate that mothers expected both their

daughters and sons to complete a university degree. This finding can be explained with modernization theory. Industrialization and urbanization coupled with the increase of psychological value of children caused parents to adopt more egalitarian attitudes toward both sexes, including schooling opportunities. The finding of Wei (2005) is also consistent with the result. Wei (2005) investigated gender differences in schooling in Taiwan between 1976 and 2000. He concluded that socioeconomic developments, decrease in economic value of children, and the presence of alternative old age security sources in the urban context together contributed to gender equality in schooling. The results are also supported by Alva, all names (1998), who conducted a cross cultural research on gender gap in schooling in 36 countries. The results clearly illustrated that rising income enhances gender equality in schooling (as cited in Wei, 2005). Therefore, socioeconomic status of parents plays an important role in children's school attainment. The mothers who participated in the present study were also from middle class families, so their socioeconomic status may have further reinforced their egalitarian attitudes.

The third hypothesis, stating that urban middle class mothers will encourage both their sons and daughters to choose their own mates and have a love marriage, was also supported. About two thirds of mothers believed that their children should be allowed to choose their own mates, but at the same time they should ask for the consent of the parents. The findings of Sunar and Fişek (2002) are consistent with this result. They suggested that

although urban middle class parents give more autonomy to children they still intervene in children's lives.

It was proposed that mothers will expect their daughters to marry at a younger age than their sons. Consistent with past research (Bozon, 1991; Witwer, 1993) girls were found to be expected to marry at a younger age than boys. In this study, the mean "expected" ages at first marriage for daughters and sons were 26.25 and 29.73 respectively. Although the results are above the 2006 averages of Turkey, they reflect the trend toward delayed marriages. Considering mothers' equal aspirations in the educational realm for boys and girls, emotional maturity seems to be the primary reason affecting mothers' expectations about children's marriage age. This finding may mean that urban middle class mothers believe that boys mature later than girls. Bozon (1991) also emphasized that men and women may differ in of the time at which they become ready to become adults. In addition, men have to do military service and are also expected to begin their careers before marrying. Therefore, they may become ready to marry at a later age.

Another research question in this study was concerned with how daughters and sons perceive their mothers' control. It was hypothesized that compared to boys, girls would perceive their mothers as exerting more control over their behaviors. The findings are contradictory with this hypothesis. The results revealed that sons perceive more maternal control than daughters. However, the reliability of this factor was less than satisfactory; therefore the results must be interpreted cautiously. Although

several studies suggested that parents exert more control on daughters, the empirical evidence on sex-differentiated socialization of parents is inconclusive (Pomerantz & Ruble, 1998). Lytton and Romney (1991) conducted a meta-analysis to investigate whether parents employ different child-rearing practices with girls and boys. They found that parent differential socialization practices including control are not significantly different for the two sexes. Thus, the explanation for the finding might be the discrepancy between actual and perceived maternal control of children. The study of Tein, Roosa and Michaels (1994) showed that parents' and children's reports on parental behaviors were incongruent. Therefore, they concluded that reports of parental behaviors from any single informant may be biased. Tein, Roosa, and Michaels (1994) also identified child gender, child developmental level and children's well-being as the factors which can influence the consistency between children's and parents' reports of parenting behaviors. For instance, maladjusted children showed a tendency to perceive their parents' attitudes as more negative or rejecting than they actually are (Schaefer, 1965; Tein et al., 1994). Children's personality can also affect children's perceptions of parental behaviors (Pomerantz & Ruble, 1998; Tein et al., 1994). In addition, children usually take their peers as a reference point in evaluating their own parents' attitudes, which can further distort their objectivity (Pomerantz & Ruble, 1998). The gender of the child may also account for this finding. Boys generally tend to perceive both mothers and fathers as more controlling compared to girls (Dropleman & Schaefer, 1963).

It was also hypothesized that daughters of affectionate and controlling mothers will endorse more feminine characteristics. Results indicated that affection and control were responsible for 30% of the variance of the femininity score of female respondents. This finding is also supported by Hastings et al. (2007). Their study showed that authoritative mothers enhance femininity in daughters and masculinity in sons. Hastings et al. (2007) reasoned that children of authoritative mothers become more open to internalizing mothers' values and goals. Developmental identification theory also states that children are more likely to choose affectionate parents as role models (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). Therefore, the emotional intimacy between mother and daughter plays an important role in girls' sex-role development. The more positive the mother-daughter relationship is, the more likely daughters are to develop feminine characteristics (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). Further support came from the study of Luetgert et al. (1972). They investigated the main characteristics of parents who are selected by male graduate students as identification figures. Luetgert et al. (1972) identified nurturance and power as two main parental variables involved in children's identification process. They concluded that children choose the most affectionate and dominant parent as the identification figure. Social power theory is also consistent with these results. According to this theory, children identify with the parent who is perceived as the dominant, powerful figure in the family (Acock & Yang, 1984).

However, girls' femininity development cannot be explained only with maternal control and affection. The results indicated that control and

affection of mother accounted for only 30% of the variance in girls' femininity development. Therefore, there are other factors which are involved in feminization of girls. One of these factors is parental reinforcement of sex-appropriate behaviors (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). Parents explicitly or implicitly communicate their gender specific expectations to their children and expect them to behave accordingly. Thus, they reward or punish children's behaviors on the basis of their own belief system (Martin, 1995; Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). Secondly, personality characteristics of parents such as maternal acceptance also influence sex role development of girls (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). Fathers may also enhance daughters' femininity (Mussen & Rutherford, 1963). The role fathers play in their children sex-role development was emphasized in many studies (Johnson, 1963; Lynn, 1976; Russell & Ellis, 1991). Peers also play an important role in the socialization process by rewarding or punishing gender appropriate and gender inappropriate behaviors (Lamb & Roopnarine, 1979; Massad, 1981; Mahalik, Morray, Coonerty-Femiano, Ludlow, Slattery, & Smiler, 2005). Lastly, it is important to consider the impact of prevailing social norms in the society. Gender role norms provide a reference point from which individuals' responses can be evaluated (Mahalik, et. al, 2005). Research shows that by the age of three children know gender appropriate behaviors for each sex (Goshen-Gottstein, 1981).

Lastly, sex role stereotypes of children were examined as a function of mothers' working experience. It was hypothesized that children of mothers with work experience would have less stereotypic, more egalitarian sex role

beliefs compared to children of mothers with no work experience. This hypothesis was not supported. The results revealed that the children's stereotypes did not differ as a function of mothers' employment status. Therefore, social learning model was not supported. Smith and Self (1980) argued that mothers' sex role attitudes rather than maternal demographic variables like employment status are important in predicting daughter's sex role attitudes. Another explanation would be that children's characteristics or demographic variables influence the degree of children's gender stereotyping. Albert and Porter (1988) also studied factors involved in children's gender stereotyping. They identified age and sex of the children as the main predictors of children's gender stereotyping. In their study, children between the ages of four and six were found to have highest level of gender stereotypes. Thus, Albert and Porter (1988) reasoned that cognitive developmental theory would be more useful in explaining gender stereotype development. However, race was also found to be an important variable affecting the degree of gender stereotyping among children. Thus, Albert and Porter (1988) concluded that gender schema theory would best account for gender stereotype development in children since it includes both social and cognitive components.

The present study provides some insight into the relations among maternal expectations, child-rearing practices and gender stereotyping of children. The present results suggest that compared to the past, urban middle class mothers currently hold more egalitarian beliefs and attitudes towards their sons and daughters. Social, economic and cultural transitions

which Turkey has undergone in the past years have significantly contributed to gender equality. For instance, in industrialized, urban areas the increase in the psychological value of the child caused either parental gender indifference or daughter preference. Parents also did not discriminate between sons and daughters in terms of their educational attainment and marriage decisions. Mothers expect both girls and boys to complete university education and encourage both of them to have a love marriage. The expectations of mothers regarding marriage age of children are consistent with the universal tendency to marry daughters at a younger age than men. The gap at the age at first marriage is present almost in every culture and it is not because of gender discrimination, but because of the belief that men and women mature at different ages and more requirements need to be completed by men.

In this study, mothers' sex discrimination in child-rearing practices was also examined. Contrary to general belief that daughters are subject to more strict control of the mothers, boys were found to perceive greater degrees of maternal control. One explanation would be that the two sexes perceive parental control differently even though mothers may behave similarly towards them.

The impact of child rearing attitudes on sex-role identification has also been widely studied in the field of psychology. Authoritative mothers, who are affectionate but at same time able to exert firm control on their children, are found to enhance femininity in daughters.

Maternal employment did not predict the degree of children's gender stereotyping. Other factors such as age and sex of the children, mothers' education level and maternal sex-role attitudes were identified as the main factors affecting the degree of gender stereotyping among children.

One limitation of this study is that the results may not be widely generalizable due to the number and demographic characteristics of the participants. The sample was composed of urban middle class mothers and their children which does not represent the heterogeneous family types in Turkey. Therefore, the results may differ for various ethnic groups and socioeconomic groups existing in Turkey. Moreover, childrearing practices were not directly reported by mothers. The data only consist of children's perceptions of their mothers' parenting styles, so that the data can be biased. The results might have been different if mothers' self-reported perceptions had been included in the study. In addition, BSRI should be administered to mothers to explore whether mothers' sex role attitudes rather than maternal demographic variables like employment status important in predicting daughter's sex role attitudes. The inclusion of fathers might also be beneficial to obtain more comprehensive results. Lastly, the low internal reliability of the Control factor may make interpretation of data from this variable difficult.

Despite its limitations, the study contributes to an understanding of current trends in childrearing practices and their correlates in contemporary urban Turkish families.

References

- Acock A. C., & Yang, W. S. (1984). Parental power and adolescents' parental identification. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46(2), 487-495.
- Albert, A. A., & Porter, J. R. (1988). Children's gender-role stereotypes: A sociological investigation of psychological models. *Sociological Forum*, 3 (2), 184-210.
- Ataca, B. (2006). Turkey. In Georgas, J., Berry, J. W., Vijver, F. J. R., Kagıtcıbaşı, C., & Poortinga, Y. (Eds.), *Families across Cultures: A 30-Nation Psychological Study* (pp. 467-475). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ataca, B., Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Diri, A. (2005). Turkish family and the value of children: Trends over time. In G. Trommsdorff & B. Nauck (Eds.), *The value of children in cross-cultural perspective. Case studies from eight societies* (pp. 91-119). Lengerich: Pabst Publishers.
- Ataca, B., & Sunar, D. (1999). Continuity and change in Turkish urban family life. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 11(1), 77-90.
- Balswick, J., & Avertt, C. P. (1977). Differences in expressiveness: Gender, interpersonal orientation, and perceived parental expressiveness as contributing factors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 39(1), 121-127.

- Barry, H., Bacon, M. K., & Child, I. L. (1957). A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55*(3), 327-332.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development, 37*(4), 887-907.
- Bayer, A. E. (1968). Early dating and early marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30*(4), 628- 632.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender Schema Theory: A cognitive account of sex-typing, *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354-364
- Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender Schema Theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a Gender-Schematic Society. *Signs, 8*(4), 598-616.
- Berndt, T. J., & Heller, K. A. (1986). Gender Stereotypes and social inferences: A developmental study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(5), 889-898.
- Block, J. H. (1965). The child rearing practices report. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.
- Bozon, M. (1991). Women and the age gap between spouses: An accepted domination? *Population: An English Selection, 3*(1), 113-148.
- Brand, M (2004). Collectivistic versus individualistic cultures: A comparison of American, Australian and Chinese music education students' self-esteem. *Music Education Research, 6*(1), 57-65.

- Brown, L. G. (1948). The family as a universal culture pattern. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 43(6), 460-463.
- Burger, G. K. (1975). Recalled parental behavior, sex roles and socialization. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 31(2), 292-298.
- Campenni, C. E. (1999). Gender stereotyping of children's toys: A comparison of parents and nonparents. *Sex Roles*, 40(1/2), 121-138.
- Carter, D., & Welch, D. (1981). Parenting styles and children's behavior. *Family Relations*, 3 (2), 191-195.
- Carter, R. S., & Wojtkiewicz, R. A. (2000). Parental involvement with adolescents' education: Do daughters or sons get more help?. *Adolescence*, 35(137), 30-46.
- Cherry, L., & Lewis, M. (1976). Mothers and two-year olds: A study of sex-differentiated aspects of verbal interaction. *Developmental Psychology*, 12(4), 278-282.
- Chick, K. A., Heilman-Houser, R. A., & Hunter, M. W. (2002). The impact of child care on gender role development and gender stereotypes. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 29(3), 149- 154.
- Cole, C. L., Cole, A. L., & Dean, D. G. (1980). Emotional maturity and marital adjustment: A decade replication. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42(3), 533-539.
- Coleman, M., Ganong, L. H., Clark, J. M., & Madsen, R. (1989). Parenting perception in rural and urban families: Is there a difference?. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 5 (2), 329-335.

- Dekovic, M., Janssens, J. M., & Gerris, J. R. (1991). Factor structure and construct validity of the Block Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR). *Psychological Assessment, 3*(2), 182-187.
- Dinitz, S., Dynes, R. R., & Clarke, A. C. (1954). Preferences for male or female children: Traditional or affectional? *Marriage and Family Living, 16*(2), 128-130.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. L., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *ChildDevelopment, 58*(5), 143-160.
- Draper, P. (1975). Cultural pressure on sex differences. *American Ethnologist, 2*(4), 602-616.
- Dropleman, L. F., & Schaefer, E. S. (1963). Boys' and girls' reports of maternal and paternal behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*(6), 648-654.
- Elm, B. V., & Hirschman, C. (1979). Age at first marriage in peninsular Malaysia. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 41*(4), 877-891.
- Erkut, S. (1982). Dualism in values toward education of Turkish women. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), *Sex Roles, family, and community in Turkey* (pp. 121-132). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Ex C. T. G. M., & Janssens, M. A. M. (1998) Maternal influence on daughters' gender role attitudes. *Sex Roles, 38*(3), 171-186.
- Fisher-Thompson, D. (1990). Adult sex-typing of children's toys. *Sex Roles, 23*(2), 291-303.

- Flerx, V. C, Fidler, D. S., & Rogers, R. W. (1976). Sex role stereotypes: Developmental aspects and early intervention. *Child Development*, 1976 (4), 998-1007.
- Gerber, G. L. (1993). Instrumental and expressive personality traits in social cognition: Parallels with social interaction. *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs*, 119(1), 101-124.
- Gire, J. T. (1997). The varying effect of individualism-collectivism on preference for methods of conflict resolution. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 29(1), 38-43.
- Gonzalez, A. Q., & Koestner, R. (2005). Parental preference for sex of newborns as reflected in positive affect in birth announcements. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 52(5/6), 407-411.
- Goshen-Gottstein, E. R. (1981). Differential maternal socialization of opposite-sexed twins, triplets, and quadruplets. *Child Development*, 52(4), 1255-1264.
- Gürbüz, E. (1988). A measurement of sex-trait stereotypes. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University. Istanbul, Turkey.
- Hank, K., & Kohler, H. P. (2002). Sex preferences for children revisited: New evidence from Germany. *Population*, 58(1), 133-143.
- Hansson, R.O., Chernovetz, M. E., & Jones, W. H. (1977). Maternal employment and androgyny. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 2(1), 76-79.

- Harris, A. C. (1994). Ethnicity as a determinant of sex-role identity: A replication study to item selection for the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Sex Roles, 31*(3/4), 241-273.
- Harris, K. M., & Morgan S. P. (1991). Fathers, sons, and daughters: Differential parental involvement in parenting. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 531-544.
- Hastings, P. D., McShane, K. E., Parker, R. & Ladha, F. (2007). Ready to make nice: Parental socialization of young sons' and daughters' prosocial behaviors with peers. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 168*(2), 177-200.
- Hoffman, R. M., & Borders, L. D. (2001). Twenty-five years after the *Bem Sex-Role Inventory*: A reassessment and new issues regarding classification variability. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development, 34*(1), 39-56.
- Hoffman, L. W., & Kloska, D. D. (1995). Parents' gender-based attitudes toward marital roles and child-rearing: Development and validation of new measures. *Sex Roles, 32* (5-6), 273-295.
- Johnson, R. C., Johnson, C., & Martin, L. (1961). Authoritarianism, occupation, and sex role differentiation of children. *Child Development, 32*(2), 271-276.
- Jones, D. S., & Wilkins, W. P. (1986). Sex equity in parenting and parent education. *Theory into Practice, 25*(4), 235-242.

- Johanson, T., & Dye, J. (2005). Indicators of marriage and fertility in the United States from the American Community Survey: 2000 to 2003. Retrieved February 22, 2008, from <http://www.census.gov/>
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Sunar, D. (1992). Family and socialization in Turkey. In J. L. Roopnarine & D. B. Carter (Eds.), *Annual advances in applied developmental psychology*: Vol. 5. Parent child socialization in diverse cultures (pp. 75-88). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Kacerguis, M. A., & Adams, G. R. (1979). Implications of sex typed child rearing practices, toys, and mass media materials in restricting occupational choices of women. *Family Coordinator*, 28(3), 369-375.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1982). Old age security value of children and socioeconomic development: Cross-national evidence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13(1), 29-42.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three-decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(3), 317-337.
- Karr, C., & Wesley, F. (1966). Comparison of German and U.S child-rearing practices. *Child Development*, 37(3), 715-723.
- Khaleque, A., & Rohner, R. P. (2002). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment: A meta-analysis of cross-cultural and intracultural studies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 64(1), 54-64.
- Klaus, D., & Suckow, J.(2002). Value of Children in Six Cultures. In Planava, I. & Pilat, M., *Children, youth and families in period of*

- transition*. Brno: Proceedings of the Symposium organised by the Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University Brno. 19-21 Sep. 2002.
- Klein, H. A., O'Bryant K., & Hopkins, H. R. (1996). Recalled parental authority style and self-perception in college men and women. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 157(1)*, 5-17.
- Knodel, J. (1997). The closing of the gender gap in schooling: The case of Thailand. *Comparative education, 33(1)*, 61-86.
- Lamb, M. E., & Roopnarine, J. (1979). Peer influences on sex-role development in preschoolers. *Child Development, 50(4)*, 1219-1222.
- Langolis, J. H., & Downs, A. C. (1980). Mothers, fathers, and peers as socialization agents of sex-typed behavior in young children. *Child Development, 51(4)*, 1217-1247.
- Lapierre-Adamcyk, E., & Burch, T. (1974). Trends and differentials in age at marriage in Korea. *Studies in Family Planning, 5(8)*, 255-260.
- Leung, K., Lau, S., & Lam, W. (1998). Parenting styles and academic achievement: A cross-cultural study. [*Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 44\(2\)*](#), 157-167.
- Lewis, M. (1972). Parents and children: Sex-role development. *The School Review, 80(2)*, 229-240.
- Lin C-Y. C., & Fu V. R. (1990). A comparison of child-rearing practices among Chinese, Immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian- American Parents. *Child Development, 61(2)*, 429-433.

- Liu, H., & Gu, B. (1998). Preference of rural population on the sex of expected children and their corresponding behaviors. *Chinese Journal of Popular Science, 10(3)*, 199-209.
- Luetgert, M. J., & Greenwald, B. S. G. (1972). Relation of emotional intimacy and parental dominance to adult identification. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 28(1)*, 25-27.
- Luster, T., Rhoades, K., & Haas, B. (1989). The relation between parental values and parenting behavior: A test of the Kohn Hypothesis. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 51(1)*, 139-147.
- Lynn, D. B. (1966). The process of learning parental and sex-role identification. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 28(4)*, 466-470.
- Lynn, D. B. (1963). Learning masculine and feminine roles. *Marriage and Family Living, 25(1)*, 103-105.
- Mahalik, J. R., Morray, E. B., Coonerty-Femiano, A., Ludlow, L. H., Slattery, S. M., & Smiler, A. (2005). Development of the conformity to feminine norms inventory. *Sex Roles, 52(7/8)*, 417-435.
- Marantz, S. A., & Mansfield, A. F. (1977). Maternal employment and the development of sex-role stereotyping in five to eleven year-old girls. *Child Development, 48(2)*, 668-673.
- Martin, C. L. (1995). Stereotypes about children with traditional and nontraditional gender roles. *Sex Roles, 33(11/12)*, 727-751.
- Martin, C. L., & Ruble, D. (2004). Children's search for gender cues. *Current Directions in Psychological Science 13(2)*, 67-70.

- Massad, C. M. (1981). Sex role identity and adjustment during adolescence. *Child Development, 52(4)*, 1290-1298.
- McNally, S., Eisenberg, N., & Harris, J. D. (1991). Consistency and change in maternal child-rearing practices and values: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 62(1)*, 190-198.
- Miller, L. R., Bilimoria, R. N., & Pattni, N. (2000). Do women want new men?. *Psychology, Evolution & Gender, 2(2)*, 127-150.
- Minuchin, P. (1965). Sex-role concepts and sex typing in childhood as a function of school and home environments. *Child Development, 36(4)*, 1033-1048.
- Moore, K. M. (1987). Women's access and opportunity to higher education: Toward the twenty-first century. *Comparative Education, 23(1)*, 23-24.
- Mussen, P., & Rutherford, E. (1963). Parent-child relations and parental personality in relation to young children's sex-role preferences. *Child Development, 34(3)*, 589-607.
- Özkan, T., & Lajunen, T. (2005). Masculinity, femininity, and the Bem Sex-role Inventory in Turkey. *Sex Roles, 52(1/2)*, 103-110.
- Pimental, E. E. (2000). Just how do I love thee?: Marital relations in urban China. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62(1)*, 32-47.
- Pomerantz, E. M., & Ruble, D. N. (1998). The role of maternal control in the development of sex differences in child self-evaluative factors. *Child Development, 69(2)*, 458-478.

- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 269-281.
- Rabban, M. (1950). Sex-role identification in young children in two diverse social groups. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 42(1), 81-158.
- Rankin, B. H., & Aytac, I. A. (2006). Gender inequality in schooling: The case of Turkey. *Sociology of Education*, 79(1), 25-43.
- Retherford, R. D., Ogawa, N., & Matsukura, R. (2001). Late marriage and less marriage in Japan. *Population and Development Review*, 27(1), 65-102.
- Rheingold, H. L., & Cook, K. (1975). The content of boys' and girls' rooms as an index of parent behavior. *Child Development*, 46(2), 459-463.
- Rickel, A. U., & Biasatti, L. L. (1982). Modification of the Block child rearing practices report. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(1), 129-134.
- Roberts, G. C., Block, J. H., & Block, J. (1984). Continuity and change in parents' child-rearing practices. *Child Development*, 55(2), 586-597.
- Romer, N., & Cherry, D. (1980). Ethnic and social class differences in children's sex role concepts. *Sex Roles*, 6(2), 245-263.
- Rosenberg, M. (1973). The biologic basis for sex role stereotypes. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 9(1), 374-391.
- Russell, C. D., & Ellis, J. B. (1991). Sex-role development in single parent households. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 19(1), 5-9.

- Ryback, D., Sanders, A. L., Lorentz, J., & Koestenblatt, M. (1980). Child-rearing practices reported by students in six cultures. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 110*(2), 153-162.
- Sandnabba N. K., & Ahlberg, C. (1999). Parents' attitudes and expectations about children's cross-gender behavior. *Sex Roles, 40*(3/4), 249-263.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. *Child Development, 36*(2), 413-424.
- Scott-Jones, D., & Peebles-Wilkins, W. (1986). Sex equity in parenting and parent education. *Theory in Practice, 25* (4), 235-242.
- Sharpe, M. J., Heppner, P. P., & Dixon, W. A. (1995). Gender role conflict, instrumentality, expressiveness, and well-being in adult men. *Sex Roles, 33*(1/2), 1-18.
- Shu, X. (2004). Education and gender egalitarianism: The case of China. *Sociology of Education, 77*(4), 311-336.
- Smith, D. E., & Mosby, G. (2003). Jamaican child-rearing practices: The role of corporal punishment. *Adolescence, 38*(1), 369-381.
- Smith, M. D., & Self, G. D. (1980). The congruence between mothers' and daughters' sex-role attitudes: A research note. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42*(1), 105-109.
- Spence, J. T. (1991). Do the BSRI and PAQ measure the same or different concepts? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*(6), 141-165.
- Spitze, G. (1988). Women's employment and family relations: A review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50*(3), 595-618.

- Stephan, C. W., & Corder, J. (1985). The effects of dual-career families on adolescents' sex-role attitudes, work and family plans, and choices of important others. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47(4), 921-929.
- Stern, B. J. (1939). The family and cultural change. *American Sociological Review*, 4(2), 199-208.
- Sugihara, Y., & Katsurada, E. (1999). Masculinity and Femininity in Japanese culture: A pilot study. *Sex Roles*, 40(7/8), 635-646.
- Sunar, D. (1982). Female stereotypes in the U.S. and Turkey: An application of functional theory to perceptions in power relations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13, 445-460.
- Sunar, D. (1989). Intergenerational and sex differences in Turkish child rearing practices. Unpublished research report. Submitted to Meawards.
- Sunar, D. (2002). Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family. In E. Ozdalga & R. Liljestrom (Eds.), *Autonomy and dependence in family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective* (pp. 217-237). Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute.
- Sunar, D. (in press). Similarities and differences in mothers' and fathers' child-rearing practices in three generations of urban Turkish families.
- Sunar, D., & Fişek, G. O. (2005). Contemporary Turkish families. U. Gielen & J. Roopnarine (Der.), *Families in global perspective*, s. 169-183. Allyn & Bacon/Pearson.

- Sunar, D. (2007). Unpublished data.
- Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies (2003). Turkey Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS). Retrieved February 25, 2008 from www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr
- Tein, J., Roosa, M. W., & Michaels, M. (1994). Agreement between parent and child reports on parental behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *56*(2), 341-355.
- Thornton, A., & Freedman, D. (1979). Changes in the sex-role attitudes of women, 1962-1977: Evidence from a panel study. *American Sociological Review* *44*(5), 832-842.
- Thornton, A., Alwin, D. F., & Camburn, D. (1983). Causes and consequences of sex-role attitudes and attitude change. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 211-227.
- Vanfossen, B. E. (1977). Sexual stratification and sex-role socialization. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *39*(3), 563-574.
- Yang, J. A. (2000). Fathering and children's sex role orientation in Korea. [*Adolescence*](#), *35*(140), 731-745.
- Wei, Y. (2005). Gender inequality and the opportunity for children's schooling in Taiwan. Conference Papers -- American Sociological Association, 2005 Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, 1-34. Retrieved, January 11, 2008 from Ebsco Host.
- Wils, A., & Goujon, A. (1998). Diffusion in education in six world regions, 1960-90. *Population and Development Review*, *24*(2), 357-368.

Witwer, M. (1993). U.S men and women now have the highest mean age at marriage in this century, census bureau finds. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 25(4), 190-191.

Appendices

Appendix A:
Block's Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR)

Cinsiyet: (E) (K) Yaş:.....

KOD: ____ _ _ _ _

Bu anket tez çalışmasının 8. sınıf öğrencileriyle yapılan bir bölümüdür. Katılım gönüllü olup istediğiniz noktada anketi bırakabilme hakkınız vardır.

Bu anket sizinle ilgili birtakım soruları içermektedir. Bu araştırmada kullanılacak olan sadece cevaplarınızdır ve cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli kalacaktır. Bu nedenle adınızı yazmayınız.

Soruların doğru yada yanlış cevapları yoktur. Cevaplarınızı verirken sadece kendi görüşlerinizi göz önünde bulundurunuz. Lütfen soru atlamadan ve hiçbir soru üzerinde fazla düşünmeden cevaplandırınız.

Teşekkürler

	Hiç Uygun Değil (1)	Uygun Değil (2)	Pek Uygun Değil (3)	Emin Değilim (4)	Biraz Uygun (5)	Uygun (6)	Çok Uygun (7)
1. Annem görüşlerime saygı gösterir ve beni onları belirtmeye teşvik ederdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2. Annem bana sık sık kızardı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3. Annem beni cezalandırmak için bir süre tek başıma bir yerde oturturdu .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4. Annem korktuğum ya da üzülduğüm zamanlar beni rahatlatır ve anlayış gösterirdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5. Annem dayanın en iyi terbiye yöntemi olduğuna inanırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6. Annem çocukların göz önünde fakat sessiz durmaları gerektiğine inanırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7. Annem sevgisini beni kucaklayıp öperek gösterirdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8. Annemin en büyük zevklerinden biri çocuklarıydı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9. Annem beni hayat hakkında düşünmeye ve merak etmeye teşvik ederdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10. Aile ile ilgili planlar yapılırken çoğu kez benim tercihlerim de göz önünde tutulurdu.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
11. Annem arada sırada düşünmem, hayal kurmam ve tembellik yapmam için vaktim olması gerektiğine inanırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
12. Beni cezalandırmak anneme zor gelirdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13. Annem beni bir çok konuda kendi kararlarımı vermekte serbest bırakırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
14. Annem bana, kötülük yaparsam şu veya bu şekilde cezalandırılacağımı öğretti.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
15. Annem kendisine kızmama izin vermezdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
16. Annem kendisini hayal kırıklığına uğrattığıma inanırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
17. Annem her zaman gerçeği söylediğime inanırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	Hiç Uygun Değil (1)	Uygun Değil (2)	Pek Uygun Değil (3)	Emin Değilim (4)	Biraz Uygun (5)	Uygun (6)	Çok Uygun (7)
18. Annem yaramazlık yaptığım zamanlar durumu bana mantıklı bir şekilde anlatırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19. Annem, kendi yokluğunda bile gerektiği gibi davranacağıma güvenirdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
20. Annem benimle oynar ve şakalaşır.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
21. Annemle bir çok tatlı ve yakın anlarımız oldu.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
22. Annem benim için katı ve kesin olarak belirlenmiş kurallar koymuştu.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
23. Annem ben büyüdükçe yeni şeyler denemeyi göze almamın gerektiğine inanırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
24. Annem meraklı olmam, sorular sormam ve araştırmam için beni teşvik ederdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
25. Annem bana bazı şeyleri doğa üstü güç ve varlıklardan söz ederek açıklardı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
26. Annem kötü bir şey yaptığım zamanlar ceza vermekten çok, iyi bir şey yaptığım zaman ödüllendirmeye önem verirdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
27. Annem beni sorunlarım konuşmaya teşvik ederdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
28. Annem beni cezalandırmak için bazı haklarımdan yokun bırakırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
29. Annem azar ve eleştirinin bana faydalı olacağına inanırdı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
30. Annemle aramızda epey çatışma vardı.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
31. Annem kararları hakkında soru sormama izin vermezdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
32. Annem başkalarına sataşmama ve muziplik yapmama izin vermezdi.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
33. Annem çocukların sık sık büyüklerin gözetiminden uzak kendi kendilerine oynamalarını sakıncalı bulurdu.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX B

Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI)

	Bana Hiç Uygun Değil (1)	Bana Uygun Değil (2)	Bana Pek Uygun Değil (3)	Emin Değilim (4)	Bana Biraz Uygun (5)	Bana Uygun (6)	Bana Çok Uygun (7)
1. Liderlik eden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2.Saldırgan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.Sevecen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4. Neşeli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5. Şartlara Uyan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6.Kendini Beğenmiş	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7.Hırslı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8. Olayları tahlil eden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9. Çocuksu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10. Şefkatli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
11.Vicdanlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
12. Geleneksel	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13. Kendi fikrini ortaya koyan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
14.Atletik	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
15. Sert söz söylemeyen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
16. Gönül almaya istekli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
17.Dost	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19. Rekabetçi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
20. İnançlarını savunan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
21. Kadınsı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
22. Pohpohlanmaktan etkilenen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
23. Mutlu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
24. Kıskanç	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
25. Hükmeden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
26.Güçlü	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
27. Nazik	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
28. Kolay aldanan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
29. Yardımsever	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
30. Günü gününe uymayan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
31. Lider yeteneği olan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
32. Bağımsız	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
33. Çocuk seven	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
34. Sadık	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
35. Sevimli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
36. Düşünce ve duygularını gizleyen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
37. Bireyci	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
38. Kolay karar verebilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
39.Başkalarının gereksinimlerine duyarlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
40.Utangaç	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	Bana Hiç Uygun Değil (1)	Bana Uygun Değil (2)	Bana Pek Uygun Değil (3)	Emin Değilim (4)	Bana Biraz Uygun (5)	Bana Uygun (6)	Bana Çok Uygun (7)
41.Güvenilir	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
42.Asık Suratlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
43.Erkeksi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
44.Kendine güvenen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
45.Tatlı dilli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
46. Derde ortak olabilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
47.Samimi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
48.Yapmacıklı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
49.Kendine yeterli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
50.Sağlam kişilikli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
51.Yumuşak	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
52.Anlayışlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
53.Yol-yordam bilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
54.Sağı-solu belli olmayan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
55.Fikrini açığa vurmaya istekli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
56.Riskleri göze alan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
57.Sıcak	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
58.Uysal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
59. Doğru Sözlü	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
60. Düzensiz	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	Hiç Uygun Değil (1)	Uygun Değil (2)	Pek Uygun Değil (3)	Emin Değilim (4)	Biraz Uygun (5)	Uygun (6)	Çok Uygun (7)
1. Liderlik eden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2.Saldırgan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.Sevecen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4. Neşeli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5. Şartlara Uyan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6.Kendini Beğenmiş	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7.Hırslı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8. Olayları tahlil eden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9. Çocuksu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10. Şefkatli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
11.Vicdanlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
12. Geleneksel	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13. Kendi fikrini ortaya koyan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
14.Atletik	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
15. Sert söz söylemeyen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
16. Gönül almaya istekli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
17.Dost	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19. Rekabetçi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
20. İnançlarını savunan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
21. Kadınsı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
22. Pohpohlanmaktan etkilenen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
23. Mutlu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
24. Kıskanç	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
25. Hükmeden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
26.Güçlü	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
27. Nazik	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
28. Kolay aldanan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
29. Yardımsever	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
30. Günü gününe uymayan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
31. Lider yeteneği olan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
32. Bağımsız	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
33. Çocuk seven	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
34. Sadık	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
35. Sevimli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
36. Düşünce ve duygularını gizleyen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
37. Bireyci	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
38. Kolay karar verebilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
39.Başkalarının gereksinimlerine duyarlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
40.Utangaç	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	Hiç Uygun Değil (1)	Uygun Değil (2)	Pek Uygun Değil (3)	Emin Değilim (4)	Biraz Uygun (5)	Uygun (6)	Çok Uygun (7)
41.Güvenilir	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
42.Asık Suratlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
43.Erkeksi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
44.Kendine güvenen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
45.Tatlı dilli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
46. Derde ortak olabilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
47.Samimi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
48.Yapmacıklı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
49.Kendine yeterli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
50.Sağlam kişilikli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
51.Yumuşak	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
52.Anlayışlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
53.Yol-yordam bilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
54.Sağı-solu belli olmayan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
55.Fikrini açığa vurmaya istekli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
56.Riskleri göze alan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
57.Sıcak	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
58.Uysal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
59. Doğru Sözlü	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
60. Düzensiz	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	Hiç Uygun Değil (1)	Uygun Değil (2)	Pek Uygun Değil (3)	Emin Değilim (4)	Biraz Uygun (5)	Uygun (6)	Çok Uygun (7)
1. Liderlik eden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2.Saldırgan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3.Sevecen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4. Neşeli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5. Şartlara Uyan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6.Kendini Beğenmiş	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7.Hırslı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8. Olayları tahlil eden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9. Çocuksu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10. Şefkatli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
11.Vicdanlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
12. Geleneksel	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13. Kendi fikrini ortaya koyan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
14.Atletik	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
15. Sert söz söylemeyen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
16. Gönül almaya istekli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
17.Dost	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19. Rekabetçi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
20. İnançlarını savunan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
21. Kadınsı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
22. Pohpohlanmaktan etkilenen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
23. Mutlu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
24. Kıskanç	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
25. Hükmeden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
26.Güçlü	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
27. Nazik	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
28. Kolay aldanan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
29. Yardımsever	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
30. Günü gününe uymayan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
31. Lider yeteneği olan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
32. Bağımsız	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
33. Çocuk seven	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
34. Sadık	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
35. Sevimli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
36. Düşünce ve duygularını gizleyen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
37. Bireyci	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
38. Kolay karar verebilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
39.Başkalarının gereksinimlerine duyarlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
40.Utangaç	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	Hiç Uygun Değil (1)	Uygun Değil (2)	Pek Uygun Değil (3)	Emin Değilim (4)	Biraz Uygun (5)	Uygun (6)	Çok Uygun (7)
41.Güvenilir	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
42.Asık Suratlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
43.Erkeksi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
44.Kendine güvenen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
45.Tatlı dilli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
46. Derde ortak olabilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
47.Samimi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
48.Yapmacıklı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
49.Kendine yeterli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
50.Sağlam kişilikli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
51.Yumuşak	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
52.Anlayışlı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
53.Yol-yordam bilen	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
54.Sağı-solu belli olmayan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
55.Fikrini açığa vurmaya istekli	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
56.Riskleri göze alan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
57.Sıcak	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
58.Uysal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
59. Doğru Sözlü	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
60. Düzensiz	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX C
Expectations Questionnaire

KOD: _ _ _ _

(Lütfen çocuđunuzun
seçtiđi 4 haneli
rakamı yazınız)

Bu anket tez çalışmasının 8. sınıf öğrencileriyle yapılan bir bölümüdür.

Bu anket sizinle ilgili birtakım soruları içermektedir. Bu arařtırmada kullanılacak olan sadece cevaplarınızdır ve cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli kalacaktır. Bu nedenle adınızı yazmayınız.

Soruların dođru yada yanlış cevapları yoktur. Cevaplarınızı verirken sadece kendi görüşlerinizi göz önünde bulundurunuz. Lütfen soru atlamadan ve hiçbir soru üzerinde fazla düşünmeden cevaplandırınız.

Teşekkürler

Anket toplam 57 sorudan oluşmaktadır. Lütfen cevapları tamamlayınız veya uygun bulduğunuz yanıtın yanına 'X' işareti koyarak cevaplayınız.

Örneğin, 'Kaç kardeşiniz? _____' sorusuna kendi kişisel yanıtınızı yazmanız gerekmektedir. Eğer toplam 3 kardeşiniz şöyle yanıtlamanız gerekmektedir:

Kaç kardeşiniz? 3

'Çalışıyor musunuz'

1___ Evet

2 ___ Hayır

sorusunda ise size sunulan seçeneklerden birini 'X' ile işaretleyerek cevaplamanız beklenmektedir. Eğer çalışmıyorsanız:

1___ Evet

2 X Hayır şikkını işaretlemelisiniz.

ANNE ANKETİ

Tarih:_____

1- Çocuğunuzun Cinsiyeti: () Kız () Erkek

2- Çocuğunuzun Yaşı:_____

Sizin Yaşınız:_____ Eşinizin Yaşı:_____

3- Eğitiminiz (en son mezun olduğunuz okul)

1 ___ İlkokul

2 ___ Ortaokul

3 ___ Lise

4 ___ Meslek Yüksek Okulu (2 yıllık)

5 ___ Üniversite (4 yıllık)

6 ___ Lisans Üstü

7 ___ Başka (belirtiniz _____)

4-Eşinizin Eğitimi (en son mezun olduğu okul)

1 ___ İlkokul

2 ___ Ortaokul

3 ___ Lise

4 ___ Meslek Yüksek Okulu (2 yıllık)

5 ___ Üniversite (4 yıllık)

6 ___ Lisans Üstü

7 ___ Başka (belirtiniz _____)

5-Halen çalışıyor musunuz?

1 ___ Evet ise İşiniz:_____

2 ___ Hayır

(Hayır ise)

6-Daha önce hiç çalıştınız mı?

1 ___ Evet

2 ___ Hayır (soru 8'e geçiniz)

7- (Soru 6' ya verilen cevap 'evet ise): Çocuğunuz küçükken çalıştınız mı?

1 ___ Evet

2 ___ Hayır

8- Eşinizin işi: _____

9-Kaç çocuğunuz var? _____

10- Kızlarınızın yaşlarını belirtiniz: _____

11- Oğullarınızın yaşlarını belirtiniz: _____

12- Siz çocukken anneniz çalışır mıydı?

1 ___ Evet

2 ___ Hayır

13- Bildiğiniz kadarıyla eşinizin çocukluğunda annesi çalışmış mı?

1 ___ Evet

2 ___ Hayır

14- Siz evlendiğinizde kaç yaşındaydınız? _____

15- Eşiniz kaç yaşındaydı? _____

16- Sizce, ideal olarak bir kadın kaç yaşında evlenmeli? _____

17- Neden?

18- Eşinize göre, ideal olarak bir kadın kaç yaşında evlenmeli? _____

19- Neden?

20- Sizce, ideal olarak bir erkek kaç yaşında evlenmeli? _____

21- Neden?

22- Eşinize göre, ideal olarak bir erkek kaç yaşında evlenmeli? _____

23- Neden?

24- Sizce karı-koca arasında yaş farkı olmalı mı?

1 ___ Evet

Kaç yaş? _____

2 ___ Hayır

Neden? _____

25- Eşinize göre, karı-koca arasında yaş farkı olmalı mı?

1 ___ Evet

Kaç yaş? _____

2 ___ Hayır

Neden? _____

26- Sizin evliliğinize nasıl karar verildi?

- 1___ Aile büyükleri anlaşılardı
- 2___ Aileler anlaşılardı fakat eşlerin fikri soruldu
- 3___ Eşler birbirlerini görüp beğendiler ve aileler anlaşılardı
- 4___ Eşler birbirlerini sevip anlaşılardı fakat ailelerin onayı alındı
- 5___ Eşler birbirlerini sevip kendileri anlaşılardı
- 6___ Ailelerin karşı çıkmasına rağmen evlendiler
- 7___ Başka: _____

27- Çocuklarınızın nasıl evlenmelerini istersiniz?

- 1___ Aile büyükleri anlaşılmalı
- 2___ Aileler anlaşılmalı fakat gençlerin fikri sorulmalı
- 3___ Gençler birbirlerini görüp beğenmeli ve aileler anlaşılmalı
- 4___ Gençler birbirlerini sevip anlaşılmalı fakat ailelerin onayı alınmalı
- 5___ Gençler birbirlerini sevip kendileri anlaşılmalı
- 6___ Başka: _____

28- Neden?

29-Eşiniz çocuklarınızın nasıl evlenmelerini ister?

- 1___ Aile büyükleri anlaşılmalı
- 2___ Aileler anlaşılmalı fakat gençlerin fikri sorulmalı
- 3___ Gençler birbirlerini görüp beğenmeli ve aileler anlaşılmalı
- 4___ Gençler birbirlerini sevip anlaşılmalı fakat ailelerin onayı alınmalı
- 5___ Gençler birbirlerini sevip kendileri anlaşılmalı
- 6___ Başka: _____

30- Neden?

31- İlk çocuğunuzun doğumunda kaç yaşındaydınız? _____

32- Eşiniz kaç yaşındaydı? _____

33- Sizce ideal olarak bir kadın ilk çocuğunu kaç yaşında doğurmalı?

34- Eşinize göre, ideal olarak bir kadın ilk çocuğunu kaç yaşında doğurmalı? _____

- 35- Sizce ideal olarak bir erkek kaç yaşında baba olmalı? _____
- 36- Eşinize göre, ideal olarak bir erkek kaç yaşında baba olmalı? _____
- 37- Sizce ideal olarak bir ailenin kaç çocuğu olmalı? _____
- 38- Eşinize göre, ideal olarak bir ailenin kaç çocuğu olmalı? _____
- 39- Siz kendiniz kaç çocuk isterdiniz? _____
- 40- Eşiniz kaç çocuk isterdi? _____
- 41- Tek çocuğunuz olsaydı kız mı, erkek mi olmasını isterdiniz?
- 1____ Kız
- 2 ____ Erkek
- 3____ Fark etmez
- 42- Neden?
-
-
- 43- Sizce eşiniz tek çocuğu olsaydı kız mı, erkek mi olmasını isterdi?
- 1____ Kız
- 2 ____ Erkek
- 3____ Fark etmez
- 44- Neden?
-
-
- 45- Oğlunuz varsa veya olsa ne kadar okumasını isterdiniz?
- 1____ İlkokul
- 2 ____ Ortaokul
- 3 ____ Lise
- 4 ____ Meslek Okulu
- 5 ____ Üniversite
- 6 ____ Lisans Üstü
- 7 ____ Kendisi ne kadar isterse

46- Eşiniz oğlunuz varsa veya olsa ne kadar okumasını isterdi?

- 1 ___ İlkokul
- 2 ___ Ortaokul
- 3 ___ Lise
- 4 ___ Meslek Okulu
- 5 ___ Üniversite
- 6 ___ Lisans Üstü
- 7 ___ Kendisi ne kadar isterse

47- Kızınız varsa veya olsa ne kadar okumasını isterdiniz?

- 1 ___ İlkokul
- 2 ___ Ortaokul
- 3 ___ Lise
- 4 ___ Meslek Okulu
- 5 ___ Üniversite
- 6 ___ Lisans Üstü
- 7 ___ Kendisi ne kadar isterse

48- Eşiniz kızınız varsa veya olsa ne kadar okumasını isterdi?

- 1 ___ İlkokul
- 2 ___ Ortaokul
- 3 ___ Lise
- 4 ___ Meslek Okulu
- 5 ___ Üniversite
- 6 ___ Lisans Üstü
- 7 ___ Kendisi ne kadar isterse

49- Çocuğunuz için düşündüğünüz belirli meslekler var mı?

- 1 ___ Evet
- 2 ___ Hayır

(Cevap evet ise:)

50- Kızınız varsa veya olsa onun için hangi mesleği düşünürdünüz?

51- Neden?

52- Eşiniz kızınız varsa veya olsa onun için hangi mesleği düşünürdünüz?

53- Neden?

54- Oğlunuz varsa veya olsa onun için hangi mesleği düşünürdünüz?

55- Neden?

56- Eşiniz oğlunuz varsa veya olsa onun için hangi mesleği düşünürdünüz?

57- Neden?

Anket burada sona ermiştir. Katılımınız için teşekkürler.