MATERNAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL AND CHILD TEMPERAMENT AS PREDICTORS OF PRESCHOOLERS' INTERNALIZING PROBLEMS: MEDIATING ROLE OF GUILT PRONENESS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

GÜLSÜN ÜNAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2015

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Head of Department

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak-Berument
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN ACAR (METU, PSY) _____

Prof. Dr. Sibel KAZAK-BERUMENT (METU, PSY) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Funda KUTLU (Ufuk U., PSY)_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name : Gülsün Ünal

Signature :

ABSTRACT

MATERNAL PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTROL AND CHILD TEMPERAMENT AS PREDICTORS OF PRESCHOOLERS' INTERNALIZING PROBLEMS: MEDIATING ROLE OF GUILT PRONENESS

Ünal, Gülsün
M.S., Department of Psychology
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak-Berument

September 2015, 93 pages

Parenting has been found to be an important determinant of child adjustment. Parental use of psychological control has been linked with children's internalizing problems during preschool years. The first aim of the present study was to investigate the relation between perceived maternal psychological control and preschoolers' internalizing problems. In addition, the mediating role of children's guilt proneness on that relation was examined. Moreover, the role of parenting and child temperament interaction in determining child outcomes has been well documented by research. The second aim of the current study was to investigate how interaction of perceived maternal psychological control and child temperament would have an effect on child's guilt proneness. To accomplish these aims, 100 preschoolers aged between 52 to 78 months and their mothers participated in the study. Children's assessment of perceived maternal psychological control and guilt proneness were conducted one by one at the kindergartens located in Ankara and Bolu. The mothers were required to rate their children on the questionnaires of child temperament, guilt proneness and

internalizing problems. On the contrary to what was expected, the results revealed no relationship between perceived maternal psychological control and child's internalizing problems. Consequently, the expected mediating role of child's guilt proneness was not statistically analyzed. Moreover, in contradiction to what was expected, interaction of perceived maternal psychological control and child temperament did not have an effect on either child's guilt proneness, or internalizing problems.

Keywords: Psychological Control, Temperament, Guilt Proneness, Internalizing Problems.

ÖZ

OKUL ÖNCESİ DÖNEMDE ÇOCUĞUN İÇSELLEŞTİRME DAVRANIŞLARINI YORDAMADA ANNEDEN ALGILANAN PSİKOLOJİK KONTROLÜN VE MİZACIN ROLÜ: SUÇLULUK HİSSETMEYE YATKINLIĞIN ARACI ROLÜ

Ünal, Gülsün
Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak-Berument

Eylül 2015, 93 Sayfa

Bu çalışmanın ana amacı, anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün okul öncesi donemde çocuğun içselleştirme davranışları üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir. Çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığının bu ilişki üzerindeki aracı rolü incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmanın bir diğer amacı da anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün ve çocuğun mizaç özelliklerinin etkileşiminin çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir. Katılımcılar Ankara ve Bolu'da yasayan yaşları 52-78 ay arasında değişen 100 çocuk ve annelerinden oluşmaktadır. Anneler çocuklarının içselleştirme davranışlarını, suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığını ve mizacını değerlendiren ölçekleri doldurmuşladır. Çocuklar ise suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı ve anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolü ölçmeyi amaçlayan iki uygulamaya katılmışlardır. Bu çalışma için 3 farklı regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. İlk analizin amacı, çocuğun kendini değerlendirmesine dayananan suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığının yordayıcılarını belirlemektir.

İkinci analizin amacı annenin değerlendirmesine dayanan çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığının yordayıcılarını belirlemektir. Son analizin amacı ise çocuğun içselleştirme davranışlarının yordayıcılarını belirlemektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Psikolojik Kontrol, Mizaç, Suçluluk Hissetmeye Yatkınlık, İçselleştirme Problemleri.

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very grateful to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument for her support and guidance in each step of the current thesis. I am also thankful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Başak Şahin Acar and Assist. Prof. Dr. Funda Kutlu for their participation and valuable comments in the Examining Committee.

My special thanks go to Onur Can Çabuk, who always stand with me and spent his valuable time in helping me completing this thesis. I am also very grateful to Şükran Okur for her assistance in statistical analysis.

At last but not least, very special thanks go to all children participated in this study, for the inspiration they gave and for the joy they shared with me.

This thesis was supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM iii
ABSTRACT iv
ÖZ vi
DEDICATION viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS x
LIST OF TABLES xiii
CHAPTER
1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 General Introduction 1
1.2 Conceptualizing Maternal Psychological Control 2
1.2.1 Intrusive and Manipulative Parenting Behaviors in Psychological Control 3
1.2.2 Importance of Assessing Children's Own Perception of Maternal Psychological Control 5
1.2.3 Psychological Control and Children's Adjustment Problems 7
1.3 Feelings of Shame and Guilt 10
1.3.1 Guilt Proneness 13
1.3.2 Development of Guilt 14
1.3.3 Psychological Control and Guilt Proneness 16
1.3.4 Feelings of Guilt and Adjustment Problems in Children 17

1.4 Child Temperament 18
1.4.1 Perceptual Sensitivity and Anger/Frustration 19
1.4.2 Child Temperament and Guilt Proneness 19
1.4.3 Child Temperament and Parenting Interaction on Child's Guilt Proneness 20
1.5 Hypotheses of the Present Study 22
2. METHOD 23
2.1 Participants 23
2.2 Measures 23
2.2.1 Measure of Mother Reported Child's Guilt Proneness 25
2.2.2 Child's Internalizing Problems 25
2.2.3 Child Temperament 26
2.2.4 Assessment of Children's Perception of Maternal Psychological Control 27
2.2.5 Assessment of Child Reported Guilt Proneness 27
2.3 Procedure 28
3. RESULTS 21
3.1 Data Cleaning 30
3.2 Descriptive Analyses for the Measures of the Study 30
3.3 Correlation Analyses for the Measures of the Study 31
3.3.1 Correlations between Child and Mother Related Demographics Variables 31
3.3.2 Correlations between Demographic Variables and Child Outcomes 32
3.3.3 Correlations between Measures of the Study 32
3.4 Regression Analyses 33
3.4.1 Predicting Child Reported Guilt Proneness 33
3.4.2 Predicting Mother Reported Child's Guilt Proneness 34
3.4.3 Predicting Child's Internalizing Problems 35
4. DISCUSSION 52
4.1 Review of the Hypotheses 38

4.2 Evaluation of the Results on Predicting Child's Guilt Proneness 39
4.3 Evaluation of the Results on Predicting Child's Internalizing Problems 43
4.4 Strengths and the Limitations of the Current Study 45
4.5 Implications and Contributions of the Study 46
4.6 Suggestions for Future Research 47
REFERENCES 48
APPENDICES
A. My Child 60
B. Child Behavior Checklist 63
C. Child Behavior Questionnaire 65
D. Assessment of Perceived Psychological Control 67
E. Assessment of Child Reported Guilt Proneness 70
F. Parental Informed Consent Form 73
G. Ethics Committee Approval 74
H. Turkish Summary 75
I. Tez Fotokopi İzin Formu 92

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 1. Mother's Demographics Characteristics 24
Table 2. Descriptive Characteristics of the Measures 24
Table 3. Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Measures of the Study 32
Table 4. Regression Coefficients of Predictors for Child Reported Guilt Proneness 34
Table 5. Regression Coefficients of Predictors for Mother Reported Child's Guilt Proneness 35
Table 6. Hierarchical Regression Results for Variables Predicting Internalizing Problems 37

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Introduction

Parenting is one of the most important determinants of child development. From birth to death, almost every child is exposed to certain types of parenting behaviors, which would shape what kind of an adult she or he will become and how her or his psychological adjustment will be. The importance of studying parenting in understanding children's adjustment problems has been emphasized by a great number of studies (Galambos, Barker, &Almeida, 2003; Williams et al., 2009).

Among the parenting characteristics maternal psychological control which has been thought to include intrusive and coercive parenting practices, has been linked with children's adjustment problems, especially internalizing symptoms (Barber, 1996). Moreover, maternal psychological control also has been found to affect development of conscious emotions like guilt and shame by altering how intense those emotions would be felt, so to say shame and guilt proneness (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004; Rakow et al., 2009). On the other hand, research conducted on shame and guilt feelings of children and adolescents has revealed a link from those emotions to children's externalizing and internalizing problems (Ferguson, 1999). Thus, the present study aims to investigate the relationship between maternal psychological control and preschoolers' internalizing problems, and the mediating role of children's guilt proneness on this relation.

Moreover, among the other factors that have a role in child outcomes appears to be the interaction between child temperament and perceived parenting (Morris et

al., 2002; Kochanska, 1991, 1993). Therefore, the second aim of the present study is to examine how the interaction of perceived maternal psychological control and certain child temperament's characteristics, namely anger/frustration and perceptual sensitivity, would play a role in determining preschooler's guilt proneness.

In the following sections of the current thesis, first of all maternal psychological control and its relation with internalizing problems will be presented. Secondly, development of conscious emotions like shame and guilt will be explained. Thirdly, guilt proneness and its relation with both perceived maternal psychological control and internalizing problems will be presented. Lastly, role of the interaction between child temperament and perceived maternal psychological control on determining preschooler's guilt proneness will be explained.

1.2 Conceptualizing Maternal Psychological Control

In the literature psychological control is defined as a covert and intrusive control of the parent which aims to manipulate the child's behavior and identity by means of coercive strategies such as excessive criticism, contingent affection, guilt induction, restrictive communication and invalidation of child's feelings (Barber, 2001). The term is also conceptualized as intrusive parenting behaviors that interfere with psychological and emotional development of the child (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005).

Psychological control is a complex and multifaceted construct combining specific strategies or behaviors of control and their outcomes in terms of child development (Barber, 2012). Schaefer, who defined the construct as "psychological methods of controlling the child's activities and behaviors that would not permit the child to develop as an individual apart from the parent" made the earliest conceptualization of the construct (1965, p. 555). Almost three decades later, Barber (1996, p. 3297) reviewed relevant work and elaborated the

construct as “a rather insidious type of control that potentially inhibits or intrudes upon psychological development through manipulation and exploitation of the parent–child bond (e.g., love withdrawal and guilt induction), negative, affect-laden expressions and criticisms (e.g., disappointment and shame), and excessive personal control (e.g., possessiveness, protectiveness).” He also added that such a socialization pressure characterized by being nonresponsive to children’s psychological and emotional needs would result in deteriorations in different areas of child development.

To sum up, psychological control is defined as parental use of intrusive behaviors aiming to manipulate children’s thoughts, feelings and attachments to parents. These parental behaviors have been thought to cause disturbances in emotional boundaries between the child and parent, which would interfere with the development of an independent self and identity coming along with difficulties in social and psychological adjustment (Barber, 2002). In the following part, specific forms and parental behaviors of psychological control will be explained. In addition, how and thorough what kind of mechanisms those kind of parental behaviors would be deleterious for children’s development will be specified.

1.2.1 Intrusive and Manipulative Parenting Behaviors in Psychological Control

Parenting behaviors, which have been thought to be *intrusive* in children’s development, has been accepted as a form of parental psychological control. These parental practices would include strategic manipulation, coercion or inappropriate display of parental authority (Barber, Xia, Olsen, McNeely, & Bose, 2012). According to Barber (2002), those kinds of controlling behavior of the parent would violate the “psychological world of the child”, which is crucial for healthy development. Similarly, those parental behaviors have been thought to violate the children’s sense of self (Barber et al., 2012), which would be deleterious for individuation and differentiation from parents (Kins, Soenenes, &

Bayers, 2012). Finally, those parental behaviors have been suggested to cause a lack of opportunities for self-discovery in children (Constanzo & Woody, 1985).

Moreover, parental use of *love withdrawal* has also been suggested to be a specific form of psychological control. It has been described as "expressing disapproval, ignoring and threatening child to take away love and attention" (Garner, 2012). It has been found to be destructive for healthy child development by eliciting feelings of shame, which could result in negative emotions and destruction of thinking and behavior (Lewis, 2008). Similar to love withdrawal, *parental conditional regard* (PCR), in which parents show affection or regard only to specific behaviors of the child, has been suggested as another specific form of psychological control (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004). In PCR affection of parents is contingent upon only certain behaviors of the child. In their work Soenenes and colleagues (2010) suggested two components of PCR, which are dependency-oriented psychological control and achievement oriented psychological control. While the former term refers to attempts to make the child psychologically and emotionally dependent on the parent, the latter term refers to parents' demands for extremely high achievement by children. These kind of parental behavior forcing of children to act or conform in a way that they receive or do not lose parental affection, would result in inconsistent changes in children's self esteem, feelings of failure and unworthiness (Assor & Tal, 2012).

Furthermore, *parental guilt induction* has been accepted as another parenting behavior reflecting psychological control. Guilt induction would refer to parent's attempts to manipulate child's behaviors by means of direct criticism, blame and making child feel that she/he is a burden for the parent. It would also include parental behaviors like expressing disappointment even on minor mistakes of the child and reminding the child that the needs of parent's is more important than those of the child's (Donatelli, Bybee, & Buka, 2007). Several studies have linked parental guilt induction with negative child outcomes such as depression and internalizing problems (Donatelli et al., 2007; Rakow et al., 2009). Moreover,

manipulative forms of parental psychological control (i.e. love withdrawal) would include parental behaviors forcing child to change his/ her thoughts and feelings in accordance with parental demands and expectations (Soenens & Vanstennkiste, 2010). As a consequence, volitional, self-determined and autonomous functioning of the child would be stunted (Grolnick &Pomerants, 2009).

In addition to all those manipulative and coercive parenting behaviors mentioned above, Sümer and colleagues (2009) suggested parental use of "*comparison*" as another controlling behavior by considering daily experiences and cultural practices in Turkish culture. In comparison, child's performance on a specific task is compared with that of another sibling or peer by parent. Although the aim of parental comparison would usually to increase child's motivation on a specific task, it has been linked with negative child outcomes such as insecure attachment and higher anxiety levels (Sümer et al., 2009).

As it has been demonstrated so far, *parental psychological control* has been suggested to consist of intrusive and manipulative parenting behaviors, which would be related with negative child outcomes (Barber, 2002). The current study aims to provide a better understanding of maternal psychological control and its effect on child adjustment by taking children's own experiences of psychological control in to account. Therefore the following section will focus on the issues about assessing children's own perceptions of parental psychological control.

1.2.2 Importance of Assessing Children's Own Perception of Maternal Psychological Control

Studies looking at the level of correspondence between parents' and children's reports of parenting behavior have not suggested a complete agreement within the respondents. This was evidenced by very small to modest correlations (Tein, Roosa, & Michaels, 1994; Sessa, Avenevoli, Steinberg, & Morris, 2001). Other studies comparing parental reports of child behavior with the trained observers'

reports on the same behavior found some correspondence between reporters (Achenbach, McConaughy, & Howell, 1987; Hinshaw, Han, Erhardt, & Huber, 1992). Although these discrepancies may result from some validity related issues on the measurement techniques used, they would be likely to reflect existing differences in the perspectives of respondents on the same behavior (Sessa et al., 2001).

Therefore, as Morris and colleagues (2002) suggested, when studying psychological control it becomes crucial to take the children's subjective experiences into account since the psychological control is in the "eye of the controlled". However, despite there has been significant number of studies about psychological control in the literature, only a small amount them relied on children's own experiences of psychological control. This has been thought to stem from a lack of developmentally sensitive measures assessing children perceptions of parental behaviors (Morris et al., 2002).

Studies examining the role of parenting and psychopathology in young children have mainly relied on parental and observers' reports of parenting behavior. This has been suggested to be related with the concerns on whether young children would be capable of providing valid reports of their own parenting experiences (Sessa et al., 2001). There has been a body of research suggesting that children younger than 8 were incapable of describing others' and their own behaviors by means of internal and stable characteristics (Barenboim, 1981; Shantz, 1985). However, this was an previously accepted view and has been questioned by later research.

From a more contemporary point of view, recent research has suggested that mainly because of the methods used to assess children's social understanding, developmental research had underestimated young children's cognitive capacities and competencies on reporting their own experiences. (Hart & Damon, 1986; Miller & Alois, 1989).

Majority of the studies on children's reports of parenting behavior has been conducted by interview techniques with open-ended questions, which would require an advanced ability in verbal production and expressive skills (Morris et al., 2002). However, it is overlooked that younger children's verbal comprehensive skills are better developed than their verbal expressive skills. As a result, age related differences between younger and older children's use of dispositional terms in their reports of experiences would likely to occur. However, this would reflect younger children's linguistic immaturity rather than lack of a psychological understanding of others (Furman & Bierman, 1983). In addition, being questioned by an unfamiliar adult would hinder children from providing meaningful reports of their experiences. In the line with this argument, when children were interviewed with a more age appropriate technique in which puppets were used, children as young as 3 and 5 years of age were found to be able to provide reliable reports of their own and others' internal states and emotions (Eder, 1989, 1990).

As it has been presented above, the literature provides a good amount of supportive argument and evidence for young children being capable of giving reliable reports of their own social relationships and psychologically meaningful descriptions of other people. The important point, well worth the attention, has seemed to be the use of appropriate assessment techniques, which would be sensitive to children's developmental level (Morris et al., 2002). In the current study, a puppet interview technique, which has been created in the light of the perspective mentioned above and originated from the work of Morris and colleagues (2002), was used to assess preschooler's perceptions of maternal psychological control. Since psychological control has been conceptualized as a very negative parenting dimension and found to be deleterious for child development, the next section will be focused on the link between parental use of psychological control and negative child outcomes.

1.2.3 Psychological Control and Children's Adjustment Problems

Since psychological control has been described as intrusive, it is likely to pose a threat to children's developing sense of self, which may cause adjustment problems, particularly internalizing difficulties (Barber, 1996). In the adolescence literature, psychological control has found be related with anxiety (Schleider, Clorinda, Krause, &Gilham, 2014), anxiety and depression (Campione-Barr, Lindell, Greer, & Amanda, 2014) and internalizing difficulties in general (Lokuas, 2009).

Moreover, parental use of *guilt induction*, which is a specific form of psychological control, has been suggested to damage children's adaptive, social and interpersonal growth, and also autonomy development during adolescence period (Donatelli et al., 2007) As a result, children exposed to parental quilt induction would become more prone to develop internalizing problems. In support of this view, guilt induction was found to be associated with higher levels of parent reported child-internalizing symptoms among 15 years olds (Donatelli et al., 2007). Similarly, Rakow and collegues (2009) examined the relation between child reported parental quilt induction and parent reported child-internalizing problems. They found that parental quilt induction was predictive of internalizing problems among 9 to15 year- olds. Finally, a recent intervention study (McKee et al., 2014) targeting to reduce youth internalizing symptoms by decreasing use of guilt induction among depressed mothers has found that reductions in parental use of guilt induction were associated with lowered internalizing symptoms of adolescents both on the termination of the study and at 1 year follow up. Although there have been a number of studies focusing on the effects of parental guilt induction on adolescents, there has been a lack of research examining the effects of parental guilt induction during preschool years. Therefore, one of the contributions of the current study will be examining the effects of guilt induction, which is assessed as a sub-domain of perceived maternal psychological control among preschoolers.

Moreover, Cicchetti and Cohen (2006) suggested that although internalizing problems peak during adolescence period, understanding and identifying processes during early childhood would be crucial for intervention and prevention. Since psychological control damage not only independence detrimental to formation of a stable and a secure sense of self (Barber & Harmon, 2002), it could be argued that negative effects of psychological control on child outcomes would not be only limited to adolescence but also prominent in earlier or later periods of the development (Stone et al., 2013). In support of this argument, Soenens and Vansteenkiste (2010) suggested that maybe more importantly than suppressing development of independence; psychological control would damage a more basic and universal psychological need of the child, which is need for autonomy.

According to Deci and Ryan (2000) need for autonomy is a need for sense of psychological freedom and volition, which would not be restricted to any age. Since need for autonomy would be salient not only in adolescence but also in early childhood, parental psychological control would be detrimental to child adjustment regardless of age (Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010). In the line with this, a study (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005) examined the role of parenting styles on young children's problem behaviors. Children aged 5-6 years were followed from kindergarten to the second grade to assess problem behaviors. It was found that maternal psychological control was associated with increasing rate of internalizing problems during transition from kindergarten to primary school. Furthermore, parental psychological control during toddlerhood predicted social withdrawal among 4 years old children (Rubin, Burgess, & Hastings, 2002).

Similarly, in a study with primary school kids mothers of three groups of children, namely aggressive-externalizing, socially withdrawn-internalizing, and socially average, were compared in terms of behavioral and psychological control that they exercised. It was found that mothers of children in socially withdrawn-internalizing group were more overcontrolling than mothers of other groups of the children (Mills & Rubin, 1998).

Although literature on preschool period provided good evidence for the link between parental psychological control and children's internalizing problems, all the studies mentioned above relied on maternal reports of psychological control. However, as it was presented in the previous section of the current thesis, measuring parental psychological control from the children's perspective would be more crucial (Morris et al., 2002).

There have been several studies, which used age appropriate techniques to assess younger children's perceptions of parenting. In one of them (Stone et al., 2013) Berkeley Puppet Interview (Measelle, Ablow, Cowan, & Cowan, 1998), which has been developed to assess perceived psychopathology and parenting with children ages 3 ½ to 8 years old, was used. The sample included children aged between 5 to 8 years old with an average of 7 years. It was found that perceived maternal psychological control was associated with children's reports of their own internalizing problems. In another study (Morris et al., 2002) psychological control subscale of the Child Puppet Interview (CPI; Sessa et al., 2001), which was very similar with Berkeley Puppet Interview, was used to assess perceptions of maternal psychological control. Similarly, perceived maternal psychological control was related with internalizing problems children aged between 6 to 9 years old.

In conclusion, although the research supported the view that preschoolers would be able to give reliable reports of their perceptions on parenting, only few studies examined the relation between perceived psychological control and internalizing

problems among young children (Stone et al., 2013; Morris et al, 2002). Therefore, the current study first aimed to investigate the link between perceived maternal psychological control and preschoolers' internalizing problems. Second, it aimed to extend the current literature by testing the mediating role of children's of guilt proneness on the link from maternal psychological control to children's internalizing problems. Therefore, the next two sections will be about development of shame and guilt and how they have been linked with both parental use of psychological control and children's internalizing difficulties.

1.3 Feelings of Shame and Guilt

In the pace of daily life people would take actions that would have negative consequences on others either intentionally or unintentionally (Tangney, 1991). The term moral affect would include emotional experiences that are related both with the capacity to understand interpersonal actions and the motivation to compensate wrongdoings (Tangney, 1991). In addition, at the times of personal failure or transgression or achievement and success, both adults and children would tend to turn toward themselves and give some thought to their actions regarding their abilities and who they are. As a product of this reflection, they would experience self-related feelings of shame and guilt (Furukawa, Tangney, & Higashibara, 2012).

There have been several attempts of different researchers to make a distinction between feelings of shame and guilt, and to provide definitions of events eliciting those emotions (Tangney, Stuewig, & Mashek, 2007). The first attempt of making a distinction between shame and guilt was made considering the types of emotion eliciting events. However, relying on type of event to make a distinction have not received sufficient empirical support. In the studies of Keltner and Buswell (1996) (as cited in Tangney, 2007) children and adults provided descriptions for guilt and shame eliciting events. In those descriptions no common standards for a situation to be classified as either guilt or shame eliciting appeared.

Indeed, while some people defined events like lying, cheating or disobeying the parents as shame eliciting, others considered them as guilt eliciting.

The second attempt to make a distinction between shame and guilt was made regarding public versus private nature of the emotion-provoking event. According to this view (Benedict, 1946) shame is conceptualized as a "public" emotion, which would be elicited in incidents or transgression, which happened in public and were followed by disapproval of others. On the other hand, guilt is viewed as a more "private" emotion since it would be elicited by self generated remorse. However, Tangney and colleagues (as cited in Tangney, 2007) provided counter evidence for this view. In their study, children and adults were required to describe their personal experiences of shame and guilt eliciting events. Examination of those descriptions in terms of social context revealed that both shame and guilt were equally likely to be experienced in the presence of others. On the contrary to public vs. private distinction, the frequency of others being aware of the participant's behavior did not have an effect for a behavior to be described as guilt or shame eliciting.

The mostly accepted criteria for making a distinction between shame and guilt was suggested by Lewis (1971), who argued that while shame would include a negative evaluation of the global self, guilt would include a negative evaluation of a certain behavior. Proving an evidence of this view, Tracy and Robins (2006) examined emotional personal narratives of 153 people to see the relation between attributional style and feeling of shame and guilt. They found that internal, stable and uncontrollable attributions for a failure were associated with shame. On the other hand, internal, unstable, controllable attributions for a failure were associated with guilt.

Furthermore, in the light of the Lewis's (1971) perspective, it was suggested that quilt would involve a negative evaluation of a specific behavior ("I did *that* wrong") and it would be likely to bring other feelings of regret and remorse, along

with a wish to fix what has been done wrong (Tangney, 1993). On the other hand, shame would be a painful emotion and involve a negative evaluation of the global self ("*I* did that wrong"). This would result in feelings of failing the standards of the self, which it is compared against. Therefore, shame would likely to be accompanied by feelings of worthless and inferior, which could result in a wish to escape or disappear (Tracy & Robins, 2004).

As it has been mentioned so far, the literature provides a definition of both shame and guilt, and there exist some criteria to make distinction between those two emotions. However, when we think about the use of guilt and shame in daily language, these terms are mostly used interchangeably to label an emotion. Although Turkish literature lacks scientific studies examining the use of shame and guilt in the language, there exist other studies looking at the use of those terms in other language like English and Chinese. For example, in a study English-speaking participants were asked to label 135 different emotions. The results revealed guilt, shame, regret and remorse was grouped together as a subgroup of sadness. In addition, guilt and shame were mostly grouped together being considered as almost similar to each other (Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, & O'Conner, 1987).

Furthermore, in another study Chinese-speaking participants were required to cluster 113 shame related emotional terms. Interestingly, it was found that although participants were not given any guilt related term; guilt was identified mostly in combination with shame or as a main subcluster of it (Li, Wang, & Fischer, 2004). Therefore, when the interchangeable use of guilt and shame in Turkish language and the evidence from the research mentioned above were considered, it was decided to examine only guilt in the scope of the current thesis. As a result, in the following sections guilt proneness, development of guilt and its relation with other variables of the study will be explained from a developmental psychology point of view.

1.3.1 Guilt Proneness

In different situations of daily life, almost everyone has experienced guilt since human beings would have the capacity to feel this emotion. However, research has demonstrated that tendency to experience guilt would be a stable personality trait and an individual difference, that is, one person could feel more levels of guilt than others at the face of a wrongdoing or mishap (Tangney, 1990). Individuals who are highly guilt prone would tend to feel guilty at an increased intensity and give guilt-filled reactions to a broader spectrum of events (Flynn & Schaumberg, 2012). In other words, guilt prone individuals would be more likely to have both anticipatory and consequential behaviors of guilt in the face of a variety of experiences, compared to less guilt prone individuals (Tangney, 2007)

Guilt proneness has been found to be an important individual differences variable in determining psychological outcomes (Ferguson, Stegge, Eyre, Vollmer, & Ashbaker, 2000). Moreover, development of guilt, and a capacity to experience it, have been suggested to be an important milestone in the development of moral affect (Ferguson, Stegge, & Damhuis, 1991; Kochanska, 1994). Furthermore, Moderate levels of guilt have been found to be adaptive since they would create a motivation for moral behavior such as empathy and altruistic behavior (Hoffman, 1982). On the other hand, extreme levels of guilt would be maladaptive since it has been found to have a role in the development of different types of psychopathology (Ferguson et al, 2000; Tangney et al., 1996). Since one of the aims of the current study is to examine guilt proneness of children at preschool age, next section will focus on the development guilt.

1.3.2 Development of Guilt

When it comes to the question of when individuals start to feel guilty, developmental literature offers a body of research shedding light on the issue. As the earliest evidence of guilt, one study has found that moral emotions, including

guilt, was observable in children as young as 17 months old (Barrett, 2005). In this study, behaviors of children were observed during free play with parents and coded in three different semi-naturalistic situations; guilt, embarrassment and anxiety/inhibition. Results showed that 17-month-old toddlers did display guilt related behaviors in the context of standard violations. In addition, those behaviors were specific to guilt related situations and significantly differed from the behaviors observed in other situations.

Later, namely in the second and third years of the life, self-consciousness starts to develop and children begin to acquire social standards, rules and goals of the culture that they live in. As a result, during these periods, feelings of moral emotions, including guilt, have been thought to increase gradually and displayed in different behaviors a

In support of this view, in one study (Cole, Barrett, & Zahn-Waxler, 1992), 2-year-old toddlers were observed in two mishap paradigms in which they were believed that they broke a toy and spilled a glass of juice. Coding of their reactions to those mishaps revealed two major components: anger -frustration and attempt to fix the wrong, which were thought to be behavioral displays of shame and guilt. Similarly, in another study (Barrett, Zahn-Waxler, & Cole, 1993) two-year-old toddlers' behaviors during a free play session with an experimenter were examined. The results showed that children's reactions after engaging in a wrongdoing clustered in two categories: avoiding the experimenter or making reparation and telling about the wrongdoing. While the first cluster of behaviors were associated with feelings of shame, the second one was related with guilt.

Moreover, in their study on early development of guilt Kochanska and collegues (2002) longitudinally observed the behaviors of toddlers in a mishap paradigm in which they were believed to break a toy. Observations on the same paradigm were done when toddlers were 22, 33 and 45 months old. It was reported that when toddlers, as young as 22 months old, were believed that they had committed a

transgression they showed a tension. This tension was displayed by symptoms such as gaze aversion, increased negative emotion or bodily signals. In addition, feeling and expression of guilt on the same paradigm showed continuity throughout the assessments on 22, 33 and 45 months of age. It was concluded that feeling guilty after a wrongdoing has already been possessed as a traitlike quality, which would be an important indicator of individual differences (Kochanska, Gross, Lin, & Nichols, 2002).

In addition, Harris (1989) suggested that with age children become better at understanding social rules, responsibility and other's mental states. As a result, older children would be likely to express more guilt than younger children. In support of this argument, Bafunno and Camodeca (2013) examined the effect of age on early development of shame and guilt where 3 to 5 year olds were observed in two mishap paradigms and their behaviors indicating shame or guilt were coded. Interestingly, there was a significant effect of age only for guilt that was, children aged 4 to 5 years old expressed more guilt than children aged 3 years old.

As mentioned so far, developmental literature provides a good amount of evidence for early development of guilt, emerging during toddlerhood and continuing in preschool years. Therefore, based on the existing body of research it seems possible to assess guilt proneness in preschool age children and to investigate its mediating role on the relation between perceived maternal psychological control and internalizing problems. In order to better explain the rationale of the current study, the following section will be about research findings on the proposed link between psychological control and guilt proneness.

1.3.3 Psychological Control and Guilt Proneness

As Deci &Ryan (1985, 1995) suggests, parental conditional regard (PCR), which is a form of psychological control might create pressuring standards of self-

evaluation for children, which might result in negative emotional experiences. As a result, while the child would feel highly worthy when meets the parental standards, he or she would feel worthless and ashamed (Assor, Vansteenkiste, & Kaplan, 2009). Furthermore, Assor and collegues (2004), examined the relationship between perceived PCR as a socializing practice and negative self related affects, including guilt, among college students. They found that participants who reported higher levels of perceived PCR also reported short-lived satisfaction following gaining a success. Those participants also reported greater guilt following failure in a targeted task.

In addition to PCR, parental guilt induction, which is another form of psychological control, was found to have negative consequences on child development (Donatelli, Bybee, & Buka, 2007). Parental guilt induction has been conceptualized as having two components, which are disparagement and self-serving elicitation. Disparagement would refer to parental use of child directed criticism; blame and making the child feel like a burden or disappointment for the parent. On the other hand, self-serving elicitation would refer to parents' exaggeration of sacrifices made for the child and their behaviors reflecting self-focus and self-absorption (Rakow et al., 2009).

Research has provided good evidence for how parental guilt induction would be deleterious by leading to higher levels of guilt feelings in offsprings. For example, Donatelli and colleagues (2007) examined the relationship between use of guilt induction among depressed mothers and their children's psychological adjustment. They found that adolescents whose mothers used greater self-serving elicitation and disparagement, reported to have more chronic and pathologic guilt. Moreover, Williams and Bybee (1994) conducted content analyses of children descriptions of guilt eliciting events, individuals and specific incidents with 5th, 8th and 11th graders. They found that parents were rated as eliciting the feeling of guilt at the highest level for all students at different grades. Interestingly, a behavior was described as guilt eliciting if it had a consequence on others or it had

victimized others. On the other hand, parents did not need to be affected or victimized by their children's behaviors in order to evoke feeling of guilt in the child. In addition, parents were reported to induce feelings of guilt by lecturing, nagging or expressing disappointment by their children on a variety of moral or personal failings.

As presented so far, the research demonstrated that several parenting practices, which could be specific forms of psychological control, are related to children's guilt feelings. In the scope of the present study the link from shame and guilt proneness to children's adjustment problems will be examined. Therefore, the following section will focus on the literature findings on this relation.

1.3.4 Feelings of Guilt and Adjustment Problems in Children

Development and experience of guilt is an important component of moral affect, which is thought to be regulative for moral behavior (Tangney, 1990). There are studies suggesting that guilt proneness can be a protective factor for externalizing and internalizing problems. For example, guilt proneness was negatively related with hostility and aggression among boys (Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999). Similarly, in a longitudinal study guilt proneness were predictive of less delinquent behavior of adolescents (Stuewig & McCloskey, 2005).

On the other hand, other studies demonstrated that guilt proneness was associated with anxiety, somatization and obsessions in both childhood and adulthood (Harder, Cutler, & Rockart, 1992; Ferguson et al., 2000). Unfortunately, studies looking at the relation between guilt proneness and internalizing problems are rarely conducted with preschoolers. There is one study, which included participants aged between 6 to 13 years old (Ferguson, Stegge, Eyre, Vollmaer, & Ashbaker, 2000). It was found that child reported guilt proneness was associated with internalizing problems. In another study (Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen,

1999) the sample included children aged 5 to 12 years old and guilt proneness, along with shame proneness, was examined in relation with both internalizing and externalizing problems. Interestingly, the results provided mixed evidence regarding different types of pathology and child's gender. Guilt proneness was negatively associated with internalizing and externalizing symptoms for boys. However, it was positively associated with internalizing and externalizing symptoms for girls.

To sum up, research conducted so far has provided mixed evidence about the relation between guilt and psychopathology in children. The literature is also limited in terms of studies focused on preschool period. Therefore, the present study aimed to examine the relationship between guilt proneness and internalizing symptoms among children as young as preschool age. Moreover, the last aim of the current study was to investigate the role of child temperament and perceived maternal psychological control interaction on children's guilt proneness. For this purpose, in the following section how temperament and parenting interaction is associated with child outcomes will be discussed.

1.4 Child Temperament

Temperament was defined as "constitutionally based individual differences in reactivity and self regulation" (Rothbart, 1989). Research on temperament has suggested that since children vary in temperamental reactivity, they would have different affective experiences in the face of a same situation. Therefore, it is likely that while some children experience an invasive approach of a stranger positively, it could create a strong frustration in others, and would not mean anything for some others (Rothbart, Ahadi, & Hershey, 1994). As a result of temperamental variations, children may have experiential differences, that may lead to differences in the affective meaning of present, past and future events.

Effect of temperamental traits would also display in children's developing "working models" which would be the reflections of children's expectations on future events and their perceptions of themselves in relation with others (Rothbart et al., 1994).

In the scope of the current study only two dimension of child temperament namely, perceptual sensitivity and anger/frustration was examined. Therefore, the following two sections will be about those characteristics and their relations with guilt proneness

1.4.1 Perceptual Sensitivity and Anger/Frustration

Perceptual sensitivity was defined as "Detection of slight, low intensity stimuli from the external environment" (Gartstein & Rothbart, 2003). Although not studied much in the literature, perceptual sensitivity has been found to be an important moderator in adverse conditions. For example, it was found that when perceptual sensitivity was low, children in institutional care were at a disadvantage on self-regulation and self-recognition tasks compared to children living with their families in low socioeconomic statutes. However, when perceptual sensitivity was high, group differences on those tasks was no longer significant (Ertekin, 2014). In addition, temperamental characteristic of anger/frustration was defined as "amount of negative affect related to interruption of ongoing tasks or goal blocking" (Putnam & Rothbart, 2006). Frequently studied in the literature, higher levels of dispositional anger/frustration has been related with lower social functioning (Zhou, Eisenber, Wang, & Reiser, 2004), higher externalizing problems (Eisenberg, Fabes, Guthrie, & Reiser, 2000) and poor emotion regulation skills (Buss &Goldsmith, 1998). In the next section, how these temperamental characteristics could play a role in determining child's guilt proneness will be explained.

1.4.2 Child Temperament and Guilt Proneness

In their study Watson and Clark (1984) investigated the role of child temperament on mother reported children's reactions to wrongdoings. They found that children' s fearfulness and arousability, reactivity in general, were positively related with maternal reports of children's feelings of guilt, apology and attempts to maintain relationship with parent following a wrongdoing. Similarly, in another study (Rothbart et al., 1994) children's negative affectivity were positively associated with feelings of shame and guilt among children aged 6-7 years. In addition, fearfulness in infancy was predictive of guilt and empathy feelings at age 6.

In later work of Kochanska (1994), girls, who were high on perceptual sensitivity and effortful control, were found to experience higher affective discomfort after a wrongdoing. This result was not applicable for boys and others girls who did not score high on perceptual sensitivity and effortful control. These results were interpreted in two ways. Firstly, higher perceptual sensitivity would have made the girls notice even small or covert signs of emotional or behavior sign of parental disapproval after they did something wrong. Secondly, girls who were perceptually sensitive may have been better at reading the clues of others' distress and shape their own behavior to refrain from possible wrongdoing or transgression. As a result, these girls would have been more likely to feel empathy and discomfort following a wrongdoing.

In the scope of the current study, not only perceptual sensitivity and anger/frustration but also their interaction with maternal psychological control is investigated. Therefore, the next section will be about the role of temperament and parenting interaction on determining a certain child outcome, namely guilt proneness.

1.4.3 Role of Child Temperament and Parenting Interaction on Child's Guilt Proneness

Kochanska (1991) proposed a conceptual model for parenting and child temperament interactions and their effects on the development of conscious emotions. According to this model there are two processes in the development of children's conscious; affective process and self-regulatory process. Affective process means the emergence of ability to experience discomfort, guilt and anxiety in the face of a wrongdoing. On the other hand, self-regulatory "executive" process refers to the child's capacity to avoid wrongdoing and act in a desired way instead of a prohibited impulse.

Effects of the interaction between parenting and child temperament on children's guilt feelings have been further investigated in the literature. In her study Kochanska (1991) examined how the interaction of children's vulnerability to anxiety and fearful temperament and parental power assertive discipline would affect development of conscience, including guilt feelings. It was found that there was a significant relation between power assertive discipline and development of conscience only for the children with high anxiety proneness and fearful temperament. Specifically, those children were affected by adversity of power assertive discipline much seriously in terms of intensity of guilt feelings and extent of reparation after a wrongdoing or a transgression.

Moreover, fearful children have been suggested to be more prone to feel guilty since they are likely to show discomfort and worry in the face of a stressful event (Kagan, 1998). Therefore, fearful children are more likely to be negatively affected by parental criticism and more likely to show stress and arousal following a wrongdoing or transgression (Kochanska, 2002). In addition, another study (Kockanska, 1997) provided further evidence for the moderator role of fearful temperament on the relation between parental socialization and children's conscience development. It was found that children, who had fearful temperament

at time 1, maternal use of gentle discipline was related with improved development of conscience at time 2. In addition, in a relatively recent study by Kochanska (2002) children's fearful temperament at 22, 33 and 45 months were predictive of maternal reported child's guilt proneness at each time point consistently.

In the light of the research mentioned above, the current study tried to reveal the effect of perceptual sensitivity and anger/frustration on children's feelings of guilt. In addition, inspired by the work of Kochanska (1991, 1997, 2002), the present study tried to make an extension of her research by examining child temperament and perceived parenting interactions on determining a specific child outcome, namely guilt proneness.

1.5 Hypotheses of the Present Study

The primary aim of the current study is to investigate the relation between perceived maternal psychological control and children's internalizing problems, and the mediator role of children's guilt proneness on this relation. Second aim of the present study is to examine the moderator role of child temperament on the relation between perceived maternal psychological control and children's guilt proneness.

In light of the existing literature, it is hypothesized that perceived maternal psychological control would have a negative effect on children's internalizing problems via increased guilt proneness. In addition, it is hypothesized that children, who are high on temperament characteristics of anger/ frustration and perceptual sensitivity, would be affected from maternal psychological control more negatively in terms of increased guilt proneness.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

100 children who were attending to preschools, and their mothers, participated in the study. 62 children were recruited from kindergartens located in Keçiören, Ankara and 38 children were recruited from a kindergarten in Bolu.

The age range of children was 52 to 78 months, with a mean of 64.69 months (*SD*= 6.90). There were 48 girls (*M*= 65.22 months, *SD*= 7.08) and 52 boys (*M*= 64.19 months, *SD*= 6.76).

The mothers' age ranged between 25 to 46 years with a mean of 34.63 years (*SD*= 4.99). Among mothers, 9.3% had a primary school education, 10.3% graduated from secondary school, 33% graduated from high school, 11.3% had a bachelor degree and 36.1% had a graduate degree. Detailed information about mothers' demographic characteristics is given in Table 1.

2.2 Measures

The measures of the study included a demographic form; three mother- reported questionnaires for the child variables and two assessments of the child. Demographic form included questions about age, education level, occupation of mother and family income, in addition the questions on child's age, gender and type of care. Mother reported data of children' guilt proneness was obtained by using two subscales of My

Table 1.

Mother's demographics characteristics (N=100)

Age (Mean; SD)	34.63; 4.99
Education Level (N;%)	
Primary School	9 (9%)
Secondary School	10 (10%)
High School	32 (32%)
College (2 Years)	11 (11%)
University (4 Years)	32 (32%)
Masters	3 (3%)
Missing	3 (3%)
Current Working Status (%)	
Worker	59 (59%)
Non-Worker	38 (38%)
Missing	3 (3%)
Monthly Income (%)	
0-1000 TL	11 (11%)
1000-3000 TL	42 (42%)
3000-5000 TL	21 (21%)
5000-75000 TL	15 (15%)
7500-10000 TL	3 (3%)
10000 TL and more	1 (1%)
Missing	3 (3%)

Child (Kochanska, De Vet, Goldman, Murray, & Putnam, 1994) which were *guilt, remorse/ other emotional reactions after transgression, mishap, wrongdoing* and *concern over good feelings with parent after wrongdoing*. In order to assess internalizing problems, internalizing symptoms subscale of the Child Behavior Checklist for Ages 6-18 (CBCL/6-18; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) was filled out by mothers. For child temperament, mothers' rated their children on

anger/frustration and perceptual sensitivity subscales of the Child Behavior Questionnaire (Rothbart, Ahadi, Hershey, & Fisher, 2001). Finally, children were individually assessed on the perceived psychological control task, which were developed by the main researchers.

2.2.1 Measure of Mother Reported Child's Guilt Proneness

My Child (Kochanska, De Vet, Goldman, Murray, & Putnam, 1994) is a mother reported measure of early morality, which has 100 items in 10 individual scales. In the scope of the current study, mothers rated their children only on two scales by using a 5-point scale (1= extremely untrue, 5= extremely true). Since the scale had not been adopted into Turkish language, the primary researchers did the translation and back translation. First scale used in the study was named *guilt, remorse/ other emotional reactions after transgression, mishap, wrongdoing* (e.g. "yanlış bir şey yaptıktan sonra durgun ve sessiz olur") and it had 18 items with α = .73 to .86 (Kochanska et al., 1994). The second scale used was *concern over good feelings with parent after wrongdoing* (e.g." yanlış bir şey/ yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra anne babasının ona kızgın olmadığından emin olmak ister") and it had 6 items with α = .79 to .84 (Kochanska et al., 1994). In the current study Cronbach's α was .76 for the measure (See Appendix A).

2.2.2 Child's Internalizing Problems

The internalizing symptoms subscale of the Child Behavior Checklist for Ages 6-18 (CBCL/6-18; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) was presented to mothers. CBCL assesses children's behavioral and emotional problems, which could be observed over the last six months. The internalizing subscale was found to have a high internal consistency with α = .90 (Achenbach and Rescorla 2001). It included 30 items from the withdrawn, somatic complaints and anxious/depressed scales. Items were rated on a scale as; 0 (not true), 1 (somewhat or sometimes true), or 2 (very or often true).

The Turkish version of CBCL (Dumenci, Erol, Achenbach, & Simsek, 2004) was also available and Cronbach's α was .81 in the current study (See Appendix B).

2.2.3 Child Temperament

The current study was focused on two dimensions of child temperament, namely *anger/frustration and perceptual sensitivity*. In order to assess those only two related subscales of the Child Behavior Questionnaire (Rothbart, Ahadi, Hershey, & Fisher, 2001) were presented to mothers. They rated their children on each item by using a 5 point scale ranging *1 (extremely untrue of your child) to 5 (extremely true of your child).* Anger/frustration subscale had 13 items with α = .76 (Rothbart et al.,2001) and an example item was "Bir şey yapmasına izin verilmediğinde engellenmiş hisseder ve sinirlenir". Cronbach's α of the subscale was .78 in the current study. Perceptual sensitivity subscale had 12 items with α = .77 (Rothbart et al., 2001) and an example item was "Dokunduğu nesnenin pürüzsüz ya da pürüzlü olduğunu farkeder". In this study Cronbach's α was .68 for the subscale (See Appendix C).

2.2.4 Assessment of Children's Perception of Maternal Psychological Control

Based on the Psychological Control subscale of the Child Puppet Interview (CPI-P; Sessa et al., 2001), a puppet interview was adapted by the main researchers. In a total of 15 items, 5 were taken directly from the psychological control subscale of CPI-P, which was found to be a reliable measure of perceived psychological control when used with children aged 6-9 years old (α = .73; Morris et al, 2001). Other 10 items were developed by the main researchers considering the relevant work by Sessa and colleagues (2001) and Sumer and colleagues (2007). The items taped on different components of psychological control, which were comparison, love withdrawal, conditional reward and guilt induction (See Appendix D). Cronbach's α for this measure was .71 in this study. In addition to 15 items on psychological control, in order to decrease the negativity of the whole scale, 3

items from the maternal warmth subscale (α = .84) (Giotsa, 2012) of the Early Childhood Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (Rohner, 2012) were taken and included in the final version.

During the assessment two identical puppets presented opposing statements about parenting behaviors. All negative and positive versions of the statements were presented to the child in a counterbalanced order. For example, one puppet said " annemin istediği gibi bir çoçuk olmadığım zaman kötü hissederim" and the other said "annemin istediği gibi bir çocuk olmadığım zaman kötü hissetmem", and the child was asked to choose a puppet, which was more likely to her or him.

In the scoring, all answers to the items were coded either as 0 or 1, 0 indicating that the child thinks mother is low on that dimension, and 1 indicating that mother is high on that dimension. At the end, a total score of perceived psychological control was obtained and high scores indicated greater maternal psychological control. Scores of the items on maternal warmth were not included in the total score of psychological control.

2.2.5 Assessment of Child Reported Guilt Proneness

On the base of the Test of Self-Conscious Affect for Children (TOSCA-C; Tangney, Wagner, Burggraf, Gramzow, & Fletcher, 1990) and the Self Conscious Emotions-Maladaptive & Adaptive Scales (SCEMAS; Stegge & Ferguson, 1994), 5 brief scenarios, which children would be likely to face in daily life, were prepared. One scenario was taken directly from the TOSCA-C, which has been found to be a reliable measure of child-reported guilt proneness (α = .74) (Tangney 1992). Three scenarios from SCEMAS, which were also reliable measure of child-reported guilt proneness (α = .89) (Ferguson et al., 1994) were taken and shortened in order to make them more comprehensible for younger children. One additional scenario was developed by the main researchers. Cronbach's α of the whole measure was .76 in the current study.

In a total of 6 scenarios, two were about an achievement failure, one of which had consequences on self and the other had consequences on others. Two of the scenarios were on performance failure with consequences on others. And the last 2 of them were about an unintentional wrongdoing with consequences on others (See Appendix E).

In the scenarios, a transgression or a wrongdoing was presented and followed by one guilt and one externalizing response, which was thought to be the opposite of guilt response. An example scenario was " Küçük kuzeninle oyun oynarken yanlışlıkla Teyze'nin vazosunu kırdın. Teyzen bunun için senin yerine küçük kuzenini azarladı, sen de hiç sesini çıkarmadın". For this scenario the guilt response was " vazoyu benim kırdığımı söylemediğim için kendimi kötü hissederim" and the externalization response was " kuzenim de vazoyu kendisinin kırmadığını söyleseydi". All responses were given in a counterbalanced order.After hearing each response, children were required to state whether they were agreed or disagreed with each response. Specifically, they were asked to spread their arms if they were agreed with the response or fold their arms if they were not. Children's answers to each guilt and externalizing response were written down for later coding. In the coding, an answer received 0 if the child was disagreeing or it received 1 if the child was agreeing with that response. At the end, a total score of guilt and externalization, which could range between 0 and 5, was obtained.

2.3 Procedure

After an approval was obtained from METU Human Subjects Ethics Committee, directors of the kindergartens were asked for help to reach children and mothers. Then, an informed consent form was sent to mothers.

Mothers who approved their own and their child's participation received a questionnaire package including measures of mother reported measures of child's guilt proneness, internalizing problems and temperament. They were required to send the questionnaires back to the teacher in a closed envelope.

Children's assessments on the perceived maternal psychological control and guilt proneness were conducted individually in a silent room at the kindergartens. It took approximately 10 minutes to complete two assessments and children's answers were audio recorded for later scoring. All children received a sticker and a balloon at the end of the assessments.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Data Cleaning

Before starting the analysis, accuracy of data entry was ensured and missing values were handled. Four cases were totally deleted since they lacked either at least one measure of mother reported data or had missing values more than 20% of the whole data. Then a Multiple Imputation Analysis was performed to handle rest of the all-missing values. After data cleaning was completed, total scores for each measure were calculated. There were no outliers and skewness kurtosis in the data. The final sample included 100 mother-child pairs.

3.2 Descriptive Analyses for the Measures of the Study

Descriptive analyses of mother reported and child reported measures are shown in table 2. Means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum scores and internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) were calculated for mother reported measures of My Child, internalizing symptoms subscale of Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), anger/frustration and perceptual sensitivity subscales of Child Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ), and child reported measures of perceived maternal psychological control measure (PSYCONT) and child reported guilt proneness measure (CGP).

Table 2

Descriptive Characteristics of the Measures

Measures	N	Mean	SD	Min-Max	Cronbach's alpha
My Child	100	84.42	9.03	59-105	.76
CBCL-Internalizing	100	10.76	6.67	1-41	.81
CBQ	100	86.97	9.43	63-110	.74
Anger/ Frustration	100	43.70	7.93	20-62	.78
Perceptual Sensitivity	100	43.27	4.46	32-52	.62
PSYCONT	100	7.27	3.09	1-14	.71
CGUILT	100	4.17	1.83	0-6	.76

Note. CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist, CBQ = Child Behavior Questionnaire, PSYCONT = Perceived Maternal Psychological Control, CGUILT = Child Reported Guilt Proneness.

3.3 Correlation Analyses for the Measures of the Study

3.3.1 Correlations between Child and Mother Related Demographic Variables

Bivariate correlation analyses showed that child's age was negatively correlated with mother's education level (r = -.37, p < .01), income (r = -.34, p < .01) and it was positively correlated with mother's work status (r = .39, p < .01). In addition, mother's age was positively related with mother's education level (r =.22, p < .01) and mother's education level was positively associated with income (r = .53, p < .01) and work status
(r = .51, p < .01).

3.3.2 Correlations between Demographic Variables and Child Outcomes

Bivariate correlation analyses revealed that mother's age was positively associated with child reported guilt (r = .32, p < .01). In addition, mother's work status (r = -.25, p < .05), income (r = -.26, p < .05) and education level (r = -.36, p < .01) were negatively correlated with perceived psychological control. Moreover, child's age (r = .21, p < .05) was positively correlated with perceived psychological control.

3.3.3 Correlations between Measures of the Study

Bivariate correlation analysis showed that among all variables only mother reported child's guilt proneness was significantly correlated with perceptual sensitivity (r = .32, p < .001) and anger/frustration was significantly correlated with child's internalizing problems (r = .39, p < .001). There were no other significant correlations among the rest of the variables. All correlation results are given in Table 3.

Table 3

Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Measures of the Study

	MGuilt	Intern	Percsens	Ang/Frust	CGuilt	Psycont
MGuilt	1	.08	**.32***	.16	-.04	.12
Intern		1	-.06	**.39***	.09	.10
Percsens			1	.09	.14	.12
Ang/frust				1	.04	.14
CGuilt					1	.01
Psycont						1

* = p < .001

Note. MGuilt = Mother Reported Child's Guilt Proneness, Intern = Child's Internalizing Problems, Percsens = Perceptual Sensitivity, Ang/Frust = Anger/Frustration, CGuilt = Child Reported Guilt Proneness, Psycont = Perceived Maternal Psychological Control.

3.4. Regression Analyses

Three different sets of regression analyses were conducted in order to determine the factors associated with child reported guilt proneness, mother reported guilt proneness and child's internalizing problems.

3.4.1. Predicting Child Reported Guilt Proneness

A multiple regression analysis was run in order to examine the factors related with child reported guilt proneness. While the total score of guilt responses was entered as dependent variable into the equation, total scores of perceived psychological control, perceptual sensitivity, anger/frustration and centered scores of interaction of perceptual sensitivity and perceived psychological control and anger/frustration and perceived psychological control were entered as independent variables. However, none of the predictors were significantly associated with child reported guilt proneness; only .03% of the variance in the dependent variable was explained (R^2 = .03, F (5,96) = .57, p = .72). That was to say, child reported guilt proneness was not predicted by perceived psychological control (B = -.01, SE = .06, p = .86, 95% CI [-.13, .11]), perceptual sensitivity (B = .06, SE = .04, p = .11, 95% CI [-.01, .14]), anger/frustration (B = .00, SE = .03, p = .85, 95% CI [-.04, .06]), interaction of perceived psychological control and perceptual sensitivity (B = -.00, SE = .01, p = .71, 95% CI [-.03, .02]) and finally interaction of perceived psychological control and anger/frustration (B = -.00, SE = .01, p = .87, 95% CI [-.01, .01]). All regression coefficients are presented in Table 4.

Table 4.

Regression Coefficients of Predictors for Child Reported Guilt Proneness

Predictor	B	β	SE	t	p
PsyCont	-.01	-.02	.06	-.17	.86
PercSens	.06	.17	.04	1.63	.11
Ang/Frust	.00	.02	.03	.19	.85
Pcont*PerSens	-.00	-.04	.01	-.38	.71
Pcont*Ang/Frust	-.00	-.02	.01	-.16	.87

Note**:** PsyCont = Perceived Psychological Control; PercSens = Perceptual Sensitivity; Ang/Frust = Anger/Frustration; Pcont*PerSens = Perceived Psychological Control*Perceptual Sensitivity; Pcont*Ang/Frust = Perceived Psychological Control*Anger/Frustration

3.4.2 Predicting Mother Reported Child's Guilt Proneness

In order to determine the factors associated with mother reported guilt proneness, a multiple regression analysis was run. While total scores on mother reported guilt proneness measure was entered as dependent variable, total scores of perceived psychological control, perceptual sensitivity, anger/frustration and centered scores of interaction of perceptual sensitivity and perceived psychological control and anger/frustration and perceived psychological control were entered as independent variables. In this model 12% of the variance in the dependent variable was explained (R^2 = .12, F (5,98) = 2.71, p = .02) and only perceptual sensitivity was significantly predictive of mother reported child's guilt proneness (B = .61, SE = .20, p < .05, 95% CI [.22, 1]). Specifically, children who were high on perceptual sensitivity were rated higher on guilt proneness by their mother. On the other hand, perceived psychological control (B = .16, SE = .29, p = .59, 95% CI [-.42, 74]), anger/frustration (B = .15, SE = .11, p = .18, 95% CI [-.07, .37]), interactions of perceptual sensitivity and perceived psychological control (B = .00, SE = .06, , p = .99, 95% CI [-.13, .13]), and anger/frustration and perceived psychological

control (*B* = .01, *SE* = .04, *p* = .77, 95% CI [-.06, .08]) were not significantly associated with mother reported guilt proneness. All regression coefficients for all variables are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.

Regression Coefficients of Predictors for Mother Reported Child's Guilt Proneness

Predictor	B	β	SE	t	p
PsyCont	.16	.05	.29	.54	.59
PercSens	.61	.30	.20	3.08	.00*
Ang/Frust	.15	.02	.11	1.36	.18
Psycont*PerSens	.00	.00	.06	.01	.99
Psycont*Ang/Frust	.01	.03	.04	.30	.77

* = p <.05

Note: PsyCont = Perceived Psychological Control; PercSens = Perceptual Sensitivity; Ang/Frust = Anger/Frustration; Psycont*PerSens = Perceived Psychological Control*Perceptual Sensitivity; Psycont*Ang/Frust = Perceived Psychological Control*Anger/Frustration

3.4.3 Predicting Child's Internalizing Problems

A five-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to figure out which variables were associated with child's internalizing problems. At the first step perceived psychological control was entered into the analysis and it accounted for no variance in internalizing problems (R^2 = .00, *F* (1,98) = .82, *p* = .37).

In the second step, perceptual sensitivity and anger/frustration were entered into the equation and they increased the explained variance up to .17% (ΔR^2 = .16, *F* (2, 95) = 9.03, *p* < .001). It was revealed that anger/frustration was significantly predictive of child's internalizing problems (*B* = .33, *SE* = .08, *p* = .00, 95% CI [.17, .49]). Specifically, children who were high on anger/frustration had more

internalizing problems. On the other hand, perceptual sensitivity was not (*B* = -.15, *SE* = .14, *p* = .29, 95% CI [-.43, .13]) associated with internalizing problems.

In the third step both child reported and mother reported guilt proneness were entered into the equation but they did not change the explained variance in internalizing problems significantly (ΔR^2 = .01, F (2, 93) = .46, *p* = .00). That was to say, neither child reported (*B* = .30, *SE* = .36, *p* = .41, 95% CI [-.41, 1]) nor mother reported (*B* = .04, *SE* = .07, *p* = .57, 95% CI [-.10, .19]) guilt proneness was a significant predictor of child's internalizing problems.

In the fourth step interaction of perceived psychological control and perceptual sensitivity was entered into the analysis. However, the explained variance in internalizing problems did not increase (ΔR^2 = .00, F (1, 92) = .55, *p* = .00). In other words, interaction of perceived psychological control and perceptual sensitivity was not significantly associated with child's internalizing problems (*B* = -.03, *SE* = .05, *p* = .46, 95% CI [-.12, .06])

In the last step, interaction of perceived psychological control and anger/frustration were entered into the equation. It slightly increased explained variance in internalizing problems, only up to 19% (ΔR^2 = .01, F (1, 91) = .65, *p* = .01). That was to say, interaction of perceived psychological control and anger/frustration was not predictive of child's internalizing problems (*B* = -.02, *SE* = .28, *p* = .42, 95% CI [-.07, .03]). Coefficients in all the steps are presented in Table 6.

Table 6.

Hierarchical Regression Results for Variables Predicting Internalizing Problems

	Predictors	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F	ΔF	B	β	*t* value	*p* value
Step 1		.09	.01	.01	.82	.82				
	PsyCont						.20	.09	.91	.37
Step 2		.41	.17	.16	6.34	9.03				
	PercSens						-.15	-.10	-1.07	.29
	Ang/Frust						.32	.38*	3.99	.00*
Step 3		.42	.17	.01	3.94	.46				
	Moth_Guilt						.04	.08	.84	.57
	Child_Guilt						.30	.08	.84	.40
Step 4		.42	.18	.00	3.36	.55				
	PsyCont*Percsens						-.03	-.07	-.74	.46
Step 5		.43	.19	.01	2.96	.65				
	PsyCont*Ang/Frust						-.02	-.08	-.80	.42

* = p < .05

Note: PsyCont = Perceived Psychological Control; PercSens = Perceptual Sensitivity; Ang/Frust = Anger/Frustration; Moth_Guilt = Mother Reported Child's Guilt Proneness; Child_Guilt = Child Reported Guilt Proneness; Pcont*PerSens = Perceived Psychological Control*Perceptual Sensitivity; Pcont*Ang/Frust = Perceived Psychological Control*Anger/Frustration

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of the current study was to investigate the relationship between perceived maternal psychological control and child's internalizing problems, and the mediator role of child's guilt proneness on this relation. The secondary purpose was to examine whether the interaction between perceived psychological control and child temperament determines a certain child outcome, namely guilt proneness. There exist a number of research that explore the relation between maternal psychological control and children's internalizing problems, however, none of them conceptualized child's guilt proneness as a possible mediator explaining the underlying mechanism of the relation. Moreover majority of the research examining the moderator role of child temperament on the relation between perceived parenting and child outcomes was conducted with older children or adolescents. However, it is crucial to understand how those relations would operate during earlier periods of life in order to promote healthy development and psychological well being of children.

In this chapter, firstly, the results of the current study are evaluated in detail considering the hypotheses. Secondly, a detailed discussion of the findings is provided in the light of existing literature. Finally, limitations, strengths and contributions of the study and suggestions for future research are presented.

4.1 Review of the Hypotheses

There were two main hypotheses of the current study. Firstly, it was hypothesized that there would be a positive relation between perceived maternal psychological control and child internalizing problems, and child's guilt proneness would act as

a mediator on this relation. More specifically, it was expected that children who perceived their mothers as displaying more psychological control would be more prone to guilt feelings, which in turn would make them more likely to have internalizing problems. Secondly, it was hypothesized that child temperament, namely perceptual sensitivity and anger/frustration would have an moderator role on the relation between perceived maternal psychological control and child's guilt proneness. Specifically, it was expected that children who were high on perceptual sensitivity and anger/frustration would be more negatively affected by maternal psychological control in terms of displaying higher guilt proneness. In the following section, the results are discussed considering these hypotheses.

4.2 Evaluation of the Results on Predicting Child's Guilt Proneness

The first regression analysis was run in order to determine the factors predicting child reported guilt proneness. The results showed that none of the variables - perceived psychological control, perceptual sensitivity, anger/frustration, perceived psychological control*perceptual sensitivity and perceived psychological control*anger/frustration predicted child reported guilt proneness. This was not supporting the first hypothesis, which suggested a relationship between perceived maternal psychological control and child's guilt proneness. This result was also contradicting with other studies (Williams & Bybee, 1994) in the literature, suggesting a relation between components of parental psychological control and children's guilt proneness. For example; Assor and colleagues (2009) found that parental conditional regard (PCR), which was conceptualized as a subcomponent of psychological control in the current study, was related with offspring's display of grater guilt after failing a targeted task. Similarly, parental guilt induction, which was also conceptualized as a subcomponent of psychological control in the current study, was related with higher chronic and pathologic guilt in adolescents (Donatelli, Bybee, & Buka, 2007).

As it was mentioned above, there are studies suggesting a link between parental psychological control and child's guilt proneness. When methodological details of these studies are examined, it is seen that all of them were conducted via self-reports of school age children or adolescents, whom would display greater cognitive ability. To the best of our knowledge, the current study was the first one examining that link with such a young sample. Therefore, one could think that sample characteristics might have accounted for the failure of documenting the proposed link. In other words, it could be argued that preschoolers might have not been able to give reliable reports of their perceptions on maternal psychological control or their guilt feelings. However, this argument could be confronted with two counter arguments. Firstly, there are studies providing evidence for preschoolers being able to give reliable reports of their mental experiences when age appropriate assessment tools were used (Eder, 1989, 1990). The puppet interview, which was used to assess preschoolers' perceptions of maternal psychological control in the current study, was developed in the light of these studies, in which the same technique was used for similar purposes (Morris et al., 2002). Secondly, when the internal consistency of the puppet interview (Cronbach's $\alpha = .71$) was considered, it could be said that the measure worked well.

Since the assessment of perceived maternal psychological control was an age appropriate technique and it was found to be a reliable measure, rather than methodological difficulties, it seemed like there were some other factors, which might have accounted for the failure of revealing the proposed link between maternal psychological control and child's guilt proneness. One possible explanation could be that although conceptualized as a negative parenting dimension in Western literature, parental psychological control is not perceived negatively in the Turkish culture. As Kağıtçıbaşı (1970) suggested, traditional Turkish parenting practices include high levels of psychological control along with high levels of parental warmth. Therefore, when the cultural context is considered, parental psychological control may not be associated with negative

outcomes for the offspring. In support of this argument, Özdemir (2009) found that perceived parental psychological control was associated with positive child outcomes like autonomous-separate, heteronomous- relational and autonomous-relational self-construal among Turkish adolescents aged between 15 and 19. Similarly, in a cross-cultural study, which was conducted with Belgian and Turkish adolescents, it was found that perceived paternal psychological control was predictive of attachment avoidance for Belgian youth but not Turkish (Güngör & Bornstein, 2010).

Furthermore, since the current study was conducted with a very young sample (mean age = 65.03 months) one could think that taking children's own reports of guilt proneness into the account would not be a reliable assessment at this young age. However, when research in developmental literature is considered it would become difficult to accept this argument. Firstly, research has suggested that the earliest evidences of moral emotions, including guilt, were observable in children as young as 17 months of age (Barret, 2005). With age, as children become more socially capable, experiences of moral emotions gradually increases and become observable in a wider a range of behaviors (Lewis, Sullivan, Stanger, & Weiss, 1989). Secondly, assessing children's reports of guilt proneness by means of hypothetical scenarios has been a frequently used technique in research on this topic. Especially, there were two important studies (Ferguson et al., 2000; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999), which contributed to the rationale of the current study. The scenario technique was found to be a reliable assessment of guilt proneness in each one with Cronbach's alpha values of .81 and .73, respectively. However, different than the current study, the age range of the participants in these studies were quite wide, 6-13 and 5-12 years old respectively. To our knowledge, this was the first study assessing child's guilt proneness by using scenario technique with preschoolers, whose age range was more restricted.

Moreover, a second regression analysis was run in order to determine the factors, which would predict mother reported child's guilt proneness. This analysis was

almost similar with the first analysis. The same predictors were entered into equation but this time the dependent variable was mother reported child' guilt proneness. The results showed that among variables of perceived psychological control, perceptual sensitivity, anger/frustration, perceived psychological control*perceptual sensitivity and perceived psychological control*anger/frustration only perceptual sensitivity was significantly predicting mother reported child's guilt proneness. This was in accordance with the work of Kochanska (1994), which was also considered in formation of the rationale of the current study. In that work, it was found that girls who were higher on perceptual sensitivity displayed higher affective discomfort after a wrongdoing. Kochanska (1994) provided an explanation for this result that was, being perceptually sensitive to environment would make those children better at detecting cues of others' discomforts. As a result, those children display greater guilt and concerns over good feelings of others' after a wrongdoing.

Furthermore, in the current study it was expected that there would be an interaction effect of perceived psychological control and child temperament on child's guilt proneness. More specifically, children, who were high on perceptual sensitivity and anger/frustration, were expected to be affected by maternal psychological control more negatively in terms of increased guilt proneness. However, the analysis did not reveal such an interaction effect. This was surprising since there are studies providing supportive evidence for role of parenting and child temperament interaction on determining guilt proneness (Kochanska, 1991, 1997, 1998, 2002). For example, Kochanska (1991, 2002) found that parental power assertive discipline and parental criticism had more adverse effects for children who were temperamentally fearful and anxiety prone than children who were not so. Specifically, when exposed to power assertive discipline, fearful and anxious children displayed more intense guilt and desire for reparation after a wrongdoing when compared to other children.

To sum up, although there are studies suggesting an association between maternal psychological control and guilt proneness during adolescence, the present study did not reveal such an association for preschool period. One of the reasons of this could be that on the contrary to "Western" cultures, psychological control is not perceived negatively in Turkish culture. On the other hand, from a more developmental point of view, it can be argued that just because psychological control was not associated with negative child outcomes in preschool period does not mean that it will not have adverse effects in later periods of the development. In other words, preschool period could be a little early for adverse outcomes of psychological control to be observable and measurable. Therefore, it becomes crucial to conduct either longitudinal or cross sectional studies to figure out the developmental period, in which maternal psychological control starts to affect children negatively.

4.3 Evaluation of the Results on Predicting Child's Internalizing Problems

One of the main purposes of the current study was to investigate the link between perceived maternal psychological control and child's internalizing problems, and mediator role of guilt proneness on this link. In order to determine the factors, which were associated with child internalizing problems, a five-step hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. Unfortunately, the results revealed that neither perceived maternal psychological control nor guilt proneness was predictive of child's internalizing problems.

There exist a body of research documenting possible risk factors for internalizing problems during preschool years. Among those factors maternal depression (West & Newman, 2003; Bayer, Sanson, & Hemphill, 2006; Trapolini et al. 2007) was found to be the strongest predictor of childhood internalizing difficulties along with stressful life events. When the underlying mechanism of this relation was examined it was found that maternal depression and stressful life events would decrease parenting quality via decreased maternal sensitivity and emotional

support, which would make the child more prone to internalizing difficulties (Shaw et al. 2006). Among other risk factors related with parenting, maternal overprotection and psychological control were found to be related with internalizing problems and anxiety in young children (McShane & Hastings, 2009). In addition, poverty and low socioeconomic status were other risk factors for childhood internalizing problems (Slopen, Filtzmaurice, Williams, & Gilman, 2010). Insecure attachment between mother and child was another important risk factor for development of internalizing problems during preschool ages (Brumariu & Kerns, 2010; Madigan, Atkinson, Laurin, & Benoit, 2013).

In the current study preschoolers' guilt proneness was also thought to be a possible risk factor because other studies documented the link for children aged between 5-12 and 6-13 (Ferguson et al., 2000; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999). However, the results revealed no association between guilt proneness and internalizing problems.

As explained so far, research documented a significant number of child and environmental related risk factors for internalizing problems occurring in preschool period. So maybe guilt proneness was a more complex factor, whose effect was not prominent in preschool period but would become so in later periods. In other words, although guilt proneness was not a risk for internalizing problems in early years of life, it might become maladaptive and constitute a risk in later periods of development. In support of this idea, only two studies in the literature provided evidence for guilt proneness-internalizing problems association in early years of life (Ferguson et al., 2000; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999). However, in these studies age range of the sample was too wide (5-12 and 6-13 years old) and only a small proportion of the samples was consisted of preschoolers. Other studies suggesting a relation between guilt proneness and internalizing problems have been conducted with older samples. For example, self reported guilt proneness was found to be predictive of self reported depression

symptoms during young and middle adolescence (Rohleder, Chen, Wolf, & Miller, 2008; Tilghman-Osborne, Cole, Felton, & Ciesla, 2008).

Although guilt proneness was not documented as a risk factor for preschoolers by the current study, it should not be overlooked that guilt proneness would still constitute a risk for development of internalizing problems in later parts of the development. Therefore, it would become important to study this relation in longitudinal designs in order to figure out approximate timing of guilt proneness' starting to pose a risk. Finally, it would also be beneficial to study this relation in a cross sectional design, in which an early and middle childhood comparison becomes possible.

In addition, as mentioned in the methods part, Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) was used in order to measure children's internalizing problems. There are four subscales in CBCL, which are somatization, withdrawn and anxiety/depression. In the current study a composite score of those three subscales was entered into regression analysis. Although not mentioned in the results part. Another regression analysis, in which scores on each subscale were calculated and entered into the equation separately, was run. Results of this analysis revealed a marginally significant (p = .07) association between child reported guilt proneness and children's anxiety/depression scores. In other words, when depression/anxiety scores were extracted from somatization and withdrawn scores, child reported quilt proneness became a significant predictor of preschoolers' depression and anxiety.

Finally, the current study documented a relationship between child's temperamental characteristic of anger/frustration and internalizing problems. This was in accordance with other studies, which have documented anger/frustration as a risk factor for internalizing problems among preschoolers (De Pauw, Mervielde, & Van Leeuwen, 2009; Eisenberg et al., 2009). The underlying mechanism of this relation could be that children who are socially withdrawn, anxious and depressed

might be more likely to be rejected by peers and they are more likely to lack skills related with social assertion. As a result, these children experience anger and frustration, which contribute their internalizing behaviors in a vicious cycle (Eisenberg et al., 2005).

4.4 Strengths and the Limitations of the Current Study

Before mentioning about the limitations of the study, the strengths of the study should be noted. Firstly, this study was first in terms of examining the relationship between maternal psychological control and preschoolers' internalizing problems by conceptualizing guilt proneness as a mediator. Secondly, to our knowledge, it is the first study, which assesses children's own perceptions of maternal psychological control and their reports of guilt proneness in such a young sample. It is especially noteworthy that working with a very young sample might have accounted for rejection of the hypothesis. However, there were no other studies examining the proposed links with such a young sample. Therefore, the young sample of the study should be considered as one of the strengths rather than a limitation.

On the other hand, the cross sectional design of the study can be a limitation which makes it impossible to infer causality. Secondly, although the number of participants were quiet high (100 mother-child dyads), it could be possible to reveal significant results with a larger sample. Lastly, in addition the mother reported measure of temperament, use of an observational measurement could strengthen the assessment of child temperament.

4.5 Implications and Contributions of the Study

Although the current study failed to find the prosed links between the variables, there are some other findings, which can be beneficial for parents and preschool educators. Firstly, the results on anger/frustration and perceptual sensitivity

pointed out the importance of recognizing child's temperament. For example, if parents and kindergarten teachers are aware that a child is temperamentally prone to anger and frustration, they could shape parenting practices of class environment in a way that risk for development of internalizing problems is reduced. Similarly, if parents are aware that their children are perceptually more sensitive to environmental factors, they could be more careful when talking about child's wrongdoings and mistakes in order to minimize the child's guilt feelings.

To the best of our knowledge, the current study is the first in terms of assessing preschoolers' perceptions of maternal psychological control and their reports of guilt proneness. Therefore, the study is making an important contribution to the related literature by examining the link between psychological control, guilt proneness and internalizing problems in a very young sample.

4.6 Suggestions for Future Research

As it was mentioned in the discussion part, in order to figure out approximate period when perceived maternal psychological control and guilt proneness become to pose a risk for child outcomes, it is important to conduct longitudinal studies in which children are followed beginning from early childhood thorough adolescence. However, since longitudinal designs are more difficult to conduct, cross sectional designs, in which children from different developmental stages are compared in terms of psychological control and guilt proneness would serve properly for the purpose just mentioned above.

REFERENCES

Achenbach, T. M., McConaughy, S. H., & Howell, C. T. (1987). Child/adolescent behavioral and emotional problems: Implications of cross-informant correlations for situational specificity. *Psychological Bulletin, 101*, 213-232.

Aslund, C., Starrin, B., Leppert, J., & Nilsson, K. W. (2009b). Social status and shaming experiences related to adolescent overt aggression at school. *Aggressive Behavior, 35*, 1–13.

Assor, A., Roth, G., & Deci, E. L. (2004). The emotional costs of perceived parents' conditional regard: a self-determination theory analysis. *Journal of Personality, 72*, 47–89.

Assor, A., Roth, G., & Deci, E.L. (2004). The emotional costs of parents' conditional regard: a self-determination theory. Journal of Personality, 72, 47-88.

Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behavior. *Child Development, 76*, 1144–1159.

Bafunno, D., & Camodeca, M. (2013). Shame and guilt development in preschoolers: The role of context, audience and individual characteristics. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 19*, 128-143.

Barber, B. K., Olsen, J. E., & Shagle, S. C. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioral control and youth internalized and externalized behaviors. *Child Development, 65*, 1120–1136.

Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*, 3296–3319.

Barber, B.K. (2001). *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents*. Washington, DC. American Psychological Association.

Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., & Olsen, J. A. (2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: assessing relevance across time, method, and culture. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 70*(4).

Bates, J.E. (1987). Temperament in infancy. In J.D. Osofsky (Ed.), *Handbook of infant development.* New York: Wiley.

Benedict, R. (1946). *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Barber, B. K., & Harmon, E. L. (2002). Violating the self: parental psychological control of children and adolescents. In B. K. Barber (Ed.), I*ntrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 15–52). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Barber, B.K., Xia, M., Olsen, J.A., Clea, A.M., & Bose, K. (2012). Feeling disrespected by parents: Refining the measurement and understanding of psychological control. *Journal of Adolescence, 35,* 273-287.

Barenboim, C. (1981). The development of person perception from childhood to adolescence: From behavior comparisons to psychological construct to psychological comparisons. *Child Development, 52,* 129-144.

Barrett, K. C. (2005). The origins of social emotions and self-regulation in toddlerhood: New evidence. *Cognition and Emotion, 19,* 953–979.

Barrett, K. C., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Cole, P. M. (1993). Avoiders versus amenders: Implications for the investigation of guilt and shame during toddlerhood. *Cognition and Emotion, 7,* 481-505.

Bayer, J. K., Sanson, A. V., & Hemphill, S. A. (2006). Parent influences on early childhood difficulties. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 27,* 542–549.

Brumariu, L.E., & Kerns, K.A. (2010). Parent-child attachment and internalizing symptoms in childhood and adolescence: a review of empirical findings and future directions. *Developmental Psychopathology, 22*, 177-203.

Buss, K. A., & Goldsmith, H. H. (1998). Fear and anger regulation in infancy: Effects of the temporal dynamics of affective expression. *Child Development, 69*, 359 – 374.

Campione-Barr, N., Lindell, A. K., Greer, K. B., & Rose, A. J. (2014). Relational aggression and psychological control in the sibling relationship: Mediators of the association between maternal psychological control and adolescents' emotional adjustment. *Development And Psychopathology, 26*, 749-758.

Cicchetti, D., & Cohen, D. (Eds.). (2006). Developmental psychopathology: Risk, disorder, and adaptation (Vol. 3, 2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The ''what" and ''why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227–268.

DePauw, S.S.W., Mervielde, I., Van Leeuwen, K.G. (2009). How are traits related to problem behavior in preschoolers? Similarities and contrasts between temperamentand personality. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 37*, 309-325.

Dumenci, L., Erol, N., Achenbach, T.M., & Simsek, Z. (2004). Measurement structure of the Turkish translation of the child behavior checklist using confirmatory factor analytic approaches to validation of syndromal constructs. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 32*, 335-340.

Donatelli, J. A., Bybee, J. A., & Buka, S. L. (2007). What do mothers make adolescents feel guilty about? Incidents, reactions, and relation to depression. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 16,* 859–875.

Eder, R.A. (1989). The emergent personologist: The structure and content of 3 ½, 5 ½ and 7 ½ year-olds concepts of themselves and other persons. *Child Development, 60,* 1218-1228.

Eder, R.A. (1990). Uncovering young children's psychological selves: Individual and developmental differences. *Child Development, 61,* 849-863.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Guthrie, I. K., & Reiser, M. (2000). Dispositional emotionality and regulation: Their role in predicting quality of social functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78,* 136–157.

Eisenberg, N., Sadovsky, A., Spinrad, T.L., Fabes, R.A., Losoya, S.H., Valiente, C., et al. (2005). The relations of problem behavior status to children's negative emotionality, effortful control, and impulsivity: Concurrent relations and prediction of change. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(1), 193–211.

Eisenberg, N., Valiente, C., Spinrad, T. L., Cumberland, A., Liew, J., Reiser, M., et al. (2009). Longitudinal Relations of Children's Effortful Control, Impulsivity, and Negative Emotionality to Their Externalizing, Internalizing, and Co-Occurring Behavior *Problems. Developmental Psychology, 45*(4), 988–1008.

Ertekin. Z. (2014). *The effects of care types and temperament on self-concept and self regulation skills of children under the care of social services* (Unpublished master thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Ferguson, T. J., Stegge, H., Eyre, H. L., Vollmer, R., & Ashbaker, M. (2000). Context effects and the (mal)adaptive nature of guilt and shame in children. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 126,* 319–345.

Ferguson, t.J., stegge, H., & Damhuis, I. (1991). Children's understanding of guilt and shame, *Child Development, 62,* 827-839.

Ferguson, T.J., Stegge, H., Miller, E.R., & Olsen, M.E. (1999). Guilt, shame, and symptoms in children. *Developmental Psychology, 35,* 347-357.

Flynn, F.J., & Schaumber, R.L.(2012). When feeling bad leads to feeling good: guilt- proneness and affective organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 124-133.

Furman, W., & Bierman, K.L (1983). Developmental changes in young children's conceptions of friendship. *Child Development, 54,* 549-556.

Furukawa, E., Tangney, J., & Higashibara, F. (2012). Cross-cultural Continuities and Discontinuities in Shame, Guilt, and Pride: A Study of Children Residing in Japan, Korea and the USA. *Self and Identity, 11*, 90-113.

Galambos, N.L., Barker, E.T., & Almeida, D.M. (2003). Parents do matter: trajectories of change in externalizing and internalizing problems in early adolescence. *Child Development, 74*, 578-594.

Giotsa, A. (2012). Translation of R.P.Rohner's The Warmth Dimension (with an addendum od "Introduction to Parental Acceptence-Rejection Theory") into Greek for use in psychology course. Athens: Gutenberg Press.

Garner, P.W. (2012). Children's emotional responsiveness and sociomoral understanding and associating with mothers' and fathers' socialization practices. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 33,* 95-106.

Gartstein, M.A., & Rothbart, M.K. (2003). Studying infant temperament via Revised Infant Behavior Questionnaire. *Infant& Behavior Development, 26,* 64-86.

Grolnick, W. S., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1997). Internalization within the family: The self-determination theory perspective. In J. E. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (pp. 78–99). London: Wiley.

Grolnick, W. S., & Pomerantz, E. M. (2009). Issues and challenges in studying parental control: toward a new conceptualization. *Child Development Perspectives, 3,* 165–170.

Güngör, D., & Bornstein, M.H. (2010). Culture-general and -specific associations of attachment avoidance and anxiety with perceived parental warmth and psychological control among Turk and Belgian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 33,* 593-602.

Hastings, P.D., &McShane, K.E. (2009). The new friends vignettes: measuring parental psychological control that confers risk for anxious adjustment in preschoolers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development. 33,* 481-495.

Hinshaw, S. P., Han, S. S., Erhardt, D., & Huber, A. (1992). Internalizing and externalizing behavior problems in preschool children: Correspondence among parent and teacher ratings and behavior observations. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 21,* 143-150.

Joussemet, M., Landry, R., & Koestner, R. (2008). A self-determination theory perspective on parenting. *Canadian Psychology, 49,*194–200.

Kağıtc□ıbaşı, C□. (1970). Social norms and authoritarianism: a Turkish–American comparison. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*(39), 444– 451.

Kins, E., Soenens, B., Beyers, W. (2012). Parental psychological control and dysfunctional separation-individuation: a tale of two different dynamics. *Journal of Adolescence, 35,* 1099-1109.

Kochanska, G. (1991). Socialization and temperament in the development of guilt and conscience. *Child Development, 62,* 1379-1392.

Kochanska, G. (1997). Multiple pathways to conscience for children with different temperaments: From toddlerhood to age 5. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 228-240.

Kochanska, G. (2002). Guilt in young children: development, determinants, and r elations with a broader system of standards. *Child Development, 73*, 461-482.

Kochanska, G., Gross, J.N., Lin, M., & Nichols, K.E. (2002). Guilt in young children: development, determinants, and relations with a broader system of standards. *Child Development, 73*, 461-482.

Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.

Lewis, M. (2008). Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame and guilt. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (3rd ed ed., pp. 742–756). New York: The Guilford Press.

Li, J., Wand, L., &Fischer, K. (2004). The organization of Chinese shame concepts. *Cognition and Emotion, 18*(6), 767-797.

Lisanne, L, S., Otten, R., Janssens, J.M.A.M., Soenens, B., Kuntsche, E., & Engels, R.C.M.E. (2013). Does parental psychological control relate to internalizing and externalizing problems in early childhood? An examination using the Berkeley puppet interview. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 37*, 309-318.

Loukas, A. (2009). Examining Temporal Associations between Perceived Maternal Psychological Control and Early Adolescent Internalizing Problems. *Journalof Abnormal Child Psychology, 37*, 1113-1122.

Madigan, S., Atkinson, L., Laurin, K., & Benoit, D. (2013). Attachment and internalizing behavior in early childhood: a meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 49, 672-689.

McKee, L, G., Parent, J., Forehand, R., Rakow, A., Watson, K.H., Dunbar, J.P., Reising, M.M., Hardcastle, E., & Compas, B.E. (2014). Reducing youth internalizing symptoms: Effects of a family-based preventive intervention on parental guilt induction and youth cognitive style. *Development and Psychopathology, 26*, 319-332.

Measelle, J. R., Ablow, J. C., Cowan, P. A., & Cowan, C. P. (1998). Assessing young children's views of their academic, social, and emotional lives: An evaluation of the self-perception scales of the Berkeley puppet interview. *Child Development, 69,* 556–1576.

Mills, R. S. L., & Rubin, K. H. (1998). Are behavioural and psychological control both differentially associated with childhood aggression and social withdrawal? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 30,* 132–136.

Morris, A. S., Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., Sessa, F. M., Avenevoli, S., & Essex, S. J. (2002). Temperamental vulnerability and negative parenting as interacting predictors of child adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*, 461–471.

Morris, A.S., Steinberg, L., Sessa, F.M., Avenevoli, S, Silk, J.S., & Essex, M.J. (2002). Measuring children's perceptions of psychological control: developmental and conceptual considerations. In Barber, B.K. (Eds.*), Intrusive Parenting: How Psychological Control Affects Children and Adolescents* (pp.125-159), Washington, DC, American Psychological Association.

Nucci, L. P. (1996). Morality and personal freedom. In E. S. Reed, E. Turiel, & T. Brown (Eds.), Values and knowledge (pp. 41–60). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Nucci, L., Hasebe, Y., & Lins-Dyer, M. T. (2005). Adolescent psychological well-being and parental control of the personal. In W. Damon, & J. Smetana (Eds.), *New directions for child and adolescent development*, Vol. 108 (pp.17–30). New York: Wiley.

Olthof, T. (2012). Anticipated feelings of guilt and shame as predictors of early adolescents' antisocial and prosocial interpersonal behavior. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*, 371-388.

Özdemir, Y. (2009). Ergenlik döneminde benlik kurgusu gelişiminin kültür ve aile bağlamında incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara. [The investigation of self construal development in adolescence in the context of culture and family, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ankara University Institude of education and Sciences, Ankara].

Putnam, S.P., & Rothbart, M.K. (2006). Development of short and very short forms of the children's behavior questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 87*(1), 103–113.

Rakow, A., Forehand, R., McKee, L., Coffelt, N., Champion, J., Fear, J., & Compas, B., et al. (2009). The relation of parental guilt induction to child internalizing problems when a caregiver has a history of depression. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 18*, 367-377.

Rohleder, N., Chen, E., Wolf, J., & Miller, G. E. (2008). The psychobiology of trait shame in young women: Extending the social self preservation theory. *Health Psychology, 27*, 523–532.

Rohner, R.P. (2012). Early Childhood Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire: Mother and Father (SF).

Rothbart, M.K. (1989). Temperament and development. In G.Kohnstamm, J. Bates, & M.K. Rothbart (Eds.), *Temperament in childhood.* Chichester, England: Wiley.

Rothbart, M.K., Stephan, A.A., & Hershey, K.L. (1994). Temperament and social behavior in childhood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 40,* 21-39.

Rubin, K. H, Burgess, K. B., & Hastings, P. D. (2002). Stability and social-behavioral consequences of toddler's inhibited temperament and parenting behaviors. *Child Development, 73*, 483–495.

Sari, B.A., Iseri, E., Yalcin, O., Aslan, A.A., &y Sener, S. (2012). Cocuk davranis listesi kisa formunun turkce guvenilirlik calismasi ve gecerliligine iliskin on calisma. *Klinik Psikiyatri, 12,* 135-143.

Schaefer, E. S. (1965). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29*, 552–557.

Schleider, L.J., Velez, C.E., Krause, E.D., & Gillham, J. (2014). Perceived psychological control and anxiety in early adolescents: the mediating role of attributional style. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 38,* 71-81.

Sessea, F.M., Avenevolo, S., Steinberg, L., & Morris, A.S. (2001). Correspondence among informants on parenting: Preschool children, mothers, and observers. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15*, 53-68.

Shantz, C.U. (1983). Social cognition. In J.H.Flavell & E.M. Markman (Eds), *Handbook of child psychology; Vol 3. Cognition development* (pp. 495-555-). New York; Willey.

Shaver, P.R., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. (1987). Emotion knowledge: Further exploration of a prototype approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(6), 1061-1086.

Shaw, D. S., Shonberg, M., Sherrill, J., Huffman, D., Lukon, J., Obrosky, D., et al. (2006). Responsivity to offspring's expression of emotion among childhood-onset depressed mothers. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 35*, 540–552.

Slopen, N., Fitzmaurice, G., Williams, D.R., & Gilman, S.E. (2010). Poverty, food insecurity, and the behavior for childhood internalizing and externalizing disorders. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 49*, 444-452.

Smetana, J. G., & Daddis, C. (2002). Domain-specific antecedents of parental psychological control and monitoring: the role of parenting beliefs and practices. *Child Development, 73*, 563–580.

Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). A theoretical upgrade of the concept of psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory. *Developmental Review, 30*, 74–99.

Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Luyten, P. (2010). Towards a domain-specific approach to the study of parental psychological control: distinguishing between dependency-oriented and achievement-oriented psychological control. *Journal of Personality*, 78, 217–256.

Stuewig, J., &McCloskey, L.A. (2005). The relation of child maltreatment to shame and guilt among adolescents: psychological routes to depression and delinquency. *Child maltreatment, 10*(4), 324-336.

Sumer, N., Sayil, M., Kazak Berument, S., Dogruyol, B., Gunaydin. G., Harma, M., Ozturk, A., Salman, S., & Selcuk, E. (2009). *Cocugun gelisiminde baglanma, ilgi-bakim ve aile dinamiklerinin etkisi*. 105K102 Nolu TUBITAK Projesi Raporu. Ankara.

Tangney, J. P. (1991). Moral affect: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 598–607.

Tangney, J. P. (1993*). Shame and guilt*. In C. G. Costello (Ed.), *Symptoms of depression* (pp. 161-180). New York: Wiley.

Tangney JP, Wagner PE, Burggraf SA, Gramzow R, Fletcher C (1990). *The test of self-conscious affect for children (TOSCA-C).* George Mason University, Fairfax.

Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P. E., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D. E., & Gramzow, R. (1996). Relation of shame and guilt to constructive versus destructive responses to anger across the lifespan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 797–809.

Tein, J., Roosa, M. W., & Michaels, M. (1994). Agreement between parent and child reports on parental behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *56*, 341-355.

Tilghman-Osborne, C., Cole, D. A., Felton, J. W., & Ciesla, J. A. (2008). Relation of guilt, shame, behavioral and characterological self-blame to depressive symptoms in adolescents over time. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 27,* 809–842.

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self- conscious emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry, 15,* 103–125.

Tracy, J.L., & Robins, R.W. (2006). Appraisal antecedents of shame, guilt, and pride: support for a theoretical model. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32, 1339-1351.

Trapolini, T., McMahon, C. A., & Ungerer, J. A. (2007). The effect of maternal depression and marital adjustment on young children's internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 34,* 794–803.

VanDerhei, S., Rojahn. J., Stuewig, J., & McKnight, P.E. (2014). The effect of shame- proneness, guilt-proneness, and internalizing tendencies on nonsuicidal self-injury. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 44,* 317-330.

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin, 96,* 465-490.

West, A. E., & Newman, D. L. (2003). Worried and blue: Mild parental anxiety and depression in relation to the development of young children's temperament and behavior problems. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 3,* 133–154.

Williams, C., & Bybee, J. (1994). What do children feel guilty about? Developmental and gender differences. *Developmental Psychology, 30,* 617-623.

Williams, L.R., Degnan, K.A., Perez-Edgar, K.E., Henderson, H.A., Rubin, K.H., Pine, D.S., Steinberg, L., & Fox, A.N. (2009). Impact of behavioral inhibition and parenting style on internalizing and externalizing problems from early childhood through adolescence. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 37,* 1063-1075.

Zhan-Waxler, C., Konchanska, G., Krupnic, J., & McKnew, D. (1990). Guilt in children of depressed and well mothers. *Developmental Psychology, 26,* 51-59.

Zhou, Q., Eisenberg, N., Wang, Y., & Reiser, M. (2004). Chinese children's effortful control and dispositional anger/frustration: relations to parenting styles and children's social functioning. *Developmental Psychology, 40*(3), 352-366.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

My Child
Benim Çocuğum

Açıklamalar: Lütfen başlamadan önce dikkatlice okuyunuz;

Aşağıda çocukların bir takım durumlar karşısında gösterdiği davranışların bir listesi verilmiştir. Bu davranışların çoğu küçük çocukların yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra verdikleri ve sık gözlemlenen tepkilerine karşılık gelmektedir. Lütfen her bir davranışın çocuğunuz için ne kadar doğru olduğunu belirtiniz. Lütfen her madde için bu seçeneklerden birini işaretlediğinizden emin olun.

Teşekkürler.

Her ifade için verilen numaralardan birini işaretleyin,

1 çok yanlış
2 yanlış
3 ne doğru ne yanlış
4 doğru
5 çok doğru

	Çok Yanlış	**Yanlış**	**Ne doğru, Ne yanlış**	**Doğru**	**Çok doğru**
1- Değerli bir eşyayı kırdıktan sonra endişeli ve kaygılı görünmez.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2- Yanlış bir şey veya yaramazlık yaparken yakalandığında birden yerinde donakalır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3- Yanlış bir şey yaptığında yaptığı şeyi veya ona benzer durumları uzun bir sure unutmaz.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
4- Ne zaman bir şey yanlış gitse, kendini bundan sorumlu hisseder.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

6- Yanlış bir şey veya yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra durgun ve sessiz olur.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
7- Geçmişte yaptığı bir hatasını veya yanlışı hatırlatıldığında kendini kötü hisseder.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
8- Yanlış bir şey/ yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra iştahı kaçar ve uyumakta zorlanır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
9- Bir hatası ya da yaptığı yanlış bir şey hakkında konuşurken gözleri dolar veya ağlar.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
10- Yanlış bir şey veya yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra anne babasının artık ona kızgın olmadığında emin olmak ister.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
11- Eleştirildiği zaman canı sıkılır/ mutsuz olur.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
12- Eleştirildiğinde üzülmez.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
13- Yaptığı yanlışı veya hatası affedilmesine rağmen kendini kötü hissetmeye devam eder.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
14- Yanlış bir şey veya yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra, affedilmeyi ister (Örn: "Anne/baba beni affet" der).	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
15- Bir yanlışı için azarlandıktan sonra, olumlu bir davranışı veya başarısı için anne babası onu övdüğünde özellikle mutlu görünür.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
16- Yanlış bir şey veya yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra affedilmeyi pek önemsemez/dert etmez.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
17- Yanlış bir şey veya yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra kolay kolay kendini kötü hissetmez.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
18- Yaptığı yanlış bir şey için affedildiğinde rahatlamış görünür.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
19- Kazara bir şeyi kırıp veya döktüğünde çok üzülmez.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
20- Yanlış bir şey veya yaramazlık yaparken yakalandığında anne babasına	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

karşı çok daha iyi/sevimli davranır.					
21- Yapmaması gereken bir şeyi yaparken yakalandığında yüzü kızarır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
22- Yanlış bir şey veya yaramazlık yapmışsa göz teması kurmaktan kaçınır (yüzüme bakmaz, gözlerini kaçırır).	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
23- Yaramazlık yaptıktan sonra başını öne eğer, yere bakar.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
24- Topluluk içindeyken yanlış bir şey yaparsa üzülür/ keyfi kaçar.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Appendix B: Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)

Aşağıda çocuk ve gençleri tanımlayan maddelerin bir listesi bulunmaktadır. Her bir madde çocuğun **şu andaki ya da son 6 ay** içindeki durumunu belirtmektedir. Maddeler çocuğunuz için **çok ya da sıklıkla doğru** olabilir, **bazen ya da biraz doğru** olabilir, veya **hiç doğru** olmayabilir. Lütfen ilgili kutucukları işaretleyerek çocuğunuzu her bir madde üzerinde değerlendiriniz.

	Doğru Değil (Bildiğiniz Kadarıyla)	**Bazen ya da Biraz Doğru**	**Çok ya da Sıklıkla Doğru**
1. Hoşlandığı ya da zevk aldığı çok az şey vardır.			
2. Çok ağlar.			
3. Bazı hayvanlardan, durumlardan (yüksek yerler), ya da ortamlardan (asansör, karanlık gibi) korkar (okulu katmayınız) (Açıklayınız): _____			
4. Okula gitmekten korkar, okul korkusu vardır.			
5. Kötü bir şey düşünebileceğinden ya da yapabileceğinden korkar.			
6. Kusursuz, dört dörtlük ve her konuda başarılı olması gerektiğine inanır.			
7. Kimsenin onu sevmediğinden yakınır.			
8. Kendini değersiz, önemsiz ya da yetersiz hisseder.			
9. Başkalarıyla birlikte olmaktansa yalnız olmayı tercih eder.			
10. Sinirli ve gergindir.			
11. Geceleri kabus görür.			
12. Kabızlık çeker.			
13. Çok korkak ve kaygılıdır.			

14. Başı döner, gözleri kararır.			
15. Kendini çok suçlu hisseder.			
16. Sebepsiz yere çok yorgun hissettiği olur.			
17. ***Sağlık sorunu olmadığı halde;***			
a. Ağrı ve sızılardan yakınır (baş ve karın ağrısı dışında).			
b. Baş ağrılarından yakınır (şikayet eder).			
c. Bulantı, kusma duygusu olur.			
d. Gözle ilgili şikayetleri olur (Gözlük, lens kullanma dışında) (açıklayınız): _____			
e. Döküntü, pullanma ya da başka cilt hastalığı olur.			
f. Mide-karın ağrısından şikayet eder.			
g. Kusmaları olur.			
h. Diğer (açıklayınız):_____			
18. Konuşmayı reddeder.			
19. Sırlarını kendine saklar, hiç kimseyle paylaşmaz.			
20. Topluluk içinde rahat değildir, başkalarının kendisi hakkında ne düşünecekleri ve ne söyleyecekleri ile ilgili kaygı duyar.			
21. Çok utangaç ve çekingendir.			
22. Kendini öldürmekten söz eder.			
23. Hareketleri yavaştır, enerjik değildir.			
24. Mutsuz, üzgün ve çökkündür (depresyondadır).			
25. İçine kapanıktır, başkalarıyla kaynaşmaz.			
26. Evhamlıdır, her şeyi dert eder.			

Appendix C: Child Behavior Questionnaire

Çocuk Davranış Anketi

Açıklamalar: Lütfen başlamadan önce dikkatlice okuyunuz;

Aşağıda çocukların bir takım durumlar karşısında gösterdiği davranışların bir listesi verilmiştir. Lütfen bu ifadeler için çocuğunuzun son "altı ay" ını düşünerek o davranışı ne sıklıkta gerçekleştirdiğini işaretleyiniz. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur, amacımız sadece çocukların hangi davranışları sergilediğini öğrenmektir. Lütfen her madde için bu seçeneklerden birini işaretlediğinizden emin olun.

Her ifade için verilen numaralardan birini işaretleyin,

1 çok yanlış

2 yanlış

3 ne doğru ne yanlış

4 doğru

5 çok doğru

	Çok Yanlış	Yanlış	Ne Doğru, Ne Yanlış	Doğru	Çok Doğru
1- Yatağa gitmesi söylendiğinde öfkelenir.	1	2	3	4	5
2- Oturma odasındaki yeni eşyaları hemen fark eder.	1	2	3	4	5
3- Dokunduğu nesnenin pürüzsüz/ pürüzlü olduğunu fark eder.	1	2	3	4	5
4- İnsanların yüz özelliklerindeki farklılıkları hakkında genellikle yorum yapmaz (burun ya da kulağın büyüklüğü, dişlerin bozukluğu).	1	2	3	4	5
5- Oynamak istediği bir şeyi bulamayınca öfkelenir.	1	2	3	4	5
6- Biraz eleştirildiğinde bile çılgına	1	2	3	4	5

döner.					
7- Anne ya da babası görünüşünde bir değişiklik yaptığında fark edip söyler.	1	2	3	4	5
8- Bir şey yapmasına izin verilmediğinde engellenmiş hisseder ve sinirlenir.	1	2	3	4	5
9- Alçak sesleri bile dinler görünür (örneğin; bir fısıltı olduğunda dikkatini verir ve dinler).	1	2	3	4	5
10- İstediğini almadığında öfke krizine girer.	1	2	3	4	5
11- Anne veya babası yeni bir kıyafet giydiğinde fark eder.	1	2	3	4	5
12-Anne ve babasının dış görünüşlerindeki değişiklikleri genellikle fark etmez.	1	2	3	4	5
13- Diğer çocuklar tarafından kışkırtıldığında öfkelenip çılgına döner.	1	2	3	4	5
14- Bir hata yaptığında nadiren sinirlenir.	1	2	3	4	5
15- Oyunu bırakması söylenip, çağırıldığında sinirlenir (oyunu bırakmaya hazır değilken).	1	2	3	4	5
16- Bir görevi yapmakta zorlandığında kolayca sinirlenir (örneğin; lego inşaa etmek, resim yapmak, kıyafetlerini giymek).	1	2	3	4	5
17- Parfüm, sigara ya da yemek kokusu gibi kokuları genellikle fark etmez.	1	2	3	4	5
18- Başka bir çocuk oyuncağını aldığında nadiren sinirlenir/karşı çıkar.	1	2	3	4	5
19- Bir nesne üzerindeki küçük bir çöpü, lekeyi bile far keder.	1	2	3	4	5
20- Yiyeceklerin farklı dokuda oluşuna (örneğin; tamamen ezilmemiş sebze püresi gibi	1	2	3	4	5

pütürcüklü yiyecekler) oluşuna genellikle tepki vermez.					
21- Sevmediği bir yiyeceği yemesi gerektiğinde hırçınlaşır/huysuzlaşır.	1	2	3	4	5
22- Yorgun olduğunda kolayca sinirlenir/huysuzlanır.	1	2	3	4	5
23- Ebeveynlerinin yüz ifadelerini pek fark etmiyor gibi görünür.	1	2	3	4	5
24-Yatağa gitmesi söylendiğinde nadiren mutsuz olur.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D: Assessment of Perceived Psychological Control

Yönerge:

Bak _____bu Hop bu da Pop. Şimdi onlar kendi anneleriyle ilgili bir şeyler söyleyecekler, sonra da sana soracaklar.

Hadi gel bir deneme yapalım.

Deneme 1: Annem bana çok ilgi gösterir

Annem bana çok ilgi göstermez.

Deneme 2: Annem beni öper.

Annem beni öpmez.

1-

H: Yaramazlık yaptığımda annem " artık senin annen olmayacağım" der.

P: Yaramazlık yaptığımda annem " artık senin annen olmayacağım" demez.

2-

P: Annem bana kızdığında " sen yaramaz bir çocuksun, hep böyle yapıyorsun" der.

H: Annem bana kızdığında " sen yaramaz bir çocuksun, hep böyle yapıyorsun" demez.

3-

H: Annem benim için ne kadar çok çalışıp yorulduğunu söyler.

P: Annem benim için ne kadar çok çalışıp yorulduğunu söylemez.

4-

P: Annem onu çok yorduğumu ve üzdüğümü söyler.

H: Annem onu çok yorduğumu ve üzdüğümü söylemez.

5-

H: Annemin istediği gibi bir çocuk olmadığım zaman kötü hissederim.

P: Annemin istediği gibi bir çocuk olmadığım zaman kötü hissetmem.

6-

P: Annem benim hakkımda güzel şeyler söyler.

H: Annem benim hakkımda güzel şeyler söylemez.

7-

H: Annem diğer çocuklara bakıp " bak ne kadar uslu davranıyor, ne kadar iyi bir çocuk" der.

P: Annem diğer çocuklara bakıp " bak ne kadar uslu davranıyor, ne kadar iyi bir çocuk" demez.

8-

P: Annem onun istediğini yapmadığımda çok kızar.

H: Annem onun istediğini yapmadığımda çok kızmaz.

9-

H: Annem her zaman bana ne yapacağımı söyler.

P: Annem her zaman bana ne yapacağımı söylemez.

10-

P: Ağladığım zaman annem bana çok kızmaz.

H: Ağladığım zaman annem bana çok kızar.

11-

H: Annem yaptıklarımı beğenmez, daha iyi bir çocuk olmamı ister.

P: Annem yaptıklarımı beğenir, daha iyi bir çocuk olmamı istemez.

12-

P: Annem her zaman bana sarılıp beni öper.

H: Annem bazen bana sarılıp beni öper.

13-

H: Annem bana “sen beni sevmiyorsun onun için böyle yapıyorsun” der.

P: Annem bana “sen beni sevmiyorsun” demez.

14-

P: Annemin istemediği bir şeyi yaptığımda annem bana küser.

H: Annemin istemediği bir şeyi yaptığımda annem bana küsmez.

15-

H: Annem hep “ ne kadar çok konuşuyorsun, soru soruyorsun” der.

P: Annem hiç ne kadar çok konuşuyorsun, soru soruyorsun demez.

16-

P: Annem her zaman bana karşı yumuşak ve sevecendir.

H: Annem bazen bana karşı yumuşak ve sevecendir.

17-

H: Annem bazen “keşke hemen büyüsen” der.

P: Annem hiç “keşke hemen büyüsen” demez.

18-

P: Annem bana “büyüklerine karşı gelme” der.

H: Annem bana “büyüklerine karşı gelme” demez.

Appendix E: Assessment of Child Reported Guilt Proneness

Yönerge: Simdi seninle bir oyun oynayacağız. Ben senin de başına gelebilecek bir kaç hikaye anlatacağım. Sen bu hikayelerin gerçekten senin başına geldiğini hayal edeceksin/gözünde canlandıracaksın tamam mi? (sen o hikayenin kahramanısın/ hikâyedeki çocuksun).

Sonra da bu hikayenin kahramanı olarak bana ne düşündüğünü ve nasıl hissettiğini kollarınla göstereceksin. Sana söylediğim cümlelere katılıyorsan kollarını kocaman aç, katılmıyorsan kollarını sımsıkı kapat, tamam mı?

Şimdi bir deneme yapalım:

Doğum gününde arkadaşın sana çok beğeneceğin bir hediye vermiş.

Bu durumda sen;

A- " Çok sevinirim ve arkadaşıma teşekkür ederim" diyorsan kollarını kocaman açacaksın. Demiyorsan kollarını sımsıkı kapatacaksın.

B- " Arkadaşıma teşekkür etmem, hediyeyi hemen açarım" diyorsan veya demiyorsan

1- Küçük kuzeninle oyun oynarken yanlışlıkla teyzenin vazosunu kırmışsın. Teyzen bunun için senin yerine küçük kuzenini azarlamış, sen de hiç sesini çıkarmamışsın.

Bu durumda sen;

G: "Vazoyu benim kırdığımı söylemediğim için kendimi suçlu hissederim "diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

E: "Kuzenim de vazoyu kendinin kırmadığını söyleseydi" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

2- Sınıfındaki bir arkadaşın doğum günü partisi varmış ve sen bu partiye davetli olduğun için çok mutluymuşsun. En yakın arkadaşına partiye gideceğini söylediğinde arkadaşın buna çok üzülmüş çünkü o partiye davetli değilmiş.

Bu durumda sen;

E: "Doğum günü çocuğu iyi bir çocuk olsaydı arkadaşımı da davet ederdi" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

G: "Arkadaşımın üzüleceğini düşünemediğim için kendime çok kızarım" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

3- Okulunuzun yıl sonu gösterisinde birlikte dans ettiğin arkadaşının yanlışlıkla ayağına basmışsın. O da cani çok yandığı için dans edememiş ve gösteri bozulmuş.

Bu durumda sen;

G: "Arkadaşımın ayağına basarak gösteriyi bozduğum için kendimi kötü hissederim" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

E: "O da dans etmeyi bırakmasaydı" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

4- Arkadaşlarınla basket maçı yapıyormuşsunuz. Maç tam biterken arkadaşın topu sana atmış ama sen topu potaya atamamışsın ve maçı kaybetmişsiniz. Takım arkadaşların da bu duruma çok üzülmüş.

Bu durumda sen"

E: "Arkadaşım topu bana iyi atamadı" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

G: "Takımın kaybetmesine neden olduğum için kendimi kotu hissederim" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

5- Arkadaşının evine gittiğinde arkadaşın sana son yaptığı resimi gösterirken kolun yanlışlıkla meyve suyu bardağına çarpmış ve meyve suyu arkadaşının resimine dökülmüş. Arkadaşın buna çok üzülmüş çünkü öğretmeni o resmini çok beğenmiş ve sınıf panosuna asacakmış.

Bu durumda sen;

G: "Resmini bozduğum için kendimi çok kötü hissederim" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

E: "O da meyve suyu bardağını resmin yanına koymasaydı" diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

6- Bisikletine binerken komşunun küçük çocuğunun yerde duran oyuncağını görmeyip üzerinden geçip oyuncağı kırmışsın. Çocuk oyuncağın kırıldığını görünce ağlamaya başlamış.

Bu durumda sen;

E: “Çocuk da oyuncağını yolun ortasında bırakmasaydı” diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

G: “Çocuğun oyuncağını kırdığım için kendimi kotu hissederim” diyorsan veya demiyorsan.

Appendix F: Parental Informed Consent Form

Gönüllü Katılım Formu

Sevgili Anneler,

Bu çalışma Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü yüksek lisans öğrencisi psikolog Gülsün Ünal tarafından, Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument danışmanlığında yüksek lisans bitirme tezi kapsamında yürütülmektedir. Çalışmanın amacı okul öncesi dönemde algılanan ebeveynliğin ve çocuğun mizaç özelliklerinin çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı ve içselleştirme davranışları üzerindeki etkilerini incelemektir.

Sizin ve çocuğunuzun bu çalışmaya katılımı tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmaya katılmayı kendiniz ve çocuğunuz için kabul ettiğiniz takdirde, çocuğunuz devam ettiği anaokulunda yapılacak olan iki uygulamaya katılacaktır. Bu uygulamanın ilkinde oyuncak kuklalar kullanılarak çocuğunuza çeşitli sorular sorulacaktır ve çocuğunuzun cevapları daha sonra değerlendirilmek için kayıt altına alınacaktır. İkinci uygulamada ise araştırmacı çocuğunuza kısa hikayeler okuyacaktır ve çocuğunuzun hikayedeki olay hakkındaki olası tepkileri sorulacak ve kaydedilecektir. Sizden ise çocuğunuzu 3 farklı anket üzerinde değerlendirmeniz istenecektir. Sizden kimlik bilgilerinize dair hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Sizin ve çocuğunuzun cevapları tamamen gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayınlarda kullanılacaktır.

Çalışma, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular veya uygulamalar içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında siz veya çocuğunuz herhangi bir nedenden ötürü çalışmayı yarıda bırakabilirsiniz. Bu çalışmaya katılımınız, ebeveynlik ve çocuk gelişimi hakkındaki literatüre çok faydalı katkılar sağlayacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden çok teşekkür ederiz. Çalışmanın toplu sonuçları Ağustos 2015'te hazır olacaktır. Toplu sonuçlar hakkında geri bildirim ve bilgi edinmek isterseniz bu tarihten itibaren araştırmacılarla iletişime geçmeniz yeterli olacaktır. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için, Gülsün Ünal ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz (e-posta: unalglsn@gmail.com).

Bu araştırmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve çocuğumun çalışmada yer almasına onay veriyorum. Benim ve çocuğumun istediğimiz zaman çalışmayı yarıda kesip bırakabileceğimizi biliyorum ve verdiğimiz bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı olarak kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

Adı-Soyadı : ..... İmza.....

Appendix G: Ethics Committee Approval

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816/94-263

26.02.2015

Gönderilen : Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument
Psikoloji Bölümü

Gönderen : Prof. Dr. Canan Sümer
IAK Başkan Vekili

İlgi : Etik Onayı

Danışmanlığını yapmış olduğunuz Psikoloji Bölümü öğrencisi Gülsün Ünal'nın "Maternal Psychological Control and Child Temperament as Predictors of Preschoolers' Internalizing Problems: The Mediating Role of Guilt Proneness" isimli araştırması "İnsan Araştırmaları Komitesi'' tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Etik Komite Onayı

Uygundur

26/02/2015

Prof.Dr. Canan Sümer
Uygulamalı Etik Araştırma Merkezi
(UEAM) Başkan Vekili
ODTÜ 06531 ANKARA

Appendix H: Turkish Summary

GİRİŞ

Ebeveynliğin çocuk gelişiminin en önemli belirleyicilerinden biridir. Çocukların uyum problemlerinde ebeveynliğin rolü ve önemi bir çok çalışma tarafından incelenmiştir (Galambos, Barker, &Almeida, 2003; Williams ve diğer., 2009). Ebeveynliğin bir boyutu olan psikolojik kontrol ile çocukların içselleştirme problemleriyle (Barber, 1996). ve suçluluk ve utanç hissetmeye yatkınlıkları arasında bir ilişki bulunmuştur (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004; Rakow ve diğerleri., 2009). Bu bilgilere dayanarak, bu çalışma anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün ve çocuğun içselleştirme davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi, çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığını aracı değişken alarak incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Bunlara ek olarak, algılanan ebeveynlik ve çocuğun mizacının etkileşimi çocuk gelişiminin bir başka önemli yordayıcısı olarak bulunmuştur (Morris ve diğer., 2002; Kochanska, 1991, 1993). Bu çalışmanın diğer amacı da, anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün ve çocuğun mizaç özellikleri etkileşiminin, çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir.

Psikolojik Kontrol

Psikolojik kontrol sağlıklı çocuk gelişiminde araya giren olumsuz ebeveynlik davranışlarını içerir. Bu tur kontrol davranışları çocuğun gelişimin bir çok alt boyutunu ,örneğin benlik gelişimi ve ebeveynden sağlıklı ayrışma, negatif yönde etkiler (Barber ve diğer., 2012; Kins, Soenenes, & Bayers, 2012). Psikolojik kontrolü oluşturan önemli ebeveynlik davranışları sevgiyi geri çekme, koşullu olumlu saygı, suçluluk aşılama ve karşılaştırmadır.

Bu ebeveynlik davranışları sırasıyla, çocuğun düşünmede ve davranışta bozulmalarıyla (Lewis, 2008), düşük öz saygısıyla (Assor & Tal, 2012), içselleştirme davranışlarıyla (Donatelli, Bybee, & Buka, 2007) ve düşük özerlik gelişimiyle (Grolnick &Pomerants, 2009) ilişkili bulunmuştur.

Çocuklarla psikolojik kontrol üzerine araştırma yaparken, ebeveynlerin kendi değerlendirmeleri yerine, çocukların ebeveynlerinden algıladıkları psikolojik kontrolü ölçmenin önemi bir çok araştırma tarafından vurgulanmıştır (Sessa ve diğer., 2001; Morris ve diger, 2002). Ayrıca, gelişim düzeylerine uygun ölçme teknikleri kullandığında, okul öncesi donemdeki çocukların kendi ebeveynlerinin psikolojik kontrol davranışları hakkında güvenilir raporlar verdikleri bulunmuştur (Morris ve diğer., 2002).

Ebeveynin Psikolojik Kontrolü ve Çocukların Uyum Problemleri

Yapılan çalışmalarda ebeveynden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün ergenlik döneminde çocuklarda görülen depresyon, anksiyete ve genel olarak içselleştirme davranışlarıyla ilişkili olduğu bulunmuştur (Schleider, Clorinda, Krause, &Gilham, 2014; Lokuas, 2009).

Psikolojik kontrolün alt boyutlarından biri olan ebeveynin suçluluk aşılama davranışının da ergenlik dönemindeki çocukların kişiler arası ilişkilerini ve özerlik gelişimini olumsuz yönde etkilediği bulunmuştur (Donatelli ve diğer., 2007). Bunlara ilaven, ebeveynin suçluluk aşılama davranışı 9-15 yas arası çocuklarda içselleştirme problemlerinin yordayıcısı olarak bulunmuştur (McKee ve diğer., 2014).

Görüldüğü gibi literatürde ebeveynin psikolojik kontrol ve çocuğun içselleştirme davranışları arasındaki ilişki genellikle büyük yas gruplarıyla çalışılmıştır. Cichetti ve Cohen'in (2006) vurguladığı gibi, içselleştirme sorunları ergenlik döneminde en üst seviyeye ulaşıyor olsa da, bu problemlerin daha erken

dönemlerde anlaşılması ve tespit edilmesi hazırlanacak müdahale ve önleme programlarının geliştirilmesi acısından çok büyük önem taşımaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amaçlarından biri de, bu ilişkiyi okul öncesi donemdeki çocuklarla çalışarak literatürdeki açığı kapatmaktır.

Suçluluk Hissetmeye Yatkınlık

Tüm bireyler farklı durumlarda suçluluk duygusunu deneyimlerler fakat bazı bireyler diğerlerine kıyasla suçluluk hissetmeye daha yatkındırlar (Tangney, 2007).Yapılan araştırmalar suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın sabit bir kişilik özelliği olduğunu ve bir çok psikolojik sonucu etkileyebildiğini göstermiştir (Tangney, 1990; Ferguson, Stegge, Eyre, Vollmer, & Ashbaker, 2000). Ayrıca, suçluluk duygusu belirli seviyelerde hissedildiğinde empati ve yardım etme gibi olumlu davranışlarla bağıntılıdır (Hoffman, 1982). Fakat diğer taraftan, yüksek seviyelerde hissedilen suçluluk duygusu çeşitli psikopatolojilerin gelişimiyle ilişkili bulunmuştur (Ferguson ve diger, 2000).

Suçluluk Duygusunun Gelişimi

İkincil duygular (suçluluk, utanç vb.) çocuklarda 17 ay kadar erken bir yasta gözlemlenebilmektedir (Barrett, 2005). Yaşamın ikinci ve üçüncü yıllarında öz bilincin gelişmeye başlamasıyla, çocuklarda suçluluk duygusu daha geniş bir davranış yelpazesinde gözlemlenmeye başlanabilir (Lewis, Sullivan, Stanger, & Weiss, 1989).

Ayrıca, çocuklar yaş aldıkça sosyal kuralları ve diğer bireylerin mental süreçlerini anlamada daha iyi hale gelirler. Buna bağlı olarak büyük çocuklar küçük çocuklara göre daha fazla suçluluk duygusu hissedebilir ve bunu davranışlarına dökebilirler (Harris, 1989). Yapılan bir araştırmada 4 ve 5 yaslarındaki çocukların

3 yaşındaki çocuklara göre daha fazla suçluluk duygusu içeren davranışlar sergiledikleri bulunmuştur (Bafunno& Camodeca, 2013).

Psikolojik Kontrol ve Suçluluk Hissetmeye Yatkınlık

Koşullu olumlu saygı psikolojik kontrolün önemli alt boyutlarından biri olarak bulunmuştur (Assor & Tal, 2012). Ebeveynin gösterdiği koşullu olumlu saygı çocuğun kendini değerlendirmesinde yüksek standartlar koymasına neden olarak çocuğun olumsuz duygusal deneyimler hissetmesine neden olabilir. Bir başka deyişle, ebeveynin standartlarına ulaştığında kendini değerli hisseden çocuk, bu standartlara ulaşmadığında değersiz ve utanmış hissedebilir (Assor, Vansteenkiste, & Kaplan, 2009). Bir başka psikolojik kontrol davranışı olan ebeveynin suçluluk aşılama davransa da çocukta olumsuz sonuçlarla ilişkili bulunmuştur. Yapılan bir araştırmada suçluluk aşılama davranışının yüksek olduğu annelerin çocukları diğer çocuklara göre daha çok kronik ve patolojik suçluluk duygusu rapor etmişlerdir (Donatelli ve diğer., 2007)

Çocuklarda Suçluluk Duygusu ve Uyum Problemleri

Suçluluk duygusunun ve suçluluk hissedebilme kapasitesinin gelişiminin ahlaki duyguların düzenlenmesine olumlu bir katkısı vardır (Tangney, 1990). Literatürde suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın çocuklarda içselleştirme ve dışsallaştırma problemleri için koruyu bir faktör olabileceğini öneren çalışmalar bulunmaktadır (Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999).

Öte yandan, diğer çalışmalarda suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlık çocuklarda kaygı, somatizasyon ve obsesyon için bir risk faktörü olarak saptanmıştır (Harder, Cutler, & Rockart, 1992; Ferguson et al., 2000). Maalesef bu çalışmaların çoğu büyük yaştaki çocuklarla yapılmıştır.

Okul öncesi dönemde suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı çocukların içselleştirme davranışlarının yordayıcısı olarak bulan sadece bir çalışma bulunmaktadır (Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999).

Çocuk Mizacı

Mizaç□, doğuştan gelen, çocuğun çevresindeki uyaranlara tepki verme bic□imini etkileyen karakteristik özelliklerinin bir bütünüdür (Rothbart, 1989). Bu çalışmanın kapsamında, mizacın sadece algısal hassasiyet ve öfke/engellenme alt boyutları ele alınmıştır. Algısal hassasiyet Gartstein ve Rothbart (2003) tarafından "Çevredeki küçük, düşük şiddetli uyaranların bile algılanması" olarak tanımlanmıştır. Algısal hassasiyete sahip olmanın, devlet bakimi altındaki çocuklarda benlik gelişimini destekleyici bir faktör olduğu bulunmuştur (Ertekin, 2014). Öte yandan, mizacın öfke/engellenme alt boyutunun tanımı Rothbart (1989) tarafından " Devam eden bir görevin bölünmesi veya amacın engellenmesi sonucu oluşan negatif duygulanımın miktarı" olarak yapılmıştır. Yüksek seviyelerdeki öfke/engellenme çocuklarda dışsallaştırma davranışları (Eisenberg, Fabes, Guthrie, & Reiser, 2000), düşük duygu düzenleme becerileri (Buss &Goldsmith, 1998) ve düşük sosyal beceriyle ilişkili bulunmuştur (Zhou, Eisenber, Wang, & Reiser, 2004),

Çocuk Mizacı ve Suçluluk Hissetmeye Yatkınlık

Yaptıkları çalışmada Watson ve Clark (1984) mizacın korku ve tepkisellik boyutlarını çocukların suçluluk hissetme, özür dileme ve bir yanlış yaptıktan sonra o yanlısı telafi etme davranışlarının yordayıcıları olarak bulmuştur. Buna benzer olarak bir başka çalışmada (Rothbart et al., 1994), mizacın negatif duygulanım boyutu çocuklarda utanç ve suçluluk duygularının yordayıcısı olarak bulunmuştur.

Bunlara ilaven, Kockanska (1994) algısal hassasiyeti yüksek olan kız çocuklarının yanlış bir şey yaptıktan sonra daha fazla rahatsızlık hissettikleri ve daha fazla empati gösterdiklerini bulmuştur.

Çocuk Mizacının ve Ebeveynlik Etkileşiminin Suçluluk Hissetmeye Yatkınlık Üzerindeki Rolü

Mizaç özellikleri ve ebeveynlik etkileşiminin çocuk gelişimi üzerindeki etkileri literatürde incelenen bir konudur. Yaptığı çalışmalarda Kochanska (1991) mizacen kaygı ve korku hissetmeye yatkın çocukların güç kullanan ebeveynlik davranışlarından daha olumsuz etkilendiğini bulmuştur. Bu çocuklar güç kullanan ebeveynlik davranışlarından suçlu hissetme ve telafi etme davranışları bağlamında özellikle daha çok etkilenmişlerdir.

Buna ilaven mizacın daha korkak çocuklar stres yaratacak bir olay karşısında daha çok endişe duyduklarından ötürü (Kagan, 1998), negatife ebeveynlik davranışlarından suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlık yönünden daha olumsuz etkilenmişlerdir (Kochanska, 1997, 2002).

Çalışmanın Hipotezleri

Literatürdeki bulgular göz önünde bulundurularak, anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün okul öncesi donemdeki çocukların içselleştirme davranışları üzerinde olumsuz bir etkisi olacağı hipotez edilmiştir. Ayrıca bu ilişkide çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığının aracı değişken olacağı hipotez edilmiştir. Bunlara ek olarak, mizacen öfke/engellenmesi ve algısal hassasiyeti yüksek olan çocukların anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolden suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlık bağlamında daha negatif etkilenecekleri hipotez edilmiştir.

YÖNTEM

Örneklem

Örneklem yaşları 52 ve 78 ay arası değişen Ankara ve Bolu'da yasayan 100 anne-çocuk çiftinden oluşmaktadır. Annelerin yaşı ise 25 ile 46 arasında değişmektedir.

Ölçekler

Çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığının verisi hem anneden hem de çocuktan alınmıştır. Anneden alınan veri için "Benim Çocuğum (My Child)" ölçeğinin iki alt boyutu kullanılmıştır. Çocuktan alınan veri için ise araştırmacılar tarafından geliştirilen 6 adet senaryo kullanılmıştır. Çocuğun içselleştirme davranışları anneye verilen "Davranış Değerlendirme Ölçeği (Child Behavior Checklist)" ile ölçülmüştür. Çocuk mizacının algısal hassasiyet ve öfke/engellenme alt boyutları "Çocuk Davranış Anketi (Child Behavior Questionnaire" kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün olçumu araştırmacılar tarafından geliştirilen kuklaların kullanıldığı bir teknikle yapılmıştır.

Veri Toplama

Tezin verilerini toplamak için Ankara ve Bolu'da bulunan anaokulları ile irtibata geçilmiştir. Gönüllü katilim formları annelere ulaştıktan sonra, katılmayı kabul eden annelerin çocukları teste alınmıştır. Anneler çocuklarının suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı, mizacı ve içselleştirme davranışlarını ölçen anketleri doldurmuşlardır. Çocuklar ise suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı ve anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolü ölçen iki farklı uygulamaya katılmışlardır. Uygulamalar anaokulunda sessiz bir sınıfta çocukla başbaşa yapılmıştır. Anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün olçumu iki tane kukla yardımıyla yapılmıştır. Ölçümde kuklalar çocuklara annelerinin ebeveynlik davranışlarıyla ilgili sorular

sormuşlardır. Çocukların cevapları kayıt altına alınarak daha sonra kodlamaları yapılmıştır. Bu uygulama yaklaşık olarak yedi dakika sürmüştür. Suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın olçumu çocuğa anlatılan kısa senaryolar yardımıyla yapılmıştır. Bu senaryolarda çocuk basit bir hata yapmış ve bu hata başkaları üzerinde sonuçlara neden olmuştur. Daha sonra çocuğa bir suçluluk bir de dışsallaştırma cümlesi okunmuş ve çocuğun cümlelere katılıp katılmadığı sorulmuştur. Cocugun verdiği cevaplar kayıt altına alınmıştır ve daha sonra kodlanmıştır. Bu uygulama yaklaşık on dakika sürmüştür.

SONUÇLAR

Korelasyon Analizi

Yapılan iki değişkenli korelasyon analizlerine göre çalışmanın değişkenleri arasında sadece iki anlamlı korelasyon değeri bulunmuştur. Bunlardan ilki annenin rapor ettiği çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı ve çocuğun algısal hassasiyeti arasındadır. İkinci önemli korelasyon ise çocuğun öfke/engellenmesi ile içselleştirme davranışları arasındadır. Bu analizde diğer değişkenler arasında anlamlı korelasyonlar bulunmaması, çalışmanın başında yapılması planlanan aracı ve düzenleyici değişken analizlerin yapılmasını engellemiştir. Bunun yerine çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığını ve içselleştirme davranışlarını yordayan değişkenleri saptamak amacıyla üç farklı regresyon analizi yapılmıştır.

Çocuğun Rapor Ettiği Suçluluk Hissetmeye Yatkınlık Üzerine Sonuçlar

Çocuğun rapor ettiği suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın yordayıcılarını belirlemek için çoklu regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Bağımsız değişken olarak anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol, algısal hassasiyet, öfke/engellenme, algısal hassasiyet-algılanan psikolojik kontrol ve öfke/engellenme-algılanan psikolojik kontrol etkileşimleri girilmiştir. Analiz sonucu bu değişkenlerin hiç birinin

çocuğun rapor ettiği suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığının anlamlı yordayıcı olmadığını göstermiştir.

Annenin Rapor Ettiği Çocuğun Suçluluk Hissetmeye Yatkınlığı Üzerine Sonuçlar

Annenin rapor ettiği suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın yordayıcılarını belirlemek için çoklu regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Bağımsız değişken olarak anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol, algısal hassasiyet, öfke/engellenme, algısal hassasiyet-algılanan psikolojik kontrol etkileşimi öfke/engellenme-algılanan psikolojik kontrol etkileşimi girilmiştir. Analiz sonucu sadece algısal hassasiyetin annenin rapor ettiği cocugun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığının anlamlı bir yor dayıcısı olduğunu göstermiştir.

Çocuğun İçselleştirme Davranışları Üzerine Sonuçlar

Çocuğun içselleştirme davranışlarının yordayıcılarını belirlemek üzere beş adımlı bir hiyerarşik regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. İlk adımda algılanan psikolojik kontrol analize girilmiştir ve çocuğun içselleştirme davranışlarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısı olmadığı görülmüştür. İkinci adımda mizaç özellikleri olan algısal hassasiyet ve öfke/engellenme analize girilmiştir ve yalnızca öfke/engellenmenin çocuğun içselleştirme davranışlarını anlamlı olarak yordadığı bulunmuştur. Üçüncü adımda hem annenin hem de çocuğun rapor ettiği çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı analize girilmiştir. Bu iki değişkenin içselleştirme davranışlarını anlamlı olarak yordamadıkları bulunmuştur. Dördüncü adımda, anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol-algısal hassasiyet etkileşimi analize girilmiştir ve bu değişkenin de içselleştirme davranışlarının anlamlı bir yordayıcısı olmadığı görülmüştür. Son adımda anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol-öfke/engellenme etkileşimi analize girilmiş ve bu değişkenin de içselleştirme davranışları için anlamlı bir yordayıcı olmadığı bulunmuştur.

TARTIŞMA

Çocuğun Suçluluk Hissetmeye Yatkınlığıyla İlgili Bulguların Değerlendirilmesi

Bu çalışmanın birinci amacı okul öncesi donemdeki çocuklarda anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol ve içselleştirme davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi ve suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın bu ilişki üzerindeki aracı değişken rolünü incelemekti. Çalışmanın ikinci amacı ise anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol ve çocuk mizacı etkileşiminin çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığını nasıl etkilediğini incelemekti. Literatürde bu konularda büyük yas çocuklarla ve ergenlerle yapılan çalışmalar bulunmaktadır fakat okul öncesi donemde bu konular hiç çalışılmamıştır. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışma yukarıda bahsedilen konuları okul öncesi donemdeki çocuklarla çalıştığı için literatüre önemli bir katkı yapmaktadır.

Yapılan analizlerin sonucunda anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol ile çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Bu sonuç literatürdeki diğer çalışmalar ile çelişmektedir. Örneğin, psikolojik kontrolün alt boyutu olan koşullu saygı ile çocuğun yanlış bir şey yaptıktan sonra kendini daha suçlu hissetmesi arasında pozitif yönlü bir ilişki bulunmuştur (Assor ve diğer., 2009). Buna ek olarak, ebeveynin suçluluk aşılama davranışı ile ergenlerin kronik ve patolojik suçluluk duyguları arasında da anlamlı pozitif bir ilişki bulunmuştur (Donatelli, Bybee, & Buka, 2007). Bu çalışmaların metotlarına bakıldığında, neredeyse hepsinin okul çağındaki veya ergenlik dönemindeki çocuklarla yürütüldüğü görülmektedir. Bu çocukların okul öncesi donemdeki çocuklara göre daha ileri seviyede olan bilişsel gelişimleri kendileriyle ilgili daha güvenilir raporlar vermiş olabileceklerini akla getirebilir. Fakat yapılan çalışmalarda, gelişimsel düzeylerine uygun ölçüm araçları kullanıldığında, okul öncesi donemdeki genç çocukların da kendilerinin ve diğerlerinin psikolojik süreçleri ve deneyimleri ile ilgili güvenilir raporlar verebildikleri ortaya konmuştur (Eder, 1989, 1990; Morris ve diğer.,2002).

Bu çalışmada algılanan psikolojik kontrolü ölçmek için kullanılan "kukla yöntemi" de okul öncesi donemdeki çocukların gelişimsel düzeylerine uygun bir yöntemdir. Bu yüzden, algılanan psikolojik kontrolün ve suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın ilişkili bulunmamasının başka nedenleri olduğu düşünülmektedir. Bunlardan ilki, psikolojik kontrol batı kültürlerinde olduğunun tersine, Türk kültüründe negatif olarak algılanmıyor olabilir. Kağıtçıbaşı'nın (1970) belirttiği gibi geleneksel Türk ebeveynlik pratikleri yüksek seviyelerde psikolojik kontrolü ve yüksek seviyede sıcaklığı ayni anda içinde barındırıyor olabilir. Bu fikir göz önünde bulundurularak kültürel bağlamın içinde düşünüldüğünde, yüksek seviyelerdeki ebeveynlik sıcaklığı psikolojik kontrolün negatif etkilerini telafi etmiş olabilir. Ayrıca anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrolün okul öncesi donemde negatif sonuçlarla ilişkili olmaması, bu etkinin gelişimin daha ileriki dönemlerinde ortaya çıkmayacağı anlamına da gelmemelidir.

Bunlara ilaven, çalışmanın örneklemi çok küçük yaştaki çocuklardan oluştuğu için, bu çocukların kendi suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlıkları hakkında güvenilir rapor veremediklerini akla getirebilir. Fakat gelişimsel psikoloji alanındaki çalışmalar göz önünde bulundurulduğunda bu endişe ortadan kalkacaktır. Daha önce belirtildiği gibi suçluluk duygusu 17 ay kadar erken bir donemde çocuklarda gözlemlenebilen bir duygudur. Ayrıca yasla birlikte sosyal kurallar ve normlar daha iyi anlaşıldıkça, suçluluk duygusu daha geniş bir davranış yelpazesinde gözlemlenir hale gelmektedir (Barret, 2005; Lewis ve diger., 1989). Ayrıca, bu çalışmada kullanılan senaryo yöntemi literatürde oldukça sık kullanılan geçerliliği ve güvenilirliği kanıtlanmış bir yöntemdir (Ferguson et al., 2000; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999). Kullanılan senaryoların çalışmadaki Cronbach alpha değeri goz önünde tutulduğunda da kullanılan tekniğin güvenilir bir teknik olduğu görülecektir.

Bunlara ilaven, ikinci regresyon analizinde annenin rapor ettiği çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı bağımlı değişken olarak alinmiş ve sadece çocuğun algısal

hassasiyeti bu değişkenin anlamlı bir yordayıcısı olarak bulunmuştur. Bu bulgu literatürdeki diğer bulgularla örtüşmektedir. Kochanska'nin çalışmasında (1994) algısal hassasiyeti yüksek olan kız çocuklarının yanlış bir şey yaptıktan sonra duygusal olarak daha fazla rahatsızlık hissettikleri ve ebeveynlerinin onun hakkında ne düşündüğüyle ilgili daha çok kaygı yasadıkları ortaya konmuştur.

Ayrıca bu çalışmada, anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol ve mizaç özellikleri arasındaki etkileşimin çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı üzerinde bir yönetici etkisi olacağı hipotez edilmiş fakat bu hipotez doğrulanmamıştır. Bu bulgu literatürdeki diğer bulgularla çelişmektedir. Yaptığı çalışmalarda Kochanska (1991, 2002) güç uygulayan ebeveynlik davranışlarının ve çocuğu eleştiren ebeveynlik tutumlarının özellikle mizacen korkak ve kaygıya yatkın çocuklarda daha negatif etkilere yol açtığını bulmuştur. Bu tur güç uygulayan ve eleştiren ebeveynlik davranışlarına maruz kalan çocuklar daha yüksek suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlık rapor etmişlerdir. Bu çocuklar ayrıca bir hata yaptıktan sonra daha fazla duygusal rahatsızlık hissetmiş ve hatayı daha fazla telafi etmeye çalışmışlardır.

Çocuğun İçselleştirme Davranışlarıyla İlgili Sonuçların Değerlendirilmesi

Hiyerarşik regresyon analizinin sonuçlarına göre ne anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol ne de çocuğun suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı içselleştirme davranışlarının anlamı yordayıcıları olarak bulunmuştur. Literatürde okul öncesi donemde içselleştirme problemlerinin risk faktörlerini araştıran ve ortaya koyan birçok araştırma bulunmaktadır. Bu araştırmalara göre annenin depresyonu (West & Newman, 2003), annenin aşırı korumacı ebeveynlik davranışları (McShane & Hastings, 2009), düşük sosyoekonomik düzey (Slopen, Filtzmaurice, Williams, & Gilman, 2010) ve anne ve çocuk arasındaki güvensiz bağlanma (Brumariu & Kerns, 2010) okul öncesi donemde çocukların içselleştirme problemleri için bulunan önemli risk faktörleridir.

Daha önce yapılan çalışmalar 5-12 ve 6-13 yaşlarındaki çocuklarda suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlık ile içselleştirme problemleri arasında bir ilişki bulunmuştur (Ferguson et al., 2000; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999). Bu nedenle bu çalışmada da suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığında da içselleştirme davranışlarının bir risk faktörü olabileceği hipotez edilmiş fakat bu hipotez doğrulanmamıştır. Diğer risk faktörleri düşünüldüğünde, suçluluk hissetmeye yetkinlik biraz daha karmaşık bir faktör olabilir ve olumsuz etkisi okul öncesi donemde görülmese de daha sonraki dönemlerde ortaya çıkacak olabilir. Literatürde bu argümanı destekleyecek iki çalışma bulunmaktadır (Ferguson et al., 2000; Ferguson, Stegge, Miller, & Olsen, 1999) fakat bu çalışmaların örneklemlerinin yas aralığı çok geniştir. Diğer araştırmalar ergenlerle yürütülmüştür ve suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın erken ve orta ergenlik döneminde depresif semptomların yordayıcısı olduğu bulunmuştur (Rohleder, Chen, Wolf, & Miller, 2008; Tilghman-Osborne, Cole, Felton, & Ciesla, 2008).

Yöntem bölümünde daha önce bahsedildiği gibi, çalışmada içselleştirme davranışlarını ölçmek için Davranış Değerlendirme Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Bu ölçeğin somatizasyon, çekilme ve depresyon/anksiyete alt ölçekleri bulunmaktadır. Çalışmada bu üç alt boyuttaki maddelerden alınan toplam skor analizlerde kullanılmış ve suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın bu toplam skoru yordamadığı bulunmuştur. Tezin sonuçlar kısmında bahsedilmeyen bir başka analiz daha yapılmıştır. Bu analizde Davranış Değerlendirme Ölçeği'nin her bir alt boyutundan alınan skorlar ayrı ayrı hesaplanmış ve yine ayrı ayrı analize girilmiştir. Bu analiz sonucunda çocukların depresyon/anksiyete skorları ile çocukların rapor ettiği suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlık arasında kısmen anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur (p = .07). Bir başka deyişle, depresyon/anksiyete skorları somatizasyon ve çekilme skorlarından ayrılarak hesaplandığında, çocukların rapor ettiği suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlık depresyon/anksiyete semptomlarını yordar hale gelmiştir.

Bu çalışmada suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlıkla herhangi bir sonuç arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmaması, suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığın sağlıklı çocuk gelişimi için hiçbir risk içermeyeceği anlamına gelmemelidir. Literatürdeki diğer bulgulara bakıldığında, bu konuda yapılacak boylamsal çalışmaların gelişimin daha sonraki dönemlerinde suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı depresyon ve anksiyete gibi patolojilerin risk faktörü olarak saptayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Çalışmanın Güçlü ve Zayıf Yanları

Bu çalışma anneden algılanan psikolojik kontrol ile çocuğun içselleştirme davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi, suçluluk hissetmeye yetkinliği aracı değişken olarak ele alarak
inceleyen ilk çalışmadır. Ayrıca bildiğimiz kadarıyla, bu çalışma okul öncesi donemdeki çocukların kendi annelerini psikolojik kontrol yönünden nasıl algıladıklarını da ölçen ilk çalışmadır. Bunlara ilaven, bu çalışma okul öncesi donemdeki çocukların suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlıklarını kendilerinin verdikleri raporlarla ölçen ilk çalışmadır. Örneklemin genç çocuklardan oluşması hipotezlerin doğrulanmamasının bir nedeni olarak algılanabilir fakat unutulmamalıdır ki bu kadar genç bir örnekleme sahip olmak bu çalışmanın zayıflığından öte güçlü bir yanıdır.

Çalışmanın Uygulanabilirliği ve Literatüre Katkıları

Öfke/engellenme ve algısal hassasiyet ile ilgili bulgular çocuk mizacını tanımanın önemini bir kez daha vurgulamıştır. Örneğin, ebeveynler ve öğretmenler bir çocuğun algısal hassasiyetinin yüksek olduğunu bilirlerse, yaptığı hataları ve yanlışları konuşurken ve tartışırken çocuğu daha az suçlu hissettirmek için daha özenli davranmaları gerektiğini bilebilirler. Benzer şekilde, ebeveynler ve öğretmenler bir çocuğun öfke/engellenmesinin yüksek olduğunu bilirlerse ebeveynlik davranışlarını ve sınıf ortamını çocuğun içselleştirme davranışları geliştirme riskini en aza indirecek şekilde düzenleyebilirler.

Bildiğimiz kadarıyla bu çalışma okul öncesi donemdeki çocuklarda algılanan psikolojik kontrolü ölçen ve suçluluk hissetmeye yatkınlığı çocukların kendi raporlarıyla ölçen ilk çalışmadır. Bu bağlamda çalışma literatüre önemli katkılar yapmaktadır.

Appendix I

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü [ ]

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü [X]

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü [ ]

Enformatik Enstitüsü [ ]

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü [ ]

YAZARIN

Soyadı: ÜNAL

Adı : GÜLSÜN

Bölümü: PSİKOLOJİ

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce): Maternal Psychological Control And Child Temperament As Predictors Of Preschoolers' Internalizing Problems: Mediating Role Of Guilt Proneness

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans [X] Doktora [ ]

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. [X]
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. [ ]
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. [ ]

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: