

PARENTING PRACTICES AND PROSOCIAL BEHAVIORS OF CHILDREN
AND ADOLESCENTS: THE MODERATING ROLE OF TEMPERAMENT

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

BY

BERİL KIYAK

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

OCTOBER 2020

Approval of the thesis:

**PARENTING PRACTICES AND PROSOCIAL BEHAVIORS OF CHILDREN
AND ADOLESCENTS: THE MODERATING ROLE OF TEMPERAMENT**

submitted by **BERİL KIYAK** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of **Master of Science in Psychology, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of
Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sibel KAZAK BERUMENT
Head of Department
Psychology

Prof. Dr. Sibel KAZAK BERUMENT
Supervisor
Psychology

Examining Committee Members:

Assist. Prof. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN-ACAR (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Psychology

Prof. Dr. Sibel KAZAK BERUMENT (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Psychology

Assist. Prof. Dr. Berna AYTAÇ
Hacettepe University
Psychology



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: Beril K1yak

Signature:

ABSTRACT

PARENTING PRACTICES AND PROSOCIAL BEHAVIORS OF CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS: THE MODERATING ROLE OF TEMPERAMENT

Kıyak, Beril

M.S., The Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument

October 2020, 62 pages

The current study aimed to investigate age differences in prosocial behaviors of Turkish children and adolescents, and to investigate the relationships between parenting practices (parental warmth, inductive reasoning, and psychological control) and prosocial behaviors. In addition, moderating roles of temperamental characteristics (negative affect and sensory processing sensitivity) in these relationships were investigated separately. This study was conducted as part of a nation-wide project funded by TUBITAK, and 478 children and adolescents attending formal education ranging from 3rd grade to 11th grade and their mothers participated in the study. Parenting practices, prosocial behavior, and temperamental characteristics of children and adolescents were assessed by different questionnaires. Firstly, a one-way ANOVA was run to investigate the age differences. Then, two hierarchical regression analyses were run for the purpose of investigating the moderating role of temperamental characteristics in the relationships between parenting practices and prosocial behavior. The results indicated that parenting practices were not related to prosocial behavior. Moreover, although temperamental characteristics did not have a moderating role in these relationships, both of them were

associated with prosocial behavior. Findings of the study, contributions, limitations, and future suggestions were discussed in terms of the relevant literature.

Keywords: Parental warmth, inductive reasoning, psychological control, prosocial behavior, temperament.



ÖZ

EBEVEYN UYGULAMALARI VE ÇOCUK VE ERGENLERİN OLUMLU SOSYAL DAVRANIŞLARI: MİZACIN DÜZENLEYİCİ ROLÜ

Kıyak, Beril

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument

Ekim 2020, 62 sayfa

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki çocuk ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışlarındaki yaş farklılıklarını araştırmayı ve ebeveynlik uygulamaları (ebeveyn sıcaklığı, açıklayıcı akıl yürütme ve psikolojik kontrol) ile olumlu sosyal davranışlar arasındaki ilişkileri incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca bu ilişkilerde mizaç özelliklerinin (olumsuz duygulanım ve duygusal duyarlılık) düzenleyici rolleri ayrı ayrı incelenmiştir. Bu çalışma, TÜBİTAK tarafından desteklenen ülke çapında yürütülen bir proje kapsamında gerçekleştirilmiş olup, çalışmaya 3. sınıftan 11. sınıfa kadar örgün eğitime devam eden 478 öğrenci ve anneleri katılmıştır. Çocukların ve ergenlerin ebeveynlik uygulamaları, olumlu sosyal davranışları ve mizaç özellikleri farklı ölçeklerle değerlendirilmiştir. İlk olarak, yaş farklılıklarını araştırmak için tek yönlü bir varyans analizi yapılmıştır. Daha sonra ebeveynlik uygulamaları ile olumlu sosyal davranışlar arasındaki ilişkilerde mizaç özelliklerinin düzenleyici rolünü araştırmak amacıyla iki hiyerarşik regresyon analizi ayrı ayrı yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar, ebeveynlik uygulamalarının olumlu sosyal davranışla ilişkili olmadığını göstermiştir. Diğer bir yandan, mizaç özelliklerinin bu ilişkilerde düzenleyici bir rolü olmamasına rağmen, her iki mizaç özelliği de olumlu sosyal davranışla ilişkili olarak bulunmuştur.

Çalışmanın bulguları, katkıları, sınırlılıkları ve gelecek çalışmalara öneriler ilgili alanyazın ışığında tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: ebeveyn sıcaklığı, açıklayıcı akıl yürütme, psikolojik kontrol, olumlu sosyal davranış, mizaç.



To my mother



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have helped and supported me in the process of writing my thesis and I sincerely thank these people. First and foremost, I would like to express my greatest thanks and the deepest appreciation to my dear supervisor, Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument for her academic guidance, support and patience through this journey. I would have had a hard time writing my thesis if I hadn't had a supervisor like her. She has always been a role model to me with her academic motivation and dedication, personality and relationships with her students. I could not imagine having a better advisor.

Besides my advisor, I would like to express my sincere thanks to my thesis committee members Assist. Prof. Başak Şahin-Acar and Assist. Prof. Berna Aytaç for making my first thesis committee experience unforgettable and for making insightful comments and asking questions that broaden my perspective.

This thesis was part of a project funded by TUBİTAK. Therefore, I would like to express my gratitude to TUBİTAK, Ministry of National Education, Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument, Assist. Prof. Başak Şahin-Acar, Assoc. Prof. Aysun Doğan, Assist. Prof. Deniz Tahiroğlu, and all the members of Child Development Lab and the project assistants at Boğaziçi University and Ege University for their hard work and contributions to this project.

I am also thankful to my dear friends from my graduate education Bilge Onursal Özer and Zeynep Su Altınöz for their help and support through this journey. Here, I would like to thank especially Bilge very sincerely because she responded to all of my questions about every detail patiently and sincerely day and night even when they were ridiculous. This process was easier and more fun with her support and assistance.

I am also grateful to my dear mother Demet Kıyak, my father AYTEKİN Kıyak, and my sister Büşra Kıyak for being there when I need their support. Besides, I would like to thank my dear family in Ankara, my grandmother Yasemin Yüksel Erdem, my aunt Çiğdem Avcı, my uncle and aunt-in-law Bülent and Güzde Bulut, and my little

cousins Umut and Vadi for bringing joy to my life and never making me feel the absence of my mother and father.

I also would like to thank my close friends İmran Şahin, Zeynep Göksu, Fuat Çıkan and many more that I could not list here. I am grateful to them for giving meaning to my life with their presence, being there when I need them, and sweetening me up when I feel overwhelmed.

Last but not least, I am thankful to my beloved one, Aykut Yılmaz. He was with me whenever I needed support and a shoulder to cry on. He has been my safe haven whenever I get tired and overwhelmed. His endless support, love and affection has been always with me.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
CHAPTERS	
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Development of Prosocial Behaviors	2
1.3 Determinants of Prosocial Behavior	4
1.3.1 Biological Explanations	4
1.3.2 Environmental Determinants of Prosocial Behavior.....	6
1.4 Parenting and Social Development	7
1.4.1 Parental Warmth and Prosocial Behavior	8
1.4.2 Inductive Reasoning and Prosocial Behavior	9
1.4.3 Parental Control and Prosocial Behavior	10
1.5 Moderating Role of Temperament	12
1.6 Current Study	13
METHOD.....	15
2.1 Participants	15
2.2 Measurements.....	17
2.2.1 Demographic Information Form	17
2.2.2 Parental Warmth.....	17
2.2.3 Inductive Reasoning.....	17
2.2.4 Psychological Control	17
2.2.5 Negative Affect	18
2.2.6 Sensory Processing Sensitivity	18
2.2.7 Prosocial Behavior	18
2.3 Procedure.....	19
RESULTS	20

3.1	Data Screening.....	20
3.2	Descriptive Analysis.....	21
3.3	Correlation Analyses	21
3.4.	One-Way ANOVA for Age Differences in Prosocial Behavior.....	23
3.5	Hierarchical Regression Analyses	23
DISCUSSION		26
4.1	Overview	26
4.2	Age Differences in the Level of Prosocial Behavior	26
4.3	Parenting Practices and Prosocial Behavior	27
4.4	Temperamental Characteristics and Prosocial Behavior	30
4.5	Strength and Contributions of This Study	32
4.6	Limitations of the Study	32
4.7	Implications of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research.....	34
4.8	Conclusion.....	34
REFERENCES.....		35
APPENDICES		
A. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE...		47
B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET		48
C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU		62

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Demographics of Children and Adolescents in Terms of City, School Level, and Grade	6
Table 2.2 Demographic Information of Mothers in Terms of Perceived SES and Education Level	6
Table 3.1 Descriptive Statistics for Study Measures ($N=478$).....	21
Table 3.2 Correlations between Variables ($N=478$).....	22
Table 3.3 Means and Standard Deviations of Grades in Terms of Prosocial Behavior	23
Table 3.4 Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Prosocial Behavior	24

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Eisenberg et al. (2006) defined prosocial behavior as “voluntary behavior intended to benefit another” (p. 646), and prosocial behaviors include behaviors such as sharing, helping, and comforting. Although prosocial behavior is very substantial in terms of the quality of social interactions, before 1970, researchers paid less attention to prosocial behavior, since the focus was mostly on the negative behaviors such as aggression and criminality. A relevant term, altruism, is defined as “intrinsically motivated voluntary behavior intended to benefit others”. Since it is very difficult to differentiate between intrinsically or extrinsically motivated behaviors, in the literature, the focus is generally on the prosocial behaviors (Eisenberg et al., 2006, p. 647). Prosocial behaviors are important since they are related to positive outcomes for both parties. For example, engaging in prosocial behavior leads to a sense of moral pride for prosocial children, which, in turn, leads to further prosocial behaviors (Etxebarria et al., 2015). Moreover, having prosocial peer relations is a protective factor for depression and substance abuse in adolescence (Mason et al., 2019).

Emotions, especially empathy-related emotions, have an essential role in the development of prosocial behaviors (Eisenberg et al., 2006). According to Barnett (1987), empathy is critical for prosocial responses. Eisenberg and Strayer (1987) defined *empathy* as “an emotional response that stems from another’s emotional state or condition, and it is congruent with the other’s emotional state or situation” (p. 5). *Sympathy* is another concept that is often confused with empathy. However, it is “an affective response consisting of feeling sorrow or concern for the distressed or needy other rather than feeling the same emotion as the other person is experiencing” (Eisenberg et al., 2006, p.647). According to Eisenberg and Strayer (1987), although other factors should be considered in addressing the link between empathy and

prosocial behavior, generally, empathy leads to sympathizing, which, in turn, leads to prosocial responding.

Although prosocial behaviors cannot be observed in newborns, they seem to be responsive to the emotional signals of other people (Termine & Izard, 1988). Concerned attention and prosocial behaviors begin to appear when they become 12-18 months old toward their siblings or mothers (Dunn, 1988; Zahn-Waxler, Robinson, et al., 1992). Development of prosocial behaviors is determined by several environmental factors such as culture, relationships with peers and siblings, and parenting (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Howe & Ross, 1990; Kiang et al., 2004; Wentzel et al., 2004). Especially parenting is critical since children have their first social interactions with their parents, and parents contribute to their prosocial behavior as their socialization agents (Hasting et al., 2007).

Therefore, this study attempts to understand the associations between parenting practices, temperamental characteristics of children and adolescents, and their prosocial behavior. With this aim, in the following sections, the development of prosocial behavior will be explained. Then, biological and environmental determinants of prosocial behavior will be given. After that, the association between parental factors and prosocial behavior will be discussed, and the parenting practices interested in this study and their relationship between prosocial behavior will be presented. Next, the role of child temperament in these associations will be explained. Lastly, the aims and hypotheses of the current study will be stated.

1.2 Development of Prosocial Behaviors

Hoffman (1982) suggested a theoretical model of empathy that consists of four levels, which explains the role of self-awareness, self-other differentiation, and affect of infants and children by summarizing the developmental shift over time. According to this theory, the first level is labeled as *global empathy* that lasts for most of the infant's first year. In this level, infants cannot separate their own distress from the distress of others, and they show reactive cry when they hear the sound of others' cry. By about 12 months, infants start to display some recognition of the difference between self and others in distress, but this distinction is not clear yet. This second level is labeled as *egocentric empathy*, and in this level, infants can recognize the distress of others and can differentiate from their own distress. However, they still

cannot understand that the inner state of others can be different from their own inner state when they are distressed. Therefore, infants try to comfort others' distress with what they find comforting, such as giving their favorite teddy bear.

The third level, *empathy for another's feelings*, starts about at the age of 2 or 3 years, and children start to understand that others have inner states that are unrelated to theirs. By 3 or 4 years, children can recognize and respond empathically to others' feelings in simple situations, and by time, they start to empathize with more complex emotions. Finally, they can empathize with someone's feelings even if this person is not present physically, and this leads to the last level of empathic development. This level, *empathy for another's general plight*, starts by late childhood, and it consists of empathy combined with an image of others' general life conditions (i.e. level of deprivation/distress). Moreover, at this level, children may have an empathic concern for the plight of an entire class or group of people (e.g., retarded, poor, abused; Hoffman, 1982).

Supporting Hoffman's theory, in the first year of life, infants display some behaviors that are implicative of global empathy. For instance, calm infants start crying when they heard the cry sounds of another infant (Martin & Clark, 1982). Other empirical findings suggest that infants and toddlers are influenced by others' emotions, respond to emotional signals of others, and show empathy and concern to others' distress (Denham, 1986; Termine & Izard, 1988; Zahn-Waxler, Robinson et al., 1992).

During the preschool ages, children's reactions to others' distress and sadness range from prosocial and emphatic to unsympathetic and egocentric responses (Eisenberg et al., 2006). As children get older, they are more likely to show emphatic concern and prosocial behavior (Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow et al., 1992). While their indifference and self-oriented reactions decrease, their empathic responses and prosociality increase (Brownell, 2013). Moreover, there are empirical findings indicating that prosocial tendencies seem to increase from childhood to adolescence (Eisenberg & Fabes 1998; Fabes & Eisenberg, 1996). According to a meta-analysis conducted by Eisenberg and Fabes (1998), adolescents were higher in their prosocial behaviors than children aged between 7 and 12.

Furthermore, age and gender differences in prosocial behavior during adolescence also among the reported findings. In a meta-analytic study investigating gender and age

differences of adolescents, girls had higher scores of kindness/considerateness than boys, but the gender difference was significantly smaller for instrumental help (Fabes & Eisenberg, 1996). Similarly, in another study, a significant grade difference was found for the involvement of adolescents in prosocial behavior. They found significant increases in prosocial behaviors from 7th to 10th grade (Jacobs, Vernon & Eccles, 2004). However, in another study comparing age and gender differences of 14-year-old and 17-year-old adolescents, results showed that girls and 14 year-olds had more prosocial strategies and behaviors than boys and 17-year-olds, respectively (Pakaslahti et al., 2002).

In conclusion, despite some contradictory results, there is a general tendency for prosocial behaviors to increase from childhood to adolescence. That is why, the first aim of this study was to examine the age differences in prosocial behavior of Turkish children and adolescents in a wide age range. However, besides age, there are other important determinants of prosocial behavior.

1.3 Determinants of Prosocial Behavior

1.3.1 Biological Explanations

For the evolutionary function of prosocial behavior, there are some suggestions in the literature, such as kin selection, reciprocal altruism, and group selection. To start with, Wilson (1980) suggested *kin selection*, which is the reproductive success of organisms at a group level, as an explanation of the evolutionary importance of altruism in animals. He argued that relatives of prosocial animals have more chances of survival and reproduction. Related to this explanation, some researchers suggested that one crucial determinant of altruistic behavior is the percentage of common or shared genes, which means species are more altruistic to their more closely-related kin (Hasting et al., 2006). However, this explanation was invalidated by the term *reciprocal altruism*, which refers to prosocial behaviors toward unrelated organisms (Trivers, 1971). Trivers argued that, in course of time, altruistic behaviors toward unrelated organisms could be beneficial to the organism that performed these behaviors. Another theory that was suggested to explain the function of prosocial behavior is *group selection*. This theory claims that selection can be at a group-level, in which some groups of species outcompete other groups, and to do so, they should

be cooperative; and some members should sacrifice themselves for the goodness of the other members (Wynne-Edwards, 1962). According to Beckes and Simpsom (2012), human beings should be cooperative and prosocial to be able to pass their genes to future generations. To conclude, altruistic and prosocial behaviors may be consequences of some evolutionary forces, and people can perform prosocial behavior for its survival and reproductive value (Sober & Wilson, 1998).

There are also studies investigating the neurobiological bases of prosociality. For example, when a person observes the behavior of another individual, mirror neurons are activated like they act the way they observe; and this leads to activation of emotion processing areas (Beckes & Simpson, 2012). Moreover, it was found that mirror neurons have an essential role in imitating facial expressions and empathizing with others (Carr et al., 2003). Another biological explanation appears to be the oxytocin (OT) neuropeptide system. It is a hormone that has essential roles in social functioning, caregiving behaviors, and human bonding (Beckes & Simpson, 2012; Knafo & Israel, 2010). Besides these functions of oxytocin, some findings in the literature suggest that it also has a role in prosocial behaviors. For example, in one study, OT was found to have prosocial effects on the behaviors of rats and mice (Lukas et al., 2011).

Another biological explanation of prosocial behaviors appears to be genetics. For example, a twin study suggested that there is a significant genetic basis for characteristics related to the emotional aspects of empathy (e.g., Davis et al., 1994). Moreover, in another twin study, the genetic contribution was found about 52% for mother-reported prosocial behaviors of children and adolescents aged between 5 and 16 (Scourfield et al., 2004).

Based on these, it can be said that there may be some genetic determinants of empathy and prosocial behavior. Still, there are also empirical findings suggesting that variances in prosocial behaviors of children are caused by the unshared environment rather than genetic factors (Deater-Deckard et al., 2003; Deater-Deckard et al., 2001). Therefore, besides the biological determinants, environmental determinants of prosocial behavior should also be considered.

1.3.2 Environmental Determinants of Prosocial Behavior

Children develop by interacting with their environment, and different systems contribute to their development. These systems are unique for every individual, and vary from the smallest (microsystem) which includes family, school, etc., to the largest (macrosystem) which includes cultural beliefs, values, etc. Each of these systems has essential roles in the development and socialization of the individual (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Culture can be labeled as one of the environmental determinants of prosocial behavior because its perceived practical value could vary across different cultures (Eisenberg et al., 2006). In some cultures, prosocial behaviors are particularly important and encouraged more compared to other cultures. According to Bornstein (2012), child-rearing practices and socialization are highly related to culture, and similar practices may have different meanings and associations in different cultures (Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, 2007). Moreover, besides parenting practices, how practical is prosocial behavior perceived may differ across cultures (Eisenberg et al., 2006). For example, in West Africa, sharing behavior starts to be encouraged from infancy to promote social bonding (Nsamenang, 1992). Since different cultures encourage and value prosocial behaviors differently, children from different cultures display variations in their social behaviors. For example, it was found that, compared to children from urban and Western countries, children from traditional societies are more cooperative (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989).

Köster and his colleagues pointed out a different perspective on the effects of culture on prosocial behavior. According to this point of view, cultures have culture-specific pathways (relational or autonomous pathways) towards prosocial behavior. Cultures with the relational pathway, which are traditional and rural communities, value social network, interpersonal responsibilities, and obedience; and these factors are the motivational source of prosocial behavior for individuals in these communities. On the other hand, cultures with the autonomous pathway, which are modern and urban communities, value self-actualization, and independence. Therefore, individuals in these communities consider prosocial behaviors as a personal choice rather than a responsibility (Köster et al., 2015).

Socialization within and outside of the family is an important determinant, and it could increase or eliminate the effect of culture (Eisenberg et al., 2006). People like

friends, peers, and teachers may act as potential socializers of children's prosocial behaviors. For example, in one study, having a reciprocated friendship with a prosocial friend predicted higher levels of prosocial behavior (Wentzel et al., 2004). Teachers could also influence prosocial development by using reinforcements for prosocial behaviors in the class (Ramaswamy & Bergin, 2009). Besides, having a younger sibling may promote the helping and comforting behaviors of children. Howe and Ross (1990) found that preschool-aged children engage in comforting behaviors toward their distressed younger siblings. Moreover, sibling warmth was found to predict children's support behavior toward their friends (Smorti & Ponti, 2018).

As within family socialization practices, researchers have examined the role of parenting styles, dimensions and practices on children's empathy and prosocial behaviors. Findings suggested that if parents are warm, sensitive, and supportive socializers, their children more likely to display empathic or prosocial behaviors (Kiang et al., 2004; Lerner et al., 2005; Newton et al., 2014). Also, parental connectedness (Yoo et al., 2013), use of parental inductions (Carlo et al., 2011), and appropriate (authoritative) parental control (Carlo et al., 2018) were found to be related to more prosocial tendencies of children; while parental harsh parental discipline (Asbury et al., 2003) and strict control (Laible & Carlo, 2004) were found to be associated with prosocial behaviors negatively. Moreover, parental emphasis on prosocial behavior (Pratt et al., 2003) and maternal modeling of helping and support behavior (Fonseca et al., 2018) predicted higher levels of prosocial tendencies. In the next section, literature about the relationship between parenting practices and the social development of children and adolescents will be reviewed.

1.4 Parenting and Social Development

Children have their first social interactions with their parents. Parents, as their socialization agents, are instrumental in the prosocial behavior of children (Hasting et al., 2007). Interactions with parents help children understand and learn positive social behaviors, which are significant for their academic, behavioral, emotional, and interpersonal functioning (Gryzkowski et al., 2018). For instance, showing empathy toward others is very important for the social functioning and competence of children (Sallquist et al., 2009).

In the literature, the predictive role of parenting practices such as warmth, inductive reasoning, and control, has a wide coverage as being related to children's and adolescents' social-emotional development (Brajša-Zganec & Hanzec, 2014; Knauer et al., 2019; Zarra-Nezhad et al., 2015).

1.4.1 Parental Warmth and Prosocial Behavior

Parental warmth can be defined as “the presence of positive affect, responsiveness and support in parent-child relationships” (Carlo et al., 2010, p. 116). Warm parenting was found to be related to emotional adjustment, school achievement, and social competence (Chen et al., 2000; Eiden et al., 2009). According to MacDonald (1992), parental warmth activates children's positive social reward system, which motivates them to show positive behaviors in their social relationships. In a study conducted with elementary school children, concurrent and longitudinal associations between maternal warmth and positive expressivity; and empathic reasoning, social competence, and externalizing behaviors of children were investigated. Results showed that maternal warmth and expressiveness are associated with empathy and social functioning of children (Zhou et al., 2002).

In the literature, there are plenty of studies supporting the idea that parental warmth promotes prosocial behavior of children and adolescents from different age groups. For instance, in a longitudinal study conducted with preschool children, results showed that prosocial behavior was higher if they have higher maternal and paternal affection (Zarra-Nezhad et al., 2018). In another study conducted with primary school children ($M_{\text{age}} = 92.42$ months), how maternal and paternal parenting affects their prosocial and antisocial behaviors, and the moderating role of sex was investigated. Results showed that warmth from both mothers and fathers was positively related to adaptive skills, which include prosocial behaviors such as helping others (Ruiz-Ortiz et al., 2017). Moreover, in one study conducted with 372 boys and 358 girls ($M_{\text{age}} = 10.84$ years) from Valencia, Spain, the relationship between parental warmth and children's sympathy, prosocial moral reasoning, and prosocial behaviors was investigated. Results revealed that parental warmth, sympathy, and moral reasoning had longitudinal and concurrent associations with prosocial behaviors of children (Carlo et al., 2010).

Other studies also investigated these variables and revealed similar results with adolescents. For example, in one study conducted with adolescents and their parents, researchers aimed to examine whether parenting in terms of warmth/support and verbal hostility was related to prosocial behaviors in their relationships with their family, friends, and strangers. Results showed that mothers' warmth was positively related to prosocial behavior toward family, while fathers' warmth was positively related to prosocial behavior toward friends (Padilla-Walker et al., 2016). In another study conducted by taking data from the Flourishing Family Project consisting of 500 adolescents, the direct relationship between parental warmth and prosocial behavior and substance use of adolescents directly and the mediating role of their self-regulation in this relationship. Results showed that parental warmth longitudinally precedes, self-regulation and prosocial peer associations of adolescents (Lee et al., 2016).

As can be seen from the studies mentioned above, warm parenting has been consistently found to be associated with higher levels of prosocial behavior. Thus, the present study aims to examine the role of parental warmth in the prosocial behaviors of children and adolescents. Besides parental warmth, parental inductive reasoning is another important parenting practice with wide coverage in the relevant literature.

1.4.2 Inductive Reasoning and Prosocial Behavior

Inductive reasoning is a positive discipline practice of parents, and it can be defined as explaining children the consequences of their behaviors and having conversations with them about how to behave (Brajsa-Zganec & Hanzec, 2014). By using inductive reasoning, parents can explain the reasons behind the rules and needs of others to their children; and this promotes the development of empathy and prosociality (Hoffman, 2000; Hasting et al., 2007). In a study conducted by Krevans and Gibbs (1996), results showed that empathy of children mediates the relationship between inductive reasoning and prosocial development of children. In other words, higher levels of inductiveness of parents predicted more empathic children, which, in turn, led to more prosocial behaviors of these children. In another study, it was found that approach behavior mediated this relationship. Results showed that higher levels of inductive reasoning predicted higher levels of approach behavior, which predicted higher levels of sharing, comforting, and cooperating behaviors (Laible et al., 2017).

In the relevant literature, many studies showed significant positive correlations between inductive reasoning and prosocial behavior (Brajsa-Zganec & Hanzec, 2014; Hadzic et al., 2013; Saltalı & Imir, 2018). Moreover, there are some studies revealed a significant direct relationship between these variables. For example, in a study conducted with preschool children from Turkey, the relationship between parenting style and social behaviors of children was investigated. Results revealed that parental inductive reasoning was positively related to children's prosocial behaviors (Saltalı & Imir, 2018). However, there is no recognized research examining this relationship with older children in the literature. That is why conducting research with older children and adolescents would be informative and contribute to the relevant literature. Thus, in the present study, the predictive role of parental inductive reasoning in the prosocial behaviors of children and adolescents will be investigated.

Besides parental warmth and inductive reasoning, parental control is another important parenting practice that has wide coverage in the relevant literature. Unlike warmth and inductive reasoning, the relationship between parental control and prosocial behavior is not consistent.

1.4.3 Parental Control and Prosocial Behavior

Parental control refers to “the degree of strictness, behavioral rules, and expectations imposed on children by parents” (Carlo et al., 2010, p. 116). As opposed to parental warmth and inductive reasoning, the relationship of parental control with prosocial behaviors depend on the harshness and type of control (Carlo et al., 2010).

According to Barber (1996), there are two types of control (behavioral or psychological). Behavioral control includes monitoring children's activities, setting reasonable rules for them, and enforcing these rules without threatening their autonomy. Psychological control includes influencing emotional states of children by using guilt induction, parental intrusiveness, and withdrawal of love, and manipulating and being insensitive to their emotional needs. In the literature, behavioral control was found to be negatively related to externalized problems such as delinquent and risk behaviors (Bean et al., 2006; Shek & Law, 2014). On the other hand, psychological control is related to more internalizing and externalizing problems, and lower academic achievement (Barber, 2002). Also, it was found to be negatively associated with friendship quality (Baumgardner & Boyatzis, 2018). Since psychological control

seems to be related to more negative child outcomes compared to behavioral control, in this study, the focus is on psychological control.

In the literature, some studies support the idea that parental psychological control has a negative effect on the prosocial behavior of children and adolescents. For example, in a longitudinal study conducted with adolescents in China, bidirectional relationships between psychological control of parents and academic achievement and prosocial behavior of adolescents were investigated. It was found that the more adolescents perceived maternal psychological control, the less they behaved prosocially in their relationships with their friends and strangers (Fu & Zhagn, 2020). As another example, in a three-year longitudinal study investigating the effect of psychological control and autonomy support on the problem and prosocial behaviors of adolescents, results showed that more psychological control of mothers directly predicted more problem behaviors and less prosocial behavior (Rueth et al., 2017). In another study conducted with married couples and their adolescent children, Yoo et al. (2013) examined whether parental behaviors (knowledge, psychological control, and socialization) and balanced connectedness of parents and adolescents are related to empathy and prosocial behaviors of the adolescents. Results revealed that the higher levels of psychological control predicted adolescents' lower levels of prosocial behavior through their lower levels of balanced connectedness of parents and adolescents. Lastly, in one study, it was aimed to investigate the association between psychological control and autonomy granting, and their relations to adolescents' psychosocial functioning of adolescents from 9th to 12th grade. Results showed that more psychological control and less autonomy support predicted higher levels of externalizing behaviors and lower levels of prosocial behavior (Silk et al., 2003). Therefore, in the present study, the predictive role of psychological control in the prosocial behaviors of children and adolescents will also be investigated.

As discussed above, parenting practices such as warmth, inductive reasoning, and psychological control are related to the prosociality of children and adolescents. On the other hand, although parenting is associated with children's prosocial development, the same parenting practices may not predict the same outcomes for all children and adolescents. The temperament of children and adolescents is a crucial determinant of the influence of the environment (Rothbart & Bates, 2006). Therefore,

the temperamental characteristics of children and adolescents were considered in the present study.

1.5 Moderating Role of Temperament

Temperament is defined as “constitutionally based individual differences in reactivity and self-regulation, in the domains of affect, activity, and attention” (Rothbart & Bates, 2006, p.100). According to the differential susceptibility hypothesis, there are variations in susceptibility of children to their environment and rearing practices of their parents (Belsky, 1997), and temperament is the most commonly used concept to investigate differential susceptibility. Children who have difficult or negative temperament are more susceptible to the negative effects of negative rearing practices and to the beneficial effects of positive rearing practices compared to children with easy temperament (Belsky, 2005). Therefore, in this study, two temperamental characteristics were used as moderators.

The first moderator was *negative emotionality*, which is one of the most frequently studied domains of temperament, and it refers “irritability, negative mood and high-intensity negative reactions” (Sanson et al., 2004, p. 143), and it was found to be related to both parenting dimensions and social skills. For instance, in one study investigating the relations between children’s temperamental traits and parenting of mothers, results showed that negative emotionality of children was related to higher psychological control and lower parental warmth (Laukkanen et al., 2014). On the other hand, in another study conducted by Eisenberg et al. (1993), it was found that negative emotionality and self-regulation of preschoolers were related to their social skills, and high negative emotionality is a risk factor for poor social skills for both girls and boys.

Recently, researchers are interested in another domain of temperament, which is *sensory processing sensitivity*, to test the differential susceptibility of children (Slagt et al., 2018). Aron and her colleagues defined sensory processing sensitivity as “ a genetically determined trait involving a deeper cognitive processing of stimuli that is driven by higher emotional reactivity” (Aron et al., 2012, p.262). Children and adolescents who have high sensory processing sensitivity are more aware of the stimuli and information in the environment, and the way they think and learn is more complex than other children and adolescents. Therefore, they are more susceptible to their

environment (Slagt et al., 2018). However, sensory processing sensitivity is generally tested on adults. There is a limited number of studies investigating the role and function of sensory processing sensitivity in childhood or adolescence, and the samples generally consisted of preschoolers. For example, in a study conducted with preschoolers, the moderating role of sensory processing sensitivity in the relationship between positive and negative parenting, and externalizing and prosocial behaviors of children was investigated. Results supported the differential susceptibility hypothesis by revealing that sensory processing sensitivity moderated the associations between changes in positive and negative parenting and changes in the externalizing behavior of children, but they did not find a moderating effect for prosocial behaviors (Slagt et al., 2018). However, in another study investigating the moderating role in the relationship between parenting styles, and problem behaviors and social competence of children aged between three and six, they found that sensory processing sensitivity had a moderating role in the association between authoritative parenting and social competence. Results supported the differential susceptibility hypothesis. In other words, children with high sensory processing sensitivity showed higher social competence when they received more authoritative parenting and showed lower social competence when they received less authoritative parenting compared to children with low sensory processing sensitivity (Lionetti et al., 2019).

In conclusion, negative emotionality and sensory processing sensitivity are two important temperamental characteristics that can be labeled as susceptibility markers (Slagt et al., 2018). Therefore, on account of the findings mentioned above, negative emotionality and sensory processing sensitivity were included in this study as moderators. To the best of our knowledge, in the Turkish literature, prosocial behavior and its association with the parenting practices and temperamental characteristics targeted in this study do not have wide coverage. Moreover, in these few studies, the target group is mostly preschool-aged children, and there is no recognized research with children from older age groups. Therefore, this study will make significant contributions to the existing literature.

1.6 Current Study

The first aim of this study was to investigate whether the level of prosocial behaviors changes from middle childhood to late adolescence. The second aim was to

examine the relationship between parental warmth, inductive reasoning, and psychological control and the prosocial behaviors of Turkish children and adolescents from 3rd grade to 11th grade. In light of the literature, it was hypothesized that;

a) higher levels of parental warmth would predict higher levels of prosocial behavior;

b) higher levels of inductive reasoning would predict higher levels of prosocial behavior;

c) higher levels of psychological control would predict lower levels of prosocial behavior of children and adolescents.

The third aim of this study was to investigate the moderating role of temperamental characteristics in the relationships between parenting practices and prosocial behavior. It was hypothesized that;

d) negative affect would have a moderating role in these associations with interactions reflecting a differential susceptibility pattern. For children who have higher levels of negative affect, parental warmth and inductive reasoning would predict higher levels of prosocial behavior, and psychological control would predict lower levels of prosocial behavior compared to children who have lower levels of negative affect.

e) sensory processing sensitivity would have a moderating role in these associations with interactions reflecting a differential susceptibility pattern. For children who have higher levels of sensory processing sensitivity, parental warmth and inductive reasoning would predict higher levels of prosocial behavior, and psychological control would predict lower levels of prosocial behavior compared to children who have higher levels of sensory processing sensitivity.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

478 children and adolescents attending formal education ranging from 3rd grade to 11th grade and their mothers participated in the study. Data were collected from a total of 28 schools (8 elementary, 11 middle, and 9 high schools) in 18 different cities in Turkey (For detailed information about the sample, see Table 2.1).

This study was planned to be conducted as part of a nation-wide project funded by TUBITAK titled as “The Effects of Parenting Attitudes and Parent Child Interaction on Child and Adolescent Developmental Outcomes”, and data of the present thesis was going to be gathered from the Time 1 assessment of this project. The sample of the greater project was determined by Turkish Statistical Institute as nationally representative, and the target sample size was 6600. However, because of the Covid-19 pandemic precautions, data collection has been terminated. That is why the present study was conducted by using the data already collected.

The total sample of 478 children and adolescents was aged from 7 to 18 ($M_{age}= 11.54$, $SD= 2.56$), and 279 of them were girls (58.37%), while 199 of them were boys (41.63%). Age of the mothers ranged from 26 to 55 ($M_{age}= 38.23$, $SD= 5.46$). The mean scores, standard deviations, and percentages of maternal education, and perceived socioeconomic status were provided in the Table 2.2.

Table 2.1*Demographics of Children and Adolescents in Terms of City, School Level, and Gender*

City	Primary School	Elementary School	High School	Gender	
				Male	Female
Amasya			46	8	38
Ankara			4	3	1
Antalya	19			9	10
Burdur	10			2	8
Çorum	17			11	6
Eskişehir		30		4	26
Isparta	20			7	13
İstanbul		9		2	7
İzmir	39	19	16	29	45
Karaman			14	7	7
Kastamonu		39		14	25
Kayseri		27	21	28	20
Kırklareli	7	1		5	3
Kırşehir		14	10	10	14
Konya	12	39		26	25
Manisa		7		4	3
Trabzon			10	8	2
Yozgat	15	33		22	26
Total	139	218	121	199	279

Table 2.2*Demographic Information of Mothers in Terms of Perceived SES and Education Level*

	N	%	M	SD
Perceived SES	478		4.27	1.12
1 (Lowest)	54	11.3		
2	51	10.7		
3	64	13.4		
4	57	11.9		
5	149	31.2		
6	45	9.4		
7	32	6.7		
8	14	2.9		
9	4	0.8		
10 (Highest)	8	1.7		
Education Level	478		3.97	2.02
Illiterate	7	1.5		
Literate (no education)	6	1.3		
Elementary School	197	41.2		
Middle School	98	20.5		
High School	128	26.8		
University	38	7.9		
Master	4	0.8		

2.2 Measurements

2.2.1 Demographic Information Form

Since this study is a part of a very comprehensive project, detailed demographic information forms were given to the children, adolescents, and the mothers separately. Questions were about age, marital status, employment status, income and education levels of parents, number of siblings and family members, etc.

2.2.2 Parental Warmth

Parental warmth was measured by using the “warmth/affection” subscale of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). This scale was adapted to Turkish culture by Varan (2003), and its internal consistency coefficients were found as ranging between 0.86 and 0.96. The subscale used in the current study consists of eight items, and it ranged in 1= “never” to 4= “always” Likert type scale. This scale was filled by children and adolescents to assess both maternal and paternal warmth. In the reliability analyses, Cronbach’s alpha values were .85 for mothers, and .88 for fathers.

2.2.3 Inductive Reasoning

Parental use of inductive reasoning was measured by using the “inductive reasoning” subscale of the Child-Rearing Questionnaire (Paterson & Sanson, 1999). The Turkish adaptation study was conducted by Yağmurlu and Sanson (2009), and the internal consistency coefficient of the subscale was found as .76. This subscale consists of six items, and it ranged in 1= “never” to 4= “always” Likert type scale. It was filled in by children and adolescents to assess both maternal and paternal inductive reasoning, and Cronbach’s alpha values were found as .86 for mothers and .92 for fathers.

2.2.4 Psychological Control

Psychological control of parents was assessed by using Psychological Control Scale – Youth Self Report (Barber, 1996). This scale consists of 8 items, and it ranged

in 1= “never” to 4= “always” Likert type scale. Its internal consistency coefficient was found as .77 in the Turkish adaptation study conducted by Sayıl and Kındap (2010). For the current study, this scale was filled in by children and adolescents to assess maternal and paternal psychological control, and its reliability was .80 for mothers and .85 for fathers.

2.2.5 Negative Affect

To assess the negative emotionality of children and adolescents, the negative affect subscale of Turkish adaptation of the Early Adolescent Temperament Questionnaire Parent-Report (EATQ-R; Ellis & Rothbart, 2001) was used. Adaptation of this scale was conducted by Demirpençe and Putham (2019), and the internal consistency of its factors was found as ranging from .65 to .74. The subscale was filled in by mothers, and it has 18 items with a 5-point Likert type scale ranging in 0= “never” to 4= “always”. In the reliability analysis conducted for this study, internal consistency was found as .90; and one item was excluded from the study since its corrected item-total correlation was lower than 1 (“Aksilikler üst üste geldiğinde bile, çocuğum üzülmez.”).

2.2.6 Sensory Processing Sensitivity

To assess the sensory processing sensitivity of children and adolescents, the Highly Sensitive Child Scale (Aron, 2002) was adapted to Turkish by the project team. After conducting a pilot study, it was determined that there was no problem in this scale, and the parent form of the 23-item Highly Sensitive Child Scale was decided to be used in the project. This scale was filled in by mothers by using a 5-point Likert-type rating (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). In the reliability analysis, Cronbach’s alpha was found as .79.

2.2.7 Prosocial Behavior

Prosocial behaviors of children and adolescents were measured by using the altruistic prosocial behavior subscale of the Prosocial and Aggressive Behaviors Questionnaire (Boxer et al., 2004). This subscale has five items, and its Cronbach’s

alpha coefficient was found as .75 in the Turkish adaptation study (Bayraktar et al., 2010). This scale is originally self-report of the adolescents, but items used in this study were transformed to the mother-report. Moreover, two other items related to comforting were added from the Prosocial Behavior Scale (Iannotti, 1985), which was adapted to Turkish culture by Yağmurlu et al. (2005). This scale ranged in 1= “never” to 4= “always” Likert type scale, and its reliability for the current study was found as .85.

2.3 Procedure

The present study was conducted as part of a project titled “The Effects of Parenting Attitudes and Parent-Child Interaction on Child and Adolescent Developmental Outcomes” funded by TUBITAK. Ethical approval was taken from the Human Subjects Ethics Committee of Middle East Technical University (See Appendix A), and official approval was taken from the Ministry of Education. The schools were determined randomly by Turkish Statistical Institute (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu; TÜİK) to have a nationally representative sample of Turkey. After that, one class from each grade was selected randomly from each school, and informed consent forms were sent to mothers of all children in the selected class. Mothers who agreed to participate in the study were invited to schools to collect data via tablet computers. The questionnaire was sent by using a Qualtrics link to mothers who agreed to attend but stated that they could not come to the school. Then, data were collected from the children of the mothers who participated. After the data collection, gifts were given to mothers and children for their participation.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Data Screening

IBM SPSS Statistics 26 was used to analyze the data of the study. Data were screened before starting the analysis. Since in the measurements of the current study data were collected both from mothers and children, mismatched mother and child data were deleted from the data set. In addition, children attending 1st and 2nd grade were deleted from the data set because the psychological control scale used in this project is suitable for 3rd grade and above. Lastly, as the parenting practices of both parents were examined in the study, the data of 17 children who did not fill in the scales for their father was also deleted. Since the participants could not leave any item empty while filling in the questionnaire via tablet computers, there were not any missing values in the data.

After checking for missing values and generating mean values for the scales, univariate and multivariate outliers, normality and multicollinearity assumptions were checked. To check for univariate outliers, z-scores were generated for all variables. Outliers with a z-score higher than 3.3 were transformed by changing the raw score of the outliers to one unite larger or smaller than the next most extreme score in the same variable as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). To check for the multivariate outliers, standardized residuals were generated, and one case with a standardized residual higher than 3 was deleted from the dataset as recommended by Blatná (2006). Then, the data were screened for normality and multicollinearity. All skewness and kurtosis values were in an acceptable range. Moreover, collinearity statistics showed that multicollinearity was not present between the variables.

3.2 Descriptive Analysis

Standard deviations, means, minimum and maximum values for temperamental characteristics (negative affect and sensory processing sensitivity), maternal and paternal parenting practices (parental warmth, inductive reasoning and psychological control, and prosocial behavior) can be seen in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1
Descriptive Statistics for Study Measures (N= 478)

	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Temperament				
Negative Affect	0	4.60	1.66	0.89
Sensory Processing Sensitivity	1.55	5.00	3.49	0.62
Parenting Practices				
Maternal Warmth	1.12	4.00	3.24	0.64
Paternal Warmth	1.00	4.00	3.09	0.74
Maternal Inductive Reasoning	1.00	4.00	2.96	0.76
Paternal Inductive Reasoning	1.00	4.00	2.88	0.88
Maternal Psychological Control	1.00	3.40	1.57	0.46
Paternal Psychological Control	1.00	3.60	1.52	.50
Prosocial Behavior				
	1.00	4.00	2.91	0.59

3.3 Correlation Analyses

To investigate the relationship between variables, Pearson's bivariate correlations between variables were carried out. Results revealed that prosocial behavior was correlated with temperamental characteristics. It was negatively correlated with negative affect ($r = -.10, p < .05$), and positively correlated with sensory processing sensitivity ($r = .21, p < .01$). Prosocial behavior was also correlated with most of the parenting variables. It was positively correlated with maternal warmth ($r = .14, p < .01$), paternal warmth ($r = .15, p < .01$), maternal inductive reasoning ($r = .12, p < .05$), and paternal inductive reasoning ($r = .13, p < .05$; See Table 3.2).

Table 3.2
Correlations between Variables (N= 478)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.Negative Affect	1										
2.Sensory Processing Sensitivity	.17**	1									
3.Maternal Warmth	-.04	.14**	1								
4.Paternal Warmth	-.07	.10*	.60**	1							
5.Maternal Inductive Reasoning	.03	.07	.61**	.47**	1						
6.Paternal Inductive Reasoning	-.03	.09	.46**	.67**	.63**	1					
7.Maternal Psychological Control	.10*	-.07	-.35**	-.22**	-.09	-.05	1				
8.Paternal Psychological Control	.14**	.01	-.29**	-.31**	-.05	-.07	.60**	1			
9.Prosocial Behavior	-.10*	.21**	.14**	.15**	.12*	.13**	-.09	-.07	1		
10.Grade	.15**	.06	-.11*	-.15**	.04	-.04	.10*	.11*	-.01	1	
11.Gender	.02	.13**	.02	.05	.03	-.02	-.17**	-.14**	.09	.11*	1

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

3.4. One-Way ANOVA for Age Differences in Prosocial Behavior

To investigate whether the level of prosocial behaviors changes from middle childhood to late adolescence, a one-way between-subjects ANOVA was performed. Results showed that there was not a significant difference between grades in terms of prosocial behavior ($F(8, 469) = 0.79, p = .61$; See Table 3.3)

Table 3.3
Means and Standard Deviations of Grades in Terms of Prosocial Behavior

Grade	N	Mean	SD
3	77	2.89	0.61
4	62	2.96	0.57
5	60	2.82	0.58
6	52	2.95	0.59
7	48	3.06	0.56
8	58	2.91	0.52
9	46	2.92	0.61
10	35	2.90	0.58
11	40	2.83	0.66
Total	478	2.91	0.59

3.5 Hierarchical Regression Analyses

To investigate the relationship between parenting practices (parental warmth, inductive reasoning, and psychological control) and prosocial behavior as well as the moderating role of negative affect and sensory processing sensitivity in these relationships, two hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. These two models differed at the last step, so only the last step of the second model will be reported. In the first step, children and adolescents' age and gender were entered to control these variables. Additionally, maternal education and perceived SES were also controlled, but since they were not significant they are not reported. In the second step temperamental characteristics were entered. Parenting practices (maternal and paternal warmth, inductive reasoning, and psychological control) were included in the third step. In the fourth step, interaction terms were included. Before conducting the

analyses, temperamental characteristics and parenting styles were centered to calculate interaction terms.

The first step of the analysis showed that age and gender did not account for significant amount of variation in prosocial behavior, $R^2 = .09$ (adjusted $R^2 = .01$), $F(2, 475) = 1.91$, $p = .15$. In this step, gender was marginally significant ($\beta = .09$, $p = .06$). In the second step, temperament variables significantly contributed to the amount of explained variation, $R^2 = .07$ (adjusted $R^2 = .06$), $\Delta R^2 = .06$, $F_{change}(2, 473) = 15.45$, $p < .01$. Both negative affect ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .01$) and sensory processing sensitivity ($\beta = .23$, $p < .01$) had a unique effect on prosocial behavior. In the third step, maternal and paternal parenting practices were entered, but these variables did not significantly contribute to the amount of variance explained $R^2 = .09$ (adjusted $R^2 = .07$), $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F_{change}(6, 467) = 1.50$, $p = .17$. Negative affect ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .01$) and sensory processing sensitivity ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$) were still significant.

Lastly, in the fourth step, since moderating role of negative affect was investigated in the first analysis, interaction terms between negative affect and parenting practices were entered, but they did not significantly contribute to the explained variance $R^2 = .09$ (adjusted $R^2 = .06$), $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F_{change}(6, 461) = 0.49$, $p = .81$. Negative affect ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .01$) and sensory processing sensitivity ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$) were still significant. In the second analysis, moderating role of sensory processing sensitivity was investigated. Therefore, interaction terms between sensory processing sensitivity and parenting practices were entered in the fourth step, but they also did not significantly contribute to the explained variance $R^2 = .09$ (adjusted $R^2 = .06$), $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F_{change}(6, 461) = 0.40$, $p = .87$. Negative affect ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .01$) and sensory processing sensitivity ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$) were still significant (See Table 3.4).

Table 3.4
Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predicting Prosocial Behavior

Predictor		R	R ²	ΔR ²	F	F _{change}	B	SE	β
	Step 1	.09	.01	.01	1.91	1.91			
Age							-.01	.01	-.02
Gender							.11	.06	.09 ^a
	Step 2	.26	.07	.06	8.74 ^{***}	15.45 ^{***}			
Age							-.00	.01	-.01
Gender							.07	.05	.06
NA							-.09	.03	-.14 ^{**}
SPS							.21	.04	.23 ^{***}

Table 3.4 (continued)

Predictor	R	R ²	ΔR ²	F	F _{change}	B	SE	β
Step 3	.29	.09	.02	4.42***	1.50			
Age						.00	.01	.00
Gender						.07	.06	.06
NA						-.09	.03	-.14**
SPS						.20	.04	.21***
MW						.03	.06	.03
PW						.03	.05	.04
MIR						.02	.05	.04
PIR						.03	.05	.05
MPC						-.03	.07	-.03
PPC						.00	.07	.00
Negative Affect as Moderator								
Step 4	.30	.09	.01	2.93***	.49			
Age						.00	.01	.00
Gender						.07	.06	.06
NA						-.09	.03	-.13**
SPS						.20	.04	.21***
MW						.02	.06	.02
PW						.04	.06	.05
MIR						.03	.05	.04
PIR						.03	.05	.04
MPC						-.03	.07	-.03
PPC						.00	.07	.00
NA*MW						.06	.07	.06
NA*PW						-.01	.07	-.01
NA*MIR						.01	.06	.01
NA*PIR						.00	.07	-.01
NA*MPC						.01	.06	.01
NA*PPC						.02	.07	.03
Sensory Processing Sensitivity as Moderator								
Step 4	.30	.09	.01	2.89	.40			
Age						.00	.01	.00
Gender						.07	.06	.06
NA						-.09	.03	-.13**
SPS						.20	.04	.21***
MW						.04	.06	.04
PW						.03	.06	.04
MIR						.02	.05	.03
PIR						.03	.05	.04
MPC						-.03	.07	-.03
PPC						.00	.07	.00
SPS*MW						.08	.11	.06
SPS*PW						.04	.09	.03
SPS*MIR						.00	.09	.00
SPS*PIR						-.07	.08	-.06
SPS*MPC						-.06	.11	-.03
SPS*PPC						.06	.11	.03

Notes. Negative Affect; NA, Sensory Processing Sensitivity; SPS, Maternal Warmth; MW, Paternal Warmth; PW, Maternal Inductive Reasoning; MIR, Paternal Inductive Reasoning; PIR, Maternal Psychological Control; MPC, Paternal Psychological Control; PPC.

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, ^amarginally significant.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview

The present study aimed to investigate the level of prosocial behaviors changes from middle childhood to late adolescence; to investigate the relationship between parental warmth, inductive reasoning, psychological control, and the prosocial behaviors of Turkish children and adolescents from 3rd grade to 11th grade; and to investigate the moderating role of temperamental characteristics in these relationships. It was hypothesized that higher levels of parental warmth and inductive reasoning would predict higher levels of prosocial behavior, while higher levels of psychological control would predict lower levels of prosocial behavior of children and adolescents. Moreover, it was hypothesized that negative affect and sensory processing sensitivity would have a moderating role in these associations. Results revealed that parenting practices did not significantly predict the prosocial behaviors of children and adolescents. Moreover, although temperamental characteristics did not have a moderating role in the relationship between parenting practices and parental behavior, they significantly predicted prosocial behaviors. Results suggested that higher negative affect was related to lower levels of prosocial behavior, while higher sensory processing sensitivity was related to higher levels of prosocial behavior.

4.2 Age Differences in the Level of Prosocial Behavior

The first aim of this study was to investigate the age differences in the level of prosocial behavior from middle childhood (3rd grade) to adolescence (11th grade). In the literature, there are a limited number of studies investigating the age differences in the level of prosocial behavior, but studies generally showed that prosocial behavior increase from childhood to adolescence (Fabes & Eisenberg, 1996; Jacobs et al.,

2004). During adolescence, however, there are some contradictory results revealing stability or fluctuations in the level of prosocial behaviors (Padilla-Walker et al., 2017; Van der Graaff et al., 2017). Based on the literature, in the current study, age differences were examined. However, results showed that the level of prosocial behavior did not differ across different ages of children and adolescents. This result could be due to the measurement used in the study. In the literature, prosocial behavior is generally measured by using self-report, teacher-report, peer nomination, or observational measures. Since, in the present study, the measure was mother-report, mothers may not have been able to observe their children in their social environment with their friends. That is why the further investigation of age differences would contribute to the literature.

4.3 Parenting Practices and Prosocial Behavior

The second aim of this study was to investigate the associations between parenting practices (parental warmth, inductive reasoning, and psychological control) and prosocial behavior. Parental warmth can be defined as “the presence of positive affect, responsiveness and support in parent-child relationships” (Carlo et al., 2010, p. 116), and it is known from the relevant literature that it is a predictor of prosocial behavior of children and adolescents (Carlo et al., 2010; Padilla-Walker et al., 2016; Ruiz-Ortiz et al., 2017). In light of these findings, it was hypothesized that higher levels of parental warmth would predict higher levels of prosocial behavior. However, although the correlations between warmth of mothers and fathers, and prosocial behavior were significant, hierarchical regression results did not reveal a significant relationship between maternal or paternal warmth and prosocial behavior.

By looking at the studies with significant results mentioned above, it can be seen that there are some differences from the present study in terms of sample and measurement. In those studies, the socio-economic status of the participants was middle or high, and the proportions of participants with low SES were very small. Moreover, the measurement of prosocial behavior was either self-report or observational. However, in the present study, the highest proportion of the sample had low SES, and the prosocial behavior measure was mother-report. These differences may be the cause of non-significant results in the study.

When the literature is searched in detail, it can be seen that some studies have similar non-significant results. For example, in one study comparing Australian and Turkish children, results revealed a significant relationship between parental warmth and prosocial behavior for Australian participants but not for Turkish participants (Yağmurlu & Sanson, 2009). In another study, results showed that parental warmth of mothers and fathers significantly predicted prosocial behavior toward some targets but not others. For example, maternal warmth predicted prosocial behaviors of children in their relationships with family, while paternal warmth predicted prosocial behaviors of children in their relationships with friends. However, they did not find a significant relationship for prosocial behaviors toward strangers (Padilla-Walker et al., 2016). In the current study, targets were not differentiated, and the items were asking about prosocial behaviors toward “other people”. The expression of “other people” is ambiguous, and it includes strangers as well as friends and family. Therefore, this may have an effect on the non-significant results. Moreover, some studies found longitudinal associations between parental warmth and prosocial behavior (Gülseven et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2016). However, in the current study, only the concurrent associations were examined.

Parental inductive reasoning can be defined as explaining children the consequences of their behaviors and having conversations with them about how to behave (Brajsa-Zganec & Hanzec, 2014). It is known that parental use of inductive reasoning helps children to understand the reasons behind the rules and needs of others, and this promotes their development of empathy and prosocial behaviors (Hoffman, 2000; Hasting et al., 2007). In the literature, some studies found significant positive associations between inductive reasoning and prosocial behavior (e.g., Saltalı & Imir, 2018). In light of these findings, it was hypothesized that higher levels of inductive reasoning would predict higher levels of prosocial behavior. However, although the correlation between maternal and paternal inductive reasoning and prosocial behavior was significant, hierarchical regression results did not reveal a significant association between maternal or paternal inductive reasoning and prosocial behavior.

In the literature, there are also some studies that did not find a significant relationship between these variables. For example, in the study conducted by Yağmurlu and Sanson (2009), they found that maternal inductive reasoning did not

predict the prosocial behavior of both Australian and Turkish children. Moreover, in another study investigating whether cooperative parenting moderates the association between inductive reasoning and prosocial behavior, they found that cooperative parenting has a moderating role, but they did not find a significant direct relationship between inductive reasoning and prosocial behavior (Scrimgeour et al., 2013). According to Scrimgeour and her colleagues, since inductions can vary in their content, the non-significant association may be caused by using a measurement for inductions in general. The same argument is also valid for the present study. The association between inductive reasoning and prosocial behavior could be non-significant since the measurement used in this study is not specifically measuring inductions to promote prosocial behavior.

Parental psychological control can be defined as influencing emotional states of children by using guilt induction, parental intrusiveness, and withdrawal of love, and manipulating and being insensitive to their emotional needs (Barber, 1996), and it is known that it is related to negative child outcomes such as internalizing and externalizing problems, lower academic achievement, lower friendship quality (Barber, 2002; Baumgardner & Boyatzis, 2018). Moreover, there are several studies revealing a significant negative association between parental psychological control and the prosocial behavior of children and adolescence (Rueth et al., 2017; Silk et al., 2003). In the light of the relevant literature, it was hypothesized that higher levels of psychological control would predict lower levels of prosocial behavior of children and adolescents. However, results did not reveal a significant relationship between maternal or paternal psychological control and prosocial behavior.

Similar to other parenting variables, there are also some studies reporting non-significant relation between psychological control and prosocial behavior. For example, in one study conducted by Yoo et al. (2013), results revealed that parent-child balanced connectedness was mediated the relationship between psychological control and prosocial behavior, but there was not a significant direct relationship between these variables. According to Yoo and her colleagues, this may suggest that psychological control of their parents may not be determinant of children's behaviors in other social interactions unless there is another construct mediating this relationship. Moreover, some studies found longitudinal associations between psychological

control and prosocial behavior (e.g., Rueth et al., 2016). However, in the current study, only concurrent associations were examined.

In general, the results of the current study did not reveal any significant relationship between parenting practices and prosocial behavior. There are some limitations that could be the reasons behind these non-significant results, which are presented in 4.6. However, these results may also be related to culture. According to Yağmurlu and Sanson (2009), social norms in Turkey may encourage the prosocial behaviors of Turkish children and adolescents instead of parenting. Since family ties and taking care of family members is valued in Turkish culture (Laible et al., 2017), children are raised as kind and respectful toward especially their older family members and are given responsibilities such as taking care of their younger siblings and appropriate household chores. According to Eisenberg and Mussen (1989), responsibilities given to the children at an early age promote children's prosocial tendencies. Moreover, being kind and prosocial toward the family members may lead to prosocial behaviors toward other people. Therefore, parenting may be less effective in their prosocial development compared to other cultures.

4.4 Temperamental Characteristics and Prosocial Behavior

The third aim of the present study was to examine the moderating role of negative affect and sensory processing sensitivity in the associations between parenting practices and the prosocial behavior of children and adolescents. Negative affect refers to “irritability, negative mood and high-intensity negative reactions” (Sanson et al., 2004, p. 143), and sensory processing sensitivity can be defined as “a genetically determined trait involving a deeper cognitive processing of stimuli that is driven by higher emotional reactivity” (Aron et al., 2012, p.262). In the literature, these temperamental characteristics were labeled as susceptibility markers (Slagt et al., 2018). Based on the differential susceptibility theory, it was hypothesized that both negative affect and sensory processing sensitivity would be moderators. However, results showed that their moderating role was not significant.

Although temperamental characteristics were not found as moderators in this study, their main effects were significant. Moreover, their significance did not disappear or weaken when other predictors (parenting practices and interaction terms) were entered to the model. This result can be considered as the most important finding

of this study since it draws attention to the importance of child temperament in the social development of children. Investigating the link between temperament and prosocial behavior helps us to understand how behaviors of children are coordinated by the underlying biological processes (Hasting et al., 2006). In the literature, the effect of temperamental characteristics on social development is explored by using different models, such as unidirectional and indirect models (Sanson et al., 2004). Although, in the present study, a moderation model was tested to understand the role of temperament in prosocial development, results confirmed the unidirectional model in which temperamental characteristics are directly related to social development.

This direct relationship between temperament and prosocial behavior of children and adolescents in Turkey is an important contribution of this study to the Turkish literature, and it is known from the literature that some temperamental characteristics are related to some aspects of social-emotional development (Sanson et al., 2004). Literature shows that high negative affectivity is a risk factor for poor social skills (Eisenberg et al., 1993). Therefore, the significant negative association between negative affect and prosocial behavior found in this study was not surprising. On the other hand, although sensory processing sensitivity was found to be moderating the relationship between parenting and prosocial behavior of social competence of children (Lionetti et al., 2019; Slagt et al., 2018), to the best of our knowledge, there are not any findings related to direct the main effect of sensory processing sensitivity in social-emotional development or prosocial behavior of children and adolescents. However, the significant positive association between sensory processing sensitivity and prosocial behavior was also not surprising. Since children with high sensory processing sensitivity are more aware of the stimuli and information in the environment, they may be more aware of the emotions and emotional signals of others, and this may lead higher empathy and prosocial behaviors. Since, there is a limited number of studies on sensory processing sensitivity, the findings of the present study have an important contribution to the relevant literature.

Although the results suggest that only the temperamental characteristics are predictors of prosocial development, the importance of parenting practices should not be ignored based solely on the findings of this study. Besides, although parenting practices were not significant in the hierarchical regression analysis, both parental warmth and inductive reasoning of mothers and fathers were found as positively

correlated with the prosocial behavior of children and adolescents. This situation could be explained statistically. A predictor with a significant bivariate correlation may turn out non-significant in a multiple linear regression analysis since other predictors might screen-off the effect of this predictor. Therefore, in future studies, the relationship between parenting practices and prosocial behavior should be further investigated.

4.5 Strength and Contributions of This Study

This study has significant contributions to the literature. First of all, in Turkish literature, there is a limited number of studies investigating the association between parenting and prosocial behavior, and these studies are mostly conducted with preschool children. To our knowledge, this is the first study examining these relationships over children and adolescents with such a wide age range.

Another contribution of this study is that a high proportion of mothers' education level was primary school (41.2%). This means a high proportion of the sample had low SES. It is a strength of this study since most of the studies in the literature had middle to high SES participants because of the convenience of this SES group. Since the main project was planned to be nationally representative, it was easier to reach out and collect data from the low SES families.

Lastly, using sensory processing sensitivity as a variable is another strength of this study. Sensory processing sensitivity is a comparatively new concept, and it is mainly used in adult studies. Also, to the best of our knowledge, sensory processing sensitivity has not been used with children and adolescents in Turkish literature. Therefore, the present study has important contributions to Turkish literature for finding this variable related to the prosocial behavior of children and adolescents in Turkey.

4.6 Limitations of the Study

Although the current study is important for being one of the few studies focusing on parent practices and prosocial behavior of school-age children and adolescents in Turkey, it has its own limitations, and these limitations can be responsible for non-significant results. To start with, the target sample size could not be reached because of the Covid-19 pandemic. Since this study had a great number of predictors and interaction terms, the sample size was not sufficient, and the power of

the analyses was poor. Moreover, there are some limitations of prosocial behavior scale. Firstly, the prosocial behavior scale used in this study was mother-report, not self-report. While evaluating their children, mothers may have rated their children's prosocial behavior higher than they actually are for social desirability concerns. Besides that, mothers often do not have the opportunity to observe their children in their school, where they spend the most time with their friends. Therefore, their evaluations may not reflect the real levels of prosocial behaviors of children and adolescents.

Moreover, the prosocial behavior scale has only seven items, and these items are very general (e.g., "Çocuğum kendiliğinden başkalarına yardım eder."). That is why mothers' evaluations are very general and shallow. The items could have been more specific. For example, in a mother-report prosocial behavior scale (Iannotti,1985), there are 13 items, and these items are more specific ("Helps another child do something that the other child cannot do or which requires additional help"). If there would be more items, and these items would be more specific, the prosocial behavior scores of children and adolescents could be more varied, and the parenting practices could be more predictive. Lastly, scores of the scale were calculated as a composite score of different factors of prosocial behavior. In the literature, there are some studies revealing significant results for specific types of prosocial behavior, such as helping or sharing (Laible et al., 2017; Yağmurlu & Sanson, 2009). Therefore, the prosocial behaviors of children and adolescents could be analyzed by calculating each factor separately.

Another limitation of this study is related to the generalizability of findings because the majority of our sample consisted of low SES mothers. In the literature, it is suggested that maternal education level is one of the important predictors of parenting styles (Durgel et al., 2012). To have higher generalizability, the sample should have included higher numbers of middle and high SES mothers.

As another limitation is that the current study was not a longitudinal study. Since the concurrent relationships were examined in this study, causal relationships between parenting practices and prosocial behavior could not be interpreted.

4.7 Implications of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research

As mentioned above, this study highlights the importance of temperament in children's social-emotional development. Both negative affect and sensory processing sensitivity were found to be related to the prosocial behavior of children and adolescents. Besides, since sensory processing sensitivity is a variable that has just started to take place in the literature, the finding that it is effective in social-emotional development is an important contribution of the current study to the literature. Therefore, for future research, it is important to replicate these findings by considering these variables.

This study, as mentioned before, did not have a representative sample, and it investigated the concurrent relationships between variables. That is why, for future research, the associations investigated in this study should be examined longitudinally in a nationally representative sample of Turkey. Moreover, future studies should measure prosocial behavior with self-report and more items. Also, these items should be more specific, and sub-factors (helping, sharing, etc.) and different targets (friends, family, etc.) of prosocial behavior can be investigated.

4.8 Conclusion

In conclusion, the present study aimed to examine the relationship between parenting practices and prosocial behavior children and adolescents in Turkey by the moderating role of temperament. Results revealed significant main effects only for temperamental characteristics. Further studies should examine these relationships between different samples to have a better understanding of the link between parental practices and prosocial behavior in Turkey.

REFERENCES

- Aron, E. N. (2002). *The highly sensitive child: Helping our children thrive when the World overwhelms them* (1. ed., p. 352). New York: Harmony.
- Aron, E. N., Aron, A., & Jagiellowicz, J. (2012). Sensory processing sensitivity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(3), 262–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311434213>
- Asbury, K., Dunn, J. F., Pike, A., & Plomin, R. (2003). Non-shared environmental influences on individual differences in early behavioral development: A monozygotic twin differences study. *Child Development*, 74(3), 933–943.
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, 67(6), 3296–3319.
- Barber, B. K. (2002). *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Barnett, M.A. (1987). Empathy and related responses in children. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 146–162). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baumgardner, M., & Boyatzis, C. J. (2017). The role of parental psychological control and warmth in college students' relational aggression and friendship quality. *Emerging Adulthood*, 6(1), 72–76. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2167696817712809>
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4(1, Pt.2), 1-103. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372>
- Bayraktar, F., Kindap, Y., Kumru, A. ve Sayıl, M. (2010). Olumlu Sosyal ve Saldırgan Davranışlar Ölçeği'nin ergen örnekleminde psikometrik açıdan incelenmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 13(26), 1-13.

- Bean, R. A., Barber, B. K., & Crane, D. R. (2006). Parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control among African American youth. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(10), 1335–1355. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x06289649>
- Beckes, L., & Simpson, J. A. (2012). Evolutionary perspectives on caring and prosocial behavior in relationships. In O. Gillath, G. Adams, & A. Kunkel (Eds.), *Decade of Behavior 2000–2010. Relationship Science: Integrating Evolutionary, Neuroscience, and Sociocultural Approaches* (p. 27–47). American Psychological Association. <http://doi.org/10.1037/13489-002>
- Belsky, J. (1997). Variation in susceptibility to environmental influence: An evolutionary argument. *Psychological Inquiry*, 8(3), 182-186. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0803_3
- Belsky, J. (2005). Differential susceptibility to rearing influences: An evolutionary hypothesis and some evidence. In B. Ellis & D. Bjorklund (Eds.), *Origins of the social mind: Evolutionary psychology and child development* (pp. 139–163). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Blatná, D. (2006). Outliers in regression. *Trutnov*, 30, 1-6. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228755285_Outliers_in_Regression
- Bornstein, M. H. (1991). Approaches to parenting in culture. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Cultural approaches to parenting* (pp. 3-19). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Boxer, P., Tisak, M. S., & Goldstein, S. E. (2004). Is it bad to be good? An exploration of aggressive and prosocial behavior subtypes in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33(2), 91-100. <http://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOYO.0000013421.02015.ef>
- Brajša-Žganec, A., & Hanzec, I. (2012). Social development of preschool children in Croatia: Contributions of child temperament, maternal life satisfaction and rearing practices. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23, 105–117. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9696-8>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge - Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.

- Brownell, C. A. (2013). Early development of prosocial behavior: Current perspectives. *Infancy*, 18(1), 1–9. <http://doi.org/10.1111/infa.12004>
- Carlo, G., Knight, G. P., McGinley, M., & Hayes, R. (2011). The roles of parental inductions, moral emotions, and moral cognitions in prosocial tendencies among Mexican American and European American early adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 31(6), 757-781. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0272431610373100>
- Carlo, G., Mestre, M. V., Samper, P., Tur, A., & Armenta, B. E. (2010). The longitudinal relations among dimensions of parenting styles, sympathy, prosocial moral reasoning, and prosocial behaviors. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35(2), 116-124. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0165025410375921>
- Carlo, G., White, R. M., Streit, C., Knight, G. P., & Zeiders, K. H. (2018). Longitudinal relations among parenting styles, prosocial behaviors, and academic outcomes in U.S. Mexican adolescents. *Child Development*, 89(2), 577-592. <http://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12761>
- Carr, L., Iacoboni, M., Dubeau, M.-C., Mazziotta, J. C., & Lenzi, G. L. (2003). Neural mechanisms of empathy in humans: A relay from neural systems for imitation to limbic areas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(9), 5497–5502. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0935845100>
- Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D. (2000). Parental warmth, control, and indulgence and their relations to adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14(3), 401–419. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.14.3.401>
- Davis, M. H., Luce, C., & Kraus, S. J. (1994). The heritability of characteristics associated with dispositional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, 62(3), 369–391.
- Deater-Deckard, K., Dunn, J., Oconnor, T. G., Davies, L., & Golding, J. (2003). Using the stepfamily genetic design to examine gene-environment processes in child and family functioning. *Marriage & Family Review*, 33(2-3), 131-155. http://doi.org/10.1300/j002v33n02_02
- Deater-Deckard, K., Pike, A., Petrill, S. A., Cutting, A. L., Hughes, C., & O'Connor, T. G. (2001). Non-shared environmental processes in social-emotional development: An observational study of identical twin differences in the preschool period. *Developmental Science*, 4(2). <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7687.00157>

- Demirpence, D., & Putnam, S. (2019). Reliability and validity of the self-report version of the Early Adolescent Temperament Questionnaire-Revised (EATQ-R) Short Form in a Turkish sample. *PsyCh Journal*, 9(1), 67–76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.314>
- Denham, S. A. (1986). Social cognition, prosocial behavior, and emotion in preschoolers: Contextual validation. *Child Development*, 57(1), 194–201.
- Dunn, J. (1988). *The beginnings of social understanding*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Durgel, E. S., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Yagmurlu, B. (2012). Self-reported maternal expectations and child-rearing practices. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 37(1), 35–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025412456145>
- Eiden, R. D., Colder, C., Edwards, E. P., & Leonard, K. E. (2009). A longitudinal study of social competence among children of alcoholic and nonalcoholic parents: Role of parental psychopathology, parental warmth, and self-regulation. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 23(1), 36–46. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0014839>
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. (1998). Prosocial development. In W. Damon (Editor-in-Chief) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 701–778). New York: Wiley.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Bernzweig, J., Karbon, M., Poulin, R., & Hanish, L. (1993). The relations of emotionality and regulation to preschoolers' social skills and sociometric status. *Child Development*, 64(5), 1418–1438. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1131543>
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A. & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. In W. Damon, R. M. Lerner & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 646–718). New York: Wiley.
- Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. (1989). *The roots of prosocial behavior in children*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- Eisenberg, N., & Strayer, J. (1987). Critical issues in the study of empathy. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 146–162). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, L. K., & Rothbart, M. K. (2001). Revision of the Early Adolescent Temperament Questionnaire. Poster presented at the *Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development*. Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Etxebarria, I., Ortiz, M., Apodaca, P., Pascual, A., & Conejero, S. (2015). Pride as moral motive: Moral pride and prosocial behaviour / El orgullo como motivación moral: Orgullo moral y conducta prosocial. *Infancia Y Aprendizaje*, 38(4), 746-774. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02103702.2015.1076267>
- Fabes, R. A., & Eisenberg, N. (1996). *Age and gender differences in prosocial behavior: A meta-analytic examination*. (Unpublished manuscript), Arizona State University.
- Fonseca, B. R., Cavalcante, L. I. C., Kärtner, J., & Köster, M. (2018). Maternal socialization goals and the spontaneous prosocial behavior of children in rural contexts. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 31(1). <http://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-018-0108-x>
- Fu, X., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Bidirectional relation between paternal/maternal psychological control and adolescent behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 29, 1402–1412. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01615-1>
- Gryczkowski, M., Jordan, S. S., & Mercer, S. H. (2018). Moderators of the relations between mothers' and fathers' parenting practices and children's prosocial behavior. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 49, 409-419. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-017-0759-3>
- Gülseven, Z., Carlo, G., Streit, C., Kumru, A., Selçuk, B., & Sayıl, M. (2017). Longitudinal relations among parenting daily hassles, child-rearing, and prosocial and aggressive behaviors in Turkish children. *Social Development*, 27(1), 45-57. <http://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12247>
- Hadzic, R., Magee, C. A., & Robinson, L. (2013). Parental employment and child behaviors. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 37(4), 332–339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025413477274>

- Hasting, P. D., Utendale, W. T., & Sullivan, C. (2007). The socialization of prosocial development. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hasting (Eds.). *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research* (pp. 638-664). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hastings, P. D., Zahn-Waxler, C., & McShane, K. (2006). We are, by nature, moral creatures: Biological bases of concern for others. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 483–516). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1982). Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *The development of prosocial behavior* (pp. 281–313). New York: Academic Press.
- Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Howe, N., & Ross, H. S. (1990). Socialization, perspective-taking, and the sibling relationship. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(1), 160–165.
- Iannotti, R. J. (1985). Naturalistic and structured assessments of prosocial behavior in preschool children: The influence of empathy and perspective-taking. *Developmental Psychology*, 21(1), 46-55.
- Jacobs, J. E., Vernon, M. K., & Eccles, J. S. (2004). Relations between social self-perceptions, time use, and prosocial or problem behaviors during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19(1), 45-62. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0743558403258225>
- Kiang, L., Moreno, A. J., & Robinson, J. L. (2004). Maternal perceptions about parenting predict child temperament, maternal sensitivity, and children's empathy. *Developmental Psychology*, 40(6), 1081–1092.
- Knafo, A., & Israel, S. (2010). Genetic and environmental influences on prosocial behavior. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Prosocial motives, emotions, and behavior: The better angels of our nature* (p. 149–167). American Psychological Association. <http://doi.org/10.1037/12061-008>
- Knauer, H. A., Ozer, E. J., Dow, W. H., & Fernald, L. C. (2019). Parenting quality at two developmental periods in early childhood and their association with child development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 47, 396-404. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.08.009>

- Köster, M., Schuhmacher, N., & Kärtner, J. (2015). A cultural perspective on prosocial development. *Human Ethology Bulletin*, 30(1), 71-82.
- Krevans, J., & Gibbs, J. C. (1996). Parents' use of inductive discipline: Relations to children's empathy and prosocial behavior. *Child Development*, 67(6), 32-63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131778>
- Laible, D. J., & Carlo, G. (2004). The differential relations of maternal and paternal support and control to adolescent social competence, self-worth, and sympathy. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19(6), 759–782.
- Laible, D. J., Kumru, A., Carlo, G., Streit, C., Selcuk, B., & Sayil, M. (2017). The longitudinal associations among temperament, parenting, and Turkish children's prosocial behaviors. *Child Development*, 88(4), 1057-1062. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12877>
- Laukkanen, J., Ojansuu, U., Tolvanen, A., Alatupa, S., & Aunola, K. (2014). Child's difficult temperament and mothers' parenting styles. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(2), 312-323. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-013-9747-9>
- Lee, C., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Memmott-Elison, M. K. (2016). The role of parents and peers on adolescents' prosocial behavior and substance use. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 34(7), 1053-1069. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0265407516665928>
- Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., . . . Eye, A. V. (2005). Positive Youth Development, Participation in Community Youth Development Programs, and Community Contributions of Fifth-Grade Adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25(1), 17-71. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0272431604272461>
- Lionetti, F., Aron, E. N., Aron, A., Klein, D. N., & Pluess, M. (2019). Observer-rated environmental sensitivity moderates children's response to parenting quality in early childhood. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(11), 2389–2402. <http://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000795>
- Lukas, M., Toth, I., Reber, S. O., Slattery, D. A., Veenema, A. H., & Neumann, I. D. (2011). The neuropeptide oxytocin facilitates pro-social behavior and prevents social avoidance in rats and mice. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 36(11), 2159–2168. <http://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2011.95>

- MacDonald, K. (1992). Warmth as a developmental construct: An evolutionary analysis. *Child Development*, 63(4), 753. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1131231>
- Martin, G. B., & Clark, R. D. (1982). Distress crying in neonates: Species and peer specificity. *Developmental Psychology*, 18(1), 3-9. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0012-1649.18.1.3>
- Mason, M., Mennis, J., Russell, M., Moore, M., & Brown, A. (2018). Adolescent depression and substance use: The protective role of prosocial peer behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 47(6), 1065-1074. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-018-0501-z>
- Newton, E. K., Laible, D., Carlo, G., Steele, J. S., & McGinley, M. (2014). Do sensitive parents foster kind children, or vice versa? Bidirectional influences between children's prosocial behavior and parental sensitivity. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(6), 1808-1816. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0036495>
- Nsamenang, A. B. (1992). *Human development in cultural context: A third-world perspective*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., Carlo, G., & Memmott-Elison, M. K. (2017). Longitudinal Change in Adolescents' Prosocial Behavior Toward Strangers, Friends, and Family. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 28(3), 698–710. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12362>
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., Nielson, M. G., & Day, R. D. (2016). The role of parental warmth and hostility on adolescents' prosocial behavior toward multiple targets. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(3), 331-340. <http://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000157>
- Pakaslahti, L., Karjalainen, A., & Keltikangas-Järvinen, L. (2002). Relationships between adolescent prosocial problem-solving strategies, prosocial behaviour, and social acceptance. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 26(2), 137-144. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01650250042000681>
- Paterson, G., & Sanson, A. (1999). The association of behavioural adjustment to temperament, parenting and family characteristics among 5-year-old children. *Social Development*, 8(3), 293–309.

- Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., Pancer, S. M., & Alisat, S. (2003). A longitudinal analysis of personal values socialization: Correlates of a moral self-ideal in late adolescence. *Social Development, 12*(4), 563–585.
- Ramaswamy, V., & Bergin, C. (2009). Do reinforcement and induction increase prosocial behavior? Results of a teacher-based intervention in preschools. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 23*(4), 527-538. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02568540909594679>
- Rohner, R., & Khaleque, P. (2005). *Handbook for the Study of Parental Acceptance-Rejection*, 4th edition. Storrs CT: Rohner Research Publications.
- Rothbart, M. K., & Bates, J. E. (2006). Temperament. In N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), W. Damon (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 99–166). New York: Wiley.
- Rothbaum, F., & Trommsdorff, G. (2007). Do roots and wings complement or oppose one another?: The socialization of relatedness and autonomy in cultural context. In J. E. Grusec, & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp. 461–489). New York: Guilford Press.
- Rueth, J. E., Otterpohl, N., & Wild, E. (2016). Influence of parenting behavior on psychosocial adjustment in early adolescence: Mediated by anger regulation and moderated by gender. *Social Development, 26*(1), 40-58. <http://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12180>
- Ruiz-Ortiz, R., Braza, P., Carreras, R., & Muñoz, J. M. (2017). Differential effects of mother's and father's parenting on prosocial and antisocial behavior: Child sex moderating. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 26*(8), 2182-2190. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0726-4>
- Sallquist, J., Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., Eggum, N. D., & Gaertner, B. M. (2009). Assessment of preschoolers' positive empathy: Concurrent and longitudinal relations with positive emotion, social competence, and sympathy. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 4*(3), 223–233. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760902819444>
- Saltali, N. D., & Imir, H. M. (2018). Parenting styles as a predictor of the preschool children's social behaviours. *Participatory Educational Research, 5*(2), 18–37. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.18.10.5.2>

- Sanson, A., Hemphill, S. A., & Smart, D. (2004). Connections between temperament and social development: A review. *Social Development, 13*(1), 142-170. <http://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-9507.2004.00261.x>
- Sayı, M., & Kındap, Y. (2010). Ergenin anne-babadan algıladığı psikolojik kontrol: Psikolojik kontrol ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirliği. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, 13*(25), 62-75.
- Scourfield, J., John, B., Martin, N., & McGuffin, P. (2004). The development of prosocial behaviour in children and adolescents: A twin study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45*(5), 927–935.
- Scrimgeour, M. B., Blandon, A. Y., Stifter, C. A., & Buss, K. A. (2013). Cooperative coparenting moderates the association between parenting practices and children's prosocial behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*(3), 506–511. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032893>
- Shek, D. T., & Law, M. Y. (2014). Parental behavioral control, parental psychological control and parent-child relational qualities: Relationships to Chinese adolescent risk behavior. In D. T. L. Shek, R. C. F. Sun, & C. M. S. Ma (Eds.), *Chinese Adolescents in Hong Kong* (pp. 51-69). Springer, Singapore.
- Silk, J. S., Morris, A. S., Kanaya, T., & Steinberg, L. (2003). Psychological control and autonomy granting: Opposite ends of a continuum or distinct constructs? *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13*(1), 113-128. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.1301004>
- Slagt, M., Dubas, J. S., van Aken, M. A. G., Ellis, B. J., & Deković, M. (2018). Sensory processing sensitivity as a marker of differential susceptibility to parenting. *Developmental Psychology, 54*(3), 543–558. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000431>
- Smorti, M., & Ponti, L. (2018). How does sibling relationship affect children's prosocial behaviors and best friend relationship quality? *Journal of Family Issues, 39*(8), 2413–2436. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x18755195>
- Sober, E., & Wilson, D. (1998). *Unto others: The evolution and psychology of unselfish behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Pearson Education.

- Termine, N. T., & Izard, C. E. (1988). Infants' responses to their mothers' expressions of joy and sadness. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(2), 223–229.
- Trivers, R. L. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *Quarterly Review of Biology*, 46(1), 35–57.
- Van der Graaff, J., Carlo, G., Crocetti, E., Koot, H. M., & Branje, S. (2017). Prosocial Behavior in Adolescence: Gender Differences in Development and Links with Empathy. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(5), 1086–1099. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0786-1>
- Varan, A. (2003). *Türk örnekleminde EKRÖ ve KİDÖ çocuk ve ebeveyn ölçeklerinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları*. <http://www.azmivaran.com/arastirma/ekar-kurami-arastirmalari/>
- Wentzel, K. R., Barry, C. M., & Caldwell, K. A. (2004). Friendship in middle school: Influences on motivation and school adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(2), 195–203.
- Wilson, E. O. (1980). *Sociobiology* (Abridged Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wynne-Edwards, V. C. (1962). *Animal dispersion in relation to social behaviour*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Oliver & Boyd.
- Yağmurlu, B., & Sanson, A. (2009). Parenting and temperament as predictors of prosocial behaviour in Australian and Turkish Australian children. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 61(2), 77-88. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00049530802001338>
- Yağmurlu, B., Sanson, A., & Köymen, S. B. (2005). Ebeveynlerin ve çocuk mizacının olumlu sosyal davranış gelişimine etkileri: Zihin kuramının belirleyici rolü. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 20(55), 1-20.
- Yoo, H., Feng, X., & Day, R. D. (2013). Adolescents' empathy and prosocial behavior in the family context: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(12), 1858-1872. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9900-6>

- Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., Wagner, E., & Chapman, M. (1992). Development of concern for others. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(1), 126–136.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Robinson, J., & Emde, R. N. (1992). The development of empathy in twins. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(6), 1038–1047.
- Zarra-Nezhad, M., Aunola, K., Kiuru, N., Mullaola, S., & Moazami-Goodarzi, A. (2015). Parenting styles and children's emotional development during the first grade: The moderating role of child temperament. *Journal of Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 5(5), 1000206. <http://doi.org/10.4172/2161-0487.1000206>
- Zarra-Nezhad, M., Kiuru, N., Aunola, K., Zarra-Nezhad, M., Ahonen, T., Poikkeus, A., Lerkkanen, M. K., & Nurmi, J. (2014). Social withdrawal in children moderates the association between parenting styles and the children's own socioemotional development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 55(11), 1260-1269. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12251>
- Zarra-Nezhad, M., Moazami-Goodarzi, A., Nurmi, J., Eklund, K., Ahonen, T., & Aunola, K. (2018). Children's shyness moderates the associations between parenting behavior and the development of children's pro-social behaviors. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(9), 3008-3018. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1134-0>
- Zhou, Q., Eisenberg, N., Losoya, S. H., Fabes, R. A., Reiser, M., Guthrie, I. K., . . . Shepard, S. A. (2002). The relations of parental warmth and positive expressiveness to children's empathy-related responding and social functioning: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 73(3), 893-915. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00446>

APPENDICES

A. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DÜMLÜPINAR BULVARI ÇESME
CAMPUSU SAKARYA YOLU
T. Sayı: 28620816/116
T: +90 312 210 79 59
www.metu.edu.tr
www.iletim.metu.edu.tr

02 OCAK 2018

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Prof.Dr. Sibel KAZAK BERUMENT ve Yrd.Doç.Dr. Başak ŞAHİN ACAR;

"Ebeveynlik Tutumlarının ve Ebeveyn-Çocuk İletişim Özelliklerinin Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimine Etkisi" başlıklı araştırmanız İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay 2017-SOS-213 protokol numarası ile 01.09.2018-01.10.2021 tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SÖL

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN

Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

Doç. Dr. Kaşar KONDARCI

Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

1. GİRİŞ

Olumlu sosyal davranışlar kişinin kendisinden başkasına fayda sağlamayı amaçladığı gönüllü davranışlar olarak tanımlanabilir (Eisenberg, Fabes ve Sinrad, 2006), ve yardım etme, paylaşma ve rahatlatma gibi davranışları kapsar. Olumlu sosyal davranışlar her iki taraf için de olumlu sonuçlarla ilişkili olduğu için oldukça önemlidir. Örneğin, olumlu sosyal davranışta bulunmak çocuklarda ahlaki bir gurur duygusuna yol açar ve bu da daha fazla olumlu sosyal davranışa yol açar (Etxebarria, Ortiz, Apodaca, Pascual, & Conejero, 2015). Diğer taraftan, ergenlik döneminde, olumlu sosyal davranışlar sergileyen akranlarla arkadaş olmak, depresyon ve madde bağımlılığı için koruyucu bir faktördür (Mason, Mennis, Russell, Moore, & Brown, 2019). Olumlu sosyal davranışların gelişimi, kültür, akranlar ve kardeşlerle ilişkiler ve ebeveynlik gibi çeşitli çevresel faktörlerden etkilenir (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Howe & Ross, 1990; Kiang, Moreno, & Robinson, 2004; Wentzel, Barry, & Caldwell, 2004). Özellikle, çocuklar ilk sosyal etkileşimlerini ebeveynleriyle yaşadıkları ve ebeveynler çocukların sosyalleştirme araçları olarak olumlu sosyal davranışlarına katkıda buldukları için ebeveynliğin belirleyici rolü oldukça önemlidir (Hasting, Utendale, & Sullivan, 2007). Bu nedenle, bu çalışma ebeveynlik uygulamaları, çocukların ve ergenlerin mizaç özellikleri ve olumlu sosyal davranışları arasındaki ilişkileri anlamaya çalışmaktadır.

1.1 Olumlu Sosyal Davranışların Gelişimi

Yaşamlarının ilk yılında bebekler, küresel empatiyle açıklanabilecek bazı davranışlar sergilerler. Örneğin, sakin bebekler başka bir bebeğin ağlama seslerini duyduklarında ağlamaya başlarlar (Martin & Clark, 1982). Diğer deneysel bulgular, bebeklerin ve çok küçük çocukların başkalarının duygularından etkilendiğini, başkalarının duygusal sinyallerine tepki verdiğini ve başkalarının sıkıntılarına empati

ve ilgi gösterdiğini göstermektedir (Denham, 1986; Termine ve Izard, 1988; Zahn-Waxler vd., 1992).

Okul öncesi çağlarda, çocukların başkalarının sıkıntı ve üzüntülerine tepkileri empatik ve egosantrik tepkiler arasında değişkenlik gösterir. Çocuklar büyüdükçe, empatik ilgi ve olumlu sosyal davranış sergileme olasılıkları yükselir (Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, Wagner ve Chapman, 1992). Zaman içinde kayıtsızlıkları ve kendilerine yönelik tepkileri azalırken, empatik tepkileri ve olumlu sosyal davranışları artar (Brownell, 2013). Dahası, olumlu sosyal davranış eğilimlerinin çocukluktan ergenliğe doğru arttığını gösteren bilimsel bulgular vardır (Eisenberg ve Fabes 1998; Fabes ve Eisenberg, 1996). Eisenberg ve Fabes (1998) tarafından yapılan bir meta-analize göre, ergenlerin 7-12 yaş arası çocuklara göre daha fazla olumlu sosyal davranışta bulunduğu görülmüştür. Başka bir çalışmada, ergenlerin 7. sınıftan 10. sınıfa olumlu sosyal davranışlarında anlamlı artışlar olduğu gözlemlenmiştir (Jacobs, Vernon & Eccles, 2004). Fakat 14 yaşındaki ve 17 yaşındaki ergenlerin yaş ve cinsiyet farklılıklarını karşılaştıran bir başka çalışmada, sonuçlar 14 yaşındaki ergenlerin, 17 yaşındakilere göre daha yüksek düzeyde olumlu sosyal davranışlara sahip olduğunu göstermiştir (Pakaslahti, Karjalainen, & Keltikangas-Jarvinen, 2002).

Sonuç olarak, bazı çelişkili sonuçlara rağmen, olumlu sosyal davranışların çocukluktan ergenliğe doğru artma yönünde genel bir eğilimi vardır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın ilk amacı, Türkiye'deki çocuk ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışlarındaki yaş farklılıklarını incelemektir.

1.2 Ebeveynlik ve Sosyal Gelişim

Çocuklar, ilk sosyal etkileşimlerini ebeveynleriyle yaşarlar. Ebeveynler, sosyalleştirme araçları olarak çocukların olumlu sosyal davranışlarına katkıda bulunurlar (Hasting vd., 2007). Ebeveynlerle etkileşimler, çocukların akademik, davranışsal, duygusal ve kişilerarası işlevleri için önemli olan olumlu sosyal davranışları anlamalarına ve öğrenmelerine yardımcı olur (Gryzkowski, Jordan, & Mercer, 2018).

Alanyazında ebeveynlerin sıcaklığı, açıklayıcı akıl yürütmesi ve psikolojik kontrolü gibi ebeveynlik uygulamalarının çocukların ve ergenlerin sosyal-duygusal gelişimindeki yordayıcı rolü geniş bir yer tutar (Brajša-Zganec & Hanzec, 2014;

Knauer, Ozer, Dow, & Fernald, 2019; Zarra-Nezhad, Aunola, Kiuru, Mullola, & Moazami-Goodarzi, 2015).

1.2.1 Ebeveyn Sıcaklığı ve Olumlu Sosyal Davranışlar

Ebeveyn sıcaklığı, ebeveynlerin çocuklarıyla olan ilişkilerindeki desteği, olumlu duygulanımı ve duyarlılığı olarak tanımlanabilir (Carlo, Mestre, Samper, Tur, & Armenta, 2010). Sıcak ebeveynliğin duygusal uyum, sosyal başarı ve sosyal yeterlilik ile ilişkili olduğu bulunmuştur (Chen, Liu, & Li, 2000; Eiden, Colder, Edwards, & Leonard, 2009). Ebeveyn sıcaklığı, çocukların olumlu sosyal ödül sistemini harekete geçirerek onları sosyal ilişkilerinde olumlu davranışlar göstermeye motive eder (MacDonald, 1992). Alanyazında, ebeveyn sıcaklığının farklı yaş gruplarından çocukların ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışlarını yordadığı fikrini destekleyen çok sayıda çalışma bulunmaktadır (Carlo vd., 2010; Padilla-Walker, Nielson, & Day, 2016; Ruiz-Ortiz, Braza, Carreras, & Muñoz, 2017; Zarra-Nezhad vd., 2018). Mevcut çalışmada da alanyazındaki bu bulgulara dayanarak, çocuk ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışlarında ebeveyn sıcaklığının rolünü araştırmak amaçlanmıştır.

1.2.2 Açıklayıcı Akıl Yürütme ve Olumlu Sosyal Davranışlar

Açıklayıcı akıl yürütme, ebeveynlerin çocuklarına davranışlarının sonuçlarını açıklaması ve onlarla nasıl davranacakları konusunda sohbet etmesi olarak tanımlanabilen olumlu bir disiplin uygulamasıdır (Brajsa-Zganec & Hanzec, 2014). Açıklayıcı akıl yürütmeyi kullanarak, ebeveynler kuralların arkasındaki nedenleri ve başkalarının ihtiyaçlarını çocuklarına açıklayabilir ve bu durum, empati ve olumlu sosyal davranışların gelişimini destekler (Hoffman, 2000; Hasting vd., 2007). İlgili alanyazında birçok çalışma, açıklayıcı akıl yürütme ve olumlu sosyal davranışlar arasında anlamlı pozitif korelasyonlar ve bu değişkenler arasında doğrudan ve anlamlı ilişkiler ortaya koymuştur (Brajsa-Zganec & Hanzec, 2014; Hadzic, Magee, & Robinson, 2013; Saltalı & Imir, 2018). Bu nedenle, mevcut çalışmada, ebeveynlerin açıklayıcı akıl yürütmesinin çocuk ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışlarındaki yordayıcı rolü araştırılmıştır.

1.2.3 Psikolojik Kontrol ve Olumlu Sosyal Davranışlar

Psikolojik kontrol, aşırı müdahalecilik kullanarak, suçlu hissettirerek ve sevgiyi geri çekerek çocukların duygusal durumlarını etkilemeyi ve duygusal ihtiyaçlarını manipüle etmeyi ve duyarsız olmayı içerir (Barber, 1996). Alanyazında psikolojik kontrol, içselleştirme ve dışsallaştırma sorunları ile pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuşken, akademik başarı ve arkadaşlık kalitesiyle negatif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur (Barber, 2002; Baumgardner ve Boyatzis, 2018). Ayrıca, bazı araştırmalar, ebeveyn psikolojik kontrolünün çocukların ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışları üzerinde olumsuz bir etkiye sahip olduğu fikrini desteklemektedir (Fu & Zhagn, 2020; Rueth, Otterpohl, & Wild, 2017; Silk, Morris, Kanaya, & Steinberg, 2003). Bu nedenle, mevcut çalışmada, ebeveyn psikolojik kontrolünün çocuk ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışları üzerindeki yordayıcı rolü de araştırılacaktır. Yukarıda tartışıldığı gibi, ebeveyn sıcaklığı, açıklayıcı akıl yürütme davranışları ve psikolojik kontrolü gibi ebeveynlik uygulamaları, çocukların ve ergenlerin toplum yanlısı davranışlarıyla ilgilidir. Öte yandan, aynı ebeveynlik uygulamaları tüm çocuklar ve ergenler için aynı sonuçları öngörmeyebilir. Çocukların ve ergenlerin mizaçları, çevrenin etkisinin önemli bir belirleyicisidir (Rothbart & Bates, 2006). Bu nedenle, bu çalışmada çocukların ve ergenlerin mizaç özellikleri de dikkate alınmıştır.

1.3 Mizacın Düzenleyici Rolü

Mizaç, tepkisellik ve öz düzenlemede, duygulanım, aktivite ve dikkat açısından görülen yapısal temelli bireysel farklılıklar olarak tanımlanabilir (Rothbart & Bates, 2006). Farklılaşma hassasiyeti teorisine göre, çocukların çevrelerine ve ebeveynlerinin yetiştirme uygulamalarına hassasiyetinde farklılıklar vardır (Belsky, 1997) ve mizaç, farklılaşan hassasiyeti araştırmak için en sık kullanılan kavramdır. Zor mizaçlı çocuklar, kolay mizaçlı çocuklara göre olumsuz yetiştirme uygulamalarının olumsuz etkilerine ve olumlu yetiştirme uygulamalarının olumlu etkilerine karşı daha hassastır (Belsky, 2005). Bu nedenle, mevcut çalışmada iki mizaç özelliğinin düzenleyici rolü incelenmiştir.

Çalışmadaki ilk düzenleyici değişken, mizacın en sık çalışılan alanlarından biri olan olumsuz duygulanımdır ve bu mizaç özelliği olumsuz ruh hali, sinirlilik ve yüksek yoğunluktaki olumsuz tepkileri ifade eder (Sanson, Hemphill & Smart, 2004). Çalışmada kullanılan diğer düzenleyici değişken ise, son zamanlarda araştırmacılar tarafından çocukların farklı duyarlılıklarını test etmek için kullanılmaya başlanan duyuşal duyarlılıktır (Slagt, Dubas, van Aken, Ellis ve Dekovic, 2018). Aron ve arkadaşları duyuşal duyarlılığı “daha yüksek duyuşal tepkisellikle yönlendirilen daha derin bir bilişsel uyarıcı işlemeyi içeren genetik olarak belirlenmiş bir özellik” olarak tanımlamıştır (Aron, Aron, & Jagiellowicz, 2012, s.262). Slagt ve arkadaşlarına göre (2018), olumsuz duygulanım ve duyuşal duyarlılık, farklılaşan hassasiyetin belirteçleri olarak adlandırılabilir iki önemli mizaç özelliğidir. Bu sebeple, mevcut çalışmada bu iki mizaç özelliğinin ebeveynlik uygulamaları ve olumlu sosyal davranışlar arasındaki ilişkideki düzenleyici rolü incelenmiştir.

Bilinen kadarıyla, Türk alanyazınında, olumlu sosyal davranışların ebeveynlik uygulamaları ve mizaç özellikleri ile ilişkisini inceleyen araştırmalara çok yer verilmemiştir. Dahası, bu değişkenleri inceleyen birkaç çalışmada, hedef grup çoğunlukla okul öncesi çağındaki çocuklardır ve daha büyük yaş gruplarından çocuklarla yapılan bir araştırma saptanamamıştır. Dolayısıyla bu çalışma alanyazına önemli katkılar sağlayacaktır.

1.4 Mevcut Çalışma

Bu çalışmanın ilk amacı, olumlu sosyal davranışların düzeyinin çocukluktan ergenliğe kadar değişip değişmediğini araştırmaktır. İkinci amacı, ebeveyn sıcaklığı, açıklayıcı akıl yürütme ve psikolojik kontrol ile çocuk ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Son olarak üçüncü amacı ise, ebeveynlik uygulamaları ile olumlu sosyal davranışlar arasındaki ilişkilerde mizaç özelliklerinin düzenleyici rolünü incelemektir.

Hipotez 1: Daha fazla ebeveyn sıcaklığı gören çocuk ve ergenler, daha yüksek seviyede olumlu sosyal davranışa sahip olacaktır.

Hipotez 2: Daha fazla açıklayıcı akıl yürütme gören çocuk ve ergenler, daha yüksek seviyede olumlu sosyal davranışa sahip olacaktır.

Hipotez 3: Daha fazla psikolojik kontrol gören çocuk ve ergenler, daha düşük seviyede olumlu sosyal davranışa sahip olacaktır.

Hipotez 4: Olumsuz duygulanımı yüksek olan çocuk ve ergenlerin düşük olanlara kıyasla, daha yüksek ebeveyn sıcaklığı ve açıklayıcı akıl yürütme görmesi daha fazla olumlu sosyal davranış göstermelerini yordarken, daha yüksek psikolojik kontrol görmesi daha az olumlu sosyal davranış yordayacaktır.

Hipotez 5: Duyusal duyarlılığı yüksek olan çocuk ve ergenlerin düşük olanlara kıyasla, daha yüksek ebeveyn sıcaklığı ve açıklayıcı akıl yürütme görmesi daha fazla olumlu sosyal davranış göstermelerini yordarken, daha yüksek psikolojik kontrol görmesi daha az olumlu sosyal davranış yordayacaktır.

2. YÖNTEM

2.1 Örneklem

Bu çalışmaya 3. sınıftan 11. sınıfa kadar örgün eğitime devam eden 478 öğrenci ve anneleri katılmıştır. Çalışmadan kullanılan veriler Türkiye'nin 18 farklı ilindeki 28 farklı okuldan (8 ilkokul, 11 ortaokul, 9 lise) toplanmıştır. Mevcut çalışmanın TÜBİTAK tarafından desteklenen bir projenin parçası olarak ve bu projenin 1. Zaman verileri kullanılarak yürütülmesi planlanmıştır. Projenin örnekleme Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu tarafından ülke temsili olacak şekilde belirlenmiştir. Ancak Koronavirüs salgını nedeniyle okulların uzaktan eğitime geçmesiyle, veri toplama süreci durdurulmuştur. Bu nedenle mevcut çalışma hâlihazırda toplanmış olan veriler kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir.

478 çocuk ve ergenin yaşları 7 ve 18 arasında ($Ort = 11.54$, $SS = 2.56$) değişmektedir ve 279'u kız öğrenciyken (%58.37), 199'u erkek öğrencidir (%41.63). Annelerin yaşları ise 26 ve 55 arasında değişmektedir ($Ort = 38.23$, $SS = 5.46$), eğitim düzeyleri ise çoğunlukla ilkokul (%41.2) olarak belirtilmiştir.

2.2 Ölçekler

2.2.1 Demografik Bilgi Formu

Bu çalışma çok kapsamlı bir projenin parçası olduğu için çocuklara, ergenlere ve annelere ayrı ayrı ayrıntılı demografik bilgi formları verilmiştir. Yaş, medeni durum, istihdam durumu, ebeveynlerin gelir ve eğitim düzeyleri, kardeş ve aile üyelerinin sayısı vb. demografik bilgiler bu formlardan elde edilmiştir.

2.2.2 Ebeveyn Sıcaklığı

Ebeveynlerin sıcaklığı, Ebeveyn Kabul-Reddi Ölçeği'nin (Rohner ve Khaleque, 2005) "sıcaklık/sevgi" alt ölçeği kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Bu ölçek, Varan (2003) tarafından Türk kültürüne uyarlanmıştır. Bu çalışmada kullanılan alt ölçek sekiz maddeden oluşmaktadır ve hem anne hem de babaların ebeveyn sıcaklığını değerlendirmek için çocuklar ve ergenler tarafından doldurulmuştur. Güvenilirlik analizlerinde, Cronbach alfa değerleri anneler için .85, babalar için .88 bulunmuştur.

2.2.3 Açıklayıcı Akıl Yürütme

Ebeveynlerin açıklayıcı akıl yürütme kullanımı, Çocuk Yetiştirme Ölçeği'nin (Paterson ve Sanson, 1999) "açıklayıcı akıl yürütme" alt ölçeği kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Bu alt ölçek altı maddeden oluşmaktadır ve Türkçe uyarlama çalışması Yağmurlu ve Sanson (2009) tarafından yapılmıştır. Bu ölçek hem anne hem de babaların açıklayıcı akıl yürütmesini değerlendirmek için çocuklar ve ergenler tarafından doldurulmuş ve Cronbach alfa değerleri anneler için .86 ve babalar için .92 olarak bulunmuştur.

2.2.4 Psikolojik Kontrol

Ebeveynlerin psikolojik kontrolü, Psikolojik Kontrol Ölçeği (Barber, 1996) kullanılarak değerlendirilmiştir. Bu ölçek 8 maddeden oluşmakta olup Türkçe'ye adaptasyon çalışması Sayıl ve Kındap (2010) tarafından yapılmıştır. Mevcut

çalışmada, bu ölçek anne ve babanın psikolojik kontrolünü değerlendirmek için çocuklar ve ergenler tarafından doldurulmuş olup, güvenilirliği anneler için .80, babalar için .85 olarak bulunmuştur.

2.2.5 Olumsuz Duygulanım

Çocuk ve ergenlerin olumsuz duygulanımı değerlendirmek için Erken Ergen Mizaç Envanteri'nin (Ellis & Rothbart, 2001) olumsuz etki alt ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Bu ölçeğin uyarlaması Demirpençe ve Putham (2019) tarafından yapılmıştır ve 18 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışma için yapılan güvenilirlik analizinde iç tutarlılık katsayısı .90 olarak bulunmuştur ve bir madde çalışmadığı için çalışmadan çıkartılmıştır (“Aksilikler üst üste geldiğinde bile, çocuğum üzülmez.”).

2.2.6 Duyusal Duyarlılık

Çocuk ve ergenlerin duyusal duyarlılığını değerlendirmek için Hassasiyeti Yüksek Çocuk Ölçeği (Aron, 2002) proje ekibi tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanmıştır. Pilot çalışma yapıldıktan sonra bu ölçekte bir sorun olmadığı tespit edilmiş ve 23 maddelik bu ölçeğin ebeveyn formunun projede kullanılmasına karar verilmiştir. Bu ölçek, anneler tarafından doldurulmuştur ve güvenilirlik analizinde Cronbach's alpha .79 olarak bulunmuştur.

2.2.7 Olumlu Sosyal Davranışlar

Çocukların ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışları, Olumlu Sosyal ve Saldırgan Davranışlar Ölçeği'nin “özgecil olumlu sosyal davranış” alt ölçeği kullanılarak ölçülmüştür (Boxer, Tisak ve Goldstein, 2004). Bu alt ölçek beş maddeden oluşmaktadır ve Türkçe uyarlama çalışması Bayraktar, Kındap, Kumru ve Sayıl (2010) tarafından yapılmıştır. Öz bildirim olan bu maddeler anne bildirimine dönüştürülmüştür. Ayrıca Yağmurlu, Sanson ve Köymen (2005) tarafından Türk kültürüne uyarlanan Olumlu Sosyal Davranış Ölçeği'nden (Iannotti, 1985) olumlu sosyal davranışın rahatlama altboyutu ile ilgili iki madde daha eklenmiştir. Mevcut çalışma için güvenilirliği .85 olarak bulunmuştur.

2.3 İşlem

Bu çalışma, TÜBİTAK tarafından desteklenen “Ebeveynlik Tutumlarının ve Ebeveyn-Çocuk İletişim Özelliklerinin Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimine Etkisi” başlıklı bir proje kapsamında gerçekleştirilmiştir. İlk olarak, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu'ndan etik izin alınmıştır. Daha sonra, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'ndan resmi izin alınmıştır. Veri toplanacak okullar Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TÜİK) tarafından Türkiye temsili bir örneklem olacak şekilde rastlantısal olarak belirlenmiştir. Daha sonra her okuldaki her sınıf düzeyinden rastlantısal olarak bir sınıf seçilerek, seçilen sınıftaki tüm çocukların annelerine onam formu gönderilmiştir. Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul eden anneler, tablet bilgisayar aracılığıyla veri toplamak üzere okullara davet edilmiştir. Katılmayı kabul eden ancak okula gelemeyeceğini belirten annelere anket Qualtrics bağlantısı kullanılarak gönderilmiştir. Ardından katılan annelerin çocuklarından veriler toplanmıştır ve verilerin toplanmasının ardından anne ve çocuklara katılımları için hediyeler verilmiştir.

3. BULGULAR

3.1 Korelasyon Analizleri

Değişkenler arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmak için korelasyon analizleri yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar, olumlu sosyal davranışın olumsuz duygulanım ile negatif ile negatif, duyuşal duyarlılık ile pozitif ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, olumlu sosyal davranış, ebeveynlik değişkenlerinin çoğu ile ilişkili bulunmuştur. Annenin ebeveyn sıcaklığı, babanın ebeveyn sıcaklığı, annenin açıklayıcı akıl yürütmesi ve babanın açıklayıcı akıl yürütmesiyle olumlu sosyal davranışlar arasından pozitif ilişki saptanmıştır.

3.2 Tek Yönlü Varyans Analizi

Olumlu sosyal davranışların düzeyinin çocukluktan ergenliğe değişip değişmediğini araştırmak için tek yönlü varyans analizi yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar olumlu sosyal davranışların yaşa göre anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaşmadığını göstermiştir.

3.3 Hiyerarşik Regresyon Analizleri

Ebeveynlik uygulamaları (ebeveyn sıcaklığı, açıklayıcı akıl yürütme ve psikolojik kontrol) ile olumlu sosyal davranış arasındaki ilişkiyi ve bu ilişkilerde olumsuz duygulanım ve duygusal duyarlılığın düzenleyici rolünü araştırmak için iki ayrı hiyerarşik regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. İlk adımda çocuk ve ergenlerin yaşı ve cinsiyeti, ikinci aşamada mizaç özellikleri girilmiştir. Üçüncü adımda ise ebeveynlik uygulamaları (anne ve baba sıcaklığı, açıklayıcı akıl yürütmesi ve psikolojik kontrolü) eklenmiştir. Son olarak, dördüncü adımda ebeveynlik uygulamaları ve mizaç özelliklerinin etkileşimi analize alınmıştır.

Bu analizler sonucunda ebeveyn uygulamalarının olumlu sosyal davranış üzerinde herhangi bir yordayıcı rolü saptanmamıştır. Ayrıca mizaç özelliklerinin ebeveyn uygulamaları ve olumlu sosyal davranışlar arasındaki ilişkideki düzenleyici rolü anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Fakat hem olumsuz duygulanım hem de duygusal duyarlılığın olumlu sosyal davranışları yordayıcı rolü olduğu görülmüştür. Sonuçlara bakılarak olumsuz duygulanımı yüksek olan çocuk ve ergenlerin daha az olumlu sosyal davranışta bulunurken ($\beta = -.13, p < .01$), duygusal duyarlılığı yüksek olan çocuk ve ergenlerin daha fazla olumlu sosyal davranışta bulunduğu söylenebilir ($\beta = .21, p < .01$).

4. TARTIŞMA

4.1 Olumlu Sosyal Davranış Düzeyinde Yaş Farklılıkları

Alanyazında olumlu sosyal davranış düzeyindeki yaş farklılıklarını inceleyen sınırlı sayıda çalışma vardır, ancak bu çalışmalar genel olarak olumlu sosyal davranışların çocukluktan ergenliğe geçişte arttığını göstermiştir (Fabes & Eisenberg,

1996; Jacobs vd., 2004). Bu sebeple, çalışmanın ilk amacı, orta çocukluktan (3. sınıf) ergenliğe (11. sınıf) kadar olumlu sosyal davranış düzeyindeki yaş farklılıklarını incelemektir. Sonuçlar, olumlu sosyal davranış düzeyinin çocuk ve ergenlerin yaşına göre farklılık göstermediğini göstermiştir. Bu sonuç, çalışmada kullanılan ölçümden kaynaklanmış olabilir. Alanyazında olumlu sosyal davranış genellikle öz bildirim, öğretmen raporu, akran oylaması veya gözlemsel ölçümler kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Fakat bu çalışmada ölçüm anne raporu olduğundan, anneler arkadaşlarıyla sosyal çevrelerinde çocuklarını gözlemleyememiş olabilirler. Bu nedenle ilerleyen çalışmalarda yaş farklılıklarının daha fazla araştırılması alanyazına katkıda bulunacaktır.

4.2 Ebeveyn Uygulamaları ve Olumlu Sosyal Davranışlar

Bu çalışmanın ikinci amacı, ebeveynlik uygulamaları (ebeveyn sıcaklığı, açıklayıcı akıl yürütme ve psikolojik kontrol) ile olumlu sosyal davranış arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. İlgili alanyazına bakıldığında bu ebeveynlik uygulamalarının çocuk ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışlarını yordadığına dair bulgular görülebilir (Carlo vd., 2010; Saltalı & İmir, 2018; Silk vd., 2003). Bu bulgulara dayanarak bahsi geçen ebeveyn uygulamalarının olumlu sosyal davranışı yordayacağı öngörülmüştür. Ancak hiçbir ebeveyn uygulamasının olumlu sosyal davranışlar üzerindeki yordayıcı rolü anlamlı bulunmamıştır.

Alanyazında anlamlı sonuçlar bulan çalışmalara bakıldığında bazı açılardan mevcut çalışmayla farklılaşma olduğu görülmektedir. Örneğin, bu çalışmalardaki katılımcıların sosyo-ekonomik durumu çoğunlukla orta veya yüksekken, mevcut çalışmadaki katılımcıların çoğunluğu düşük sosyo-ekonomik duruma sahiptir. Ayrıca, bu çalışmalarda olumlu sosyal davranış genellikle öz bildirim veya gözlemsel ölçümlerle değerlendirilmiştir, ancak mevcut çalışmada anne-bildirimi bir ölçek kullanılmıştır. Son olarak, alanyazındaki bazı çalışmalarda ebeveyn uygulamaları ve olumlu sosyal davranış arasındaki ilişkiler boylamsal olarak incelenmiştir ve anlamlı sonuçlar bulunmuştur (Gülseven vd., 2017; Lee, Padilla-Walker, & Memmott-Elison, 2016; Rueth vd., 2016). Ancak mevcut çalışmada sadece eşzamanlı ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Bu gibi farklılıklar çalışmanın anlamlı olmayan bulgularının altında yatan sebepler olabilir.

Genel olarak, mevcut çalışmanın sonuçları ebeveynlik uygulamaları ile olumlu sosyal davranışlar arasında anlamlı bir ilişki ortaya koymamıştır. Bu sonuçların arkasındaki sebepler çalışmanın 4.5'te sunulan bazı sınırlılıkları olabilir. Ancak bu sonuçlar Türk kültürüyle de açıklanabilir. Yağmurlu ve Sanson'a (2009) göre ebeveynlik yerine Türkiye'deki sosyal normlar, Türk çocukları ve ergenlerinin olumlu sosyal davranışlarını teşvik edebilir. Türk kültüründe aile bağlarına ve aile üyeleriyle ilgilenmeye değer verildiğinden (Laible vd., 2017) çocuklara özellikle kendilerinden büyük aile üyelerine karşı nazik ve saygılı olmak öğretilmekte ve küçük kardeşlerine bakma ve yaşlarına uygun ev işleri gibi sorumluluklar verilmektedir. Eisenberg ve Mussen'e (1989) göre, çocuklara erken yaşta verilen sorumluluklar, çocukların toplum yanlısı davranışlarını teşvik edebilir. Dahası, aile üyelerine karşı nazik olmak ve olumlu sosyal davranışlarda bulunmak, diğer insanlara karşı olumlu sosyal davranışlara da yol açabilir. Bu nedenle ebeveynlik, Türk kültüründe diğer kültürlerle kıyasla, çocukların olumlu sosyal davranışlarının gelişiminde daha az etkili olabilir.

4.3 Mizaç Özellikleri ve Olumlu Sosyal Davranışlar

Bu çalışmanın üçüncü amacı, ebeveynlik uygulamaları ile çocukların ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışları arasındaki ilişkilerde olumsuz duygulanım ve duygusal duyarlılığın düzenleyici rolünü incelemektir. Bu çalışmada mizaç özellikleri düzenleyici role sahip olarak bulunmasa da olumlu sosyal davranışları yordayıcı rolü anlamlıdır. Dahası, modele diğer yordayıcılar girildiğinde mizaç özelliklerinin anlamlılığı ortadan kalkmamış veya zayıflamamıştır. Bu sonuç, çocukların sosyal gelişiminde çocuk mizacının önemine dikkat çekmektedir.

Alanyazından, bazı mizaç özelliklerinin sosyal-duygusal gelişimin bazı yönleriyle ilişkili olduğu bilinmektedir (Sanson vd., 2004). Alanyazın, yüksek olumsuz duygulanımın zayıf sosyal beceriler için bir risk faktörü olduğunu göstermektedir (Eisenberg vd., 1993). Bu nedenle, bu çalışmada bulunan olumsuz duygulanım ile olumlu sosyal davranış arasındaki anlamlı negatif ilişki şaşırtıcı değildir. Öte yandan, bilindiği kadarıyla, duygusal duyarlılığın çocuk ve ergenlerin sosyal-duygusal gelişimi veya olumlu sosyal davranışları üzerindeki yordayıcı rolüne ilişkin herhangi bir bulgu yoktur. Duyusal duyarlılık ile ilgili sınırlı sayıda çalışma olduğundan bu çalışmanın bulguları ilgili alanyazına önemli bir katkı sağlamaktadır.

4.4 Çalışmanın Güçlü Yönleri ve Katkıları

Bu çalışmanın alanyazına önemli katkıları vardır. Öncelikle, Türkiye’de ebeveynlik ve olumlu sosyal davranış arasındaki ilişkiyi araştıran sınırlı sayıda çalışma vardır ve bu çalışmalar çoğunlukla okul öncesi çocukları ile yapılmıştır. Bilindiği kadarıyla mevcut çalışma, bu kadar geniş bir yaş aralığına sahip çocuklar ve ergenler üzerinde bahsi geçen ilişkileri araştıran ilk çalışmadır.

Bu araştırmanın bir diğer katkısı da annelerin eğitim düzeyinin yüksek bir kısmının ilkokul (% 41,2) olmasıdır. Bu, örneklemin yüksek bir oranının düşük sosyo-ekonomik duruma sahip olduğu anlamına gelir. Alanyazındaki çalışmaların çoğu, kolay ulaşılabilir olmaları sebebiyle orta ila yüksek sosyo-ekonomik duruma sahip katılımcılarla yapılmıştır. Bu sebeple, düşük sosyo-ekonomik duruma sahip katılımcıların çoğunlukta olması mevcut çalışmanın önemli bir güçlü yanındır.

Son olarak, duygusal duyarlılığı değişken olarak kullanmak bu çalışmanın alanyazına bir başka katkısıdır. Duyusal duyarlılık alanyazında nispeten yeni bir kavramdır ve çoğunlukla yetişkin çalışmalarında kullanılmaktadır. Ayrıca bildiğimiz kadarıyla bu değişken Türkiye’de yapılan çalışmalarda çocuklar ve ergenler için kullanılmamıştır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmada, duygusal duyarlılığın Türkiye'deki çocuk ve ergenlerin olumlu sosyal davranışlarıyla ilişkili olarak bulunması alanyazına önemli bir katkı sağlamaktadır.

4.5 Çalışmanın Sınırlılıkları ve Gelecek Çalışmalara Tavsiyeler

Bu çalışmanın katkıları olduğu kadar önemli sınırlılıkları vardır ve bu sınırlılıklar sonuçlarda anlamlı ilişkiler bulunamamasından sorumlu olabilir. İlk olarak, Covid-19 salgını nedeniyle hedeflenen örneklem büyüklüğüne ulaşamadır. Bu çalışmada çok sayıda yordayıcı ve bu yordayıcılarla düzenleyici değişkenler arasında çok sayıda etkileşim ilişkisi bulunduğu için, örneklem büyüklüğü analizlerin gücü için yeterli değildir. İkinci olarak, olumlu sosyal davranış ölçeğinin bazı sınırlılıkları vardır. Örneğin, bu çalışmada kullanılan olumlu sosyal davranış ölçeği öz bildirim değil anne bildirim formundadır. Anneler çocuklarını değerlendirirken, çocuklarının davranışlarını gerçekte olduğundan daha yüksek olarak bildirmiş

olabilirler. Bunun yanı sıra, anneler çoğu zaman çocuklarını arkadaşlarıyla en çok vakit geçirdikleri yer olan okullarında gözlemlene fırsatı bulamayabilirler. Bu nedenle, annelerin değerlendirmeleri çocuklarının gerçek olumlu sosyal davranış düzeylerini yansıtmayabilir. Ayrıca, ölçek sadece yedi tane ve çok genel olan maddeler içermektedir (e.g., “Çocuğum kendiliğinden başkalarına yardım eder.”). Bu nedenle annelerin değerlendirmeleri çok genel ve yüzeysel olmuş olabilir.

Bu çalışmanın bir diğer sınırlılığı da bulguların genellenebilirliği ile ilgilidir çünkü örneklemin çoğunluğu düşük sosyo-ekonomik düzeye sahip annelerden oluşmaktadır. Alanyazında annelerin eğitim düzeyinin, ebeveynlik stillerinin önemli yordayıcılarından biri olduğu ileri sürülmektedir (Durgel, Van De Vijver, & Yağmurlu, 2012). Daha yüksek genellenebilirliğe sahip olmak için, örneklem daha yüksek oranda orta ve yüksek sosyo-ekonomik düzeyden katılımcılar içermelidir. Son olarak, mevcut çalışmanın boyutsal bir çalışma olmaması bu çalışmanın bir diğer sınırlılığıdır. Çalışmada sadece eşzamanlı ilişkiler incelendiğinden, ebeveynlik uygulamaları ile olumlu sosyal davranış arasındaki nedensel ilişkiler yorumlanamamaktadır.

Gelecekteki araştırmalarda, bu çalışmada araştırılan ilişkiler Türkiye'yi ulusal olarak temsil eden daha geniş bir örnekleme boyutsal olarak incelenmelidir. Dahası, gelecekteki çalışmalar olumlu sosyal davranışları öz bildirim formuyla ve daha spesifik maddelerle ölçmelidir.

C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

(Please fill out this form on computer. Double click on the boxes to fill them)

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences**
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences**
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics**
- Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics**
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences**

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Kıyak
Adı / Name : Beril
Bölümü / Department : Psikoloji / Psychology

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): Parenting Practices and Prosocial Behaviors of Children and Adolescents: The Moderating Role of Temperament

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans / Master** **Doktora / PhD**

- Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.**
- Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two years. ***
- Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. ***

** Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. / A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date

*(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)*

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.