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Abstract

Expanding our knowledge on parenting practices of immigrant families is crucial for designing culturally sensitive parenting intervention programs in countries with high immigration rates. We investigated differences in patterns of parenting between second-generation immigrant and native families with young children. Authoritarian and authoritative control and sensitivity of second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers of 2-year-old children ($n = 70$) and native Dutch mothers ($n = 70$) were observed in the home and in the laboratory. Controlling for maternal age and education, Turkish immigrant mothers were less supportive, gave less clear instructions to their children, were more intrusive, and were less authoritative in their control strategies than native Dutch mothers. No differences were found in authoritarian control. In both ethnic groups supportive presence, clarity of instruction, authoritative control, and low intrusiveness loaded on one factor. No differences between ethnic groups were found in gender-differentiated parenting. Maternal emotional connectedness to the Turkish culture was associated with less authoritative control, whereas more use of the Turkish language was related to more sensitivity. Even though mean level differences in parenting behaviors still exist between second-generation Turkish immigrant and native Dutch mothers, the patterns of associations between parenting behaviors were comparable for both groups. This suggests that existing parenting interventions for native families may be applicable to second-generation Turkish immigrants as well.
Introduction

In the United States, one in five children is the child of an immigrant (UI, 2002) and in Europe the growth of the population is mostly due to immigration (EUROSTAT, 2006). Knowledge about differences in parenting between immigrant and native families, and of the role of acculturation in parenting is crucial for designing culturally sensitive parenting intervention programs. The aim of our study is to compare parenting behaviors in Turkish immigrant and native Dutch mothers in the Netherlands. The Turkish culture is often described as a collectivistic culture, whereas the Dutch culture is seen as individualistic. Parents in individualist cultures have been suggested to be less authoritarian and more authoritative than parents in collectivistic cultures. Further, it has been argued that authoritarian parenting in individualistic cultures is generally associated with lower levels of warmth and sensitivity, whereas the opposite may be true in collectivistic cultures. However, the question is whether these differences are also found when examining second-generation Turkish immigrant parents. These parents have a collectivistic cultural background, but have been living in an individualistic culture since birth. To examine this issue, we investigate mean level differences in parenting, as well as differences in the interrelations of parenting behaviors between Dutch and second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers. We also examined the role of child gender and parental acculturation levels.

Both sensitivity and control have been found to play an important role in the social-emotional development of young children. Sensitivity refers to the ability to perceive the child’s signals, to interpret these signals correctly, and to respond to them in a prompt and appropriate way (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). The sensitivity construct is also closely related to measures of maternal warmth and emotional supportiveness (De Wolff & Van IJzendoorn, 1997). Sensitive and warm parenting is predictive of positive child outcomes (e.g., De Wolff & Van IJzendoorn, 1997; Raikes & Thompson, 2008). Parental control refers to how rules and limits are imposed on the child (for a review, see Coie & Dodge, 1998) and is often distinguished as authoritarian versus authoritative control. Both authoritarian and authoritative parents expect their children to behave appropriately and to obey rules, but authoritarian parents restrict unwanted behavior without explanation by demanding and physical interference, whereas authoritative parents emphasize discussion, explanation, and clear communication (Baumrind, 1966). More authoritarian and less authoritative control are associated with negative child outcomes (e.g., Patterson, 1982; Rothbaum & Weisz, 1994).

Parents from more ‘collectivistic’ cultures (e.g., Turkish culture) have been reported to be more authoritarian, using more restraining behaviors during social play, and expecting more
obedience (Ispa et al., 2004; Rubin, 1998). In Turkey, more obedience and dependence is expected from daughters than from sons, leading to more external control on girls compared to boys (Kağıtcibaşi, 2007). Parents from more ‘individualistic’ cultures (e.g., Dutch culture) tend to be more authoritative; they are supposed to try to promote autonomy, self-reliance, exploration of the environment, and put less emphasis on obedience and sociability (Harwood, Miller, & Irrizary, 1995; Tamis-LeMonda, Way, & Hughes, 2007). In the four-fold classification by Maccoby and Martin (1983), authoritarian parenting consists of high control combined with low warmth and acceptance. However, in collectivistic cultures authoritarian parents who demand obedience and are restrictive may not necessarily be rejecting or lacking in warmth (e.g., Deković, Pels, & Model, 2006; Rudy & Grusec, 2001, 2006). In collectivistic cultures, authoritarian parenting goals (obedience, respect for adults) are more normative and may not necessarily reflect lack of warmth. For example, perceived higher parental control was not associated with lower warmth in Turkish immigrant families in Belgium (Güngör, 2008).

When individuals migrate from collectivistic to individualistic countries they undergo an acculturation process (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 2002) in which cognitions and parenting goals and behaviors may change through contact with the host society (Bornstein & Cote, 2006; Çıtlak, Leyendecker, Schölmerich, Driessen, & Harwood, 2008). However, immigrant parents also maintain the family values and parenting practices of their heritage culture (Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2008; Kelley & Tseng, 1992).

The Turkish group is the largest immigration population in Europe (Crul, 2008) as well as in the Netherlands (370,000; CBS, 2008). The current study focuses on the second-generation of Turkish immigrants because the growth of the number of Turkish inhabitants is mostly due to the increase of the second-generation population. Nevertheless, few studies have reported on parenting of young children in Turkish immigrant families in the Netherlands. In one of these studies, maternal sensitivity during observations of problem solving tasks was lower in Turkish immigrant families with 3 and 4-year-old children than in Dutch native families, when controlled for socio-economic status (Leseman & Van den Boom, 1999). However, another study among mostly first-generation Turkish immigrant and Dutch families with children between the ages of 0 and 19 years showed no differences between the groups on self-reported responsiveness and expression of affection (Pels, Nijsten, Oosterwegel, & Vollebergh, 2006). With regard to discipline, authoritarian control was more common among (Turkish) immigrants than among native Dutch families, whereas differences in authoritative control were less evident (Pels et al., 2006). In another study, Turkish immigrant parents of 17-year-olds were less authoritative in their parenting practices than their Dutch counterparts (Van der Veen & Meijnen, 2002). Regarding gender-differentiated
parenting, girls and boys were treated equally in Turkish immigrant families (Çıtlak et al., 2008; Wissink, Deković, & Meijer, 2006).

As these previous studies have been conducted primarily among first-generation Turkish immigrant mothers in the Netherlands, it is unclear how the parenting behaviors of second-generation Turkish immigrant parents compare to those in native Dutch families. Our aim is to investigate this issue.

We hypothesize that Turkish immigrant mothers show more intrusive and less sensitive parenting, and that they use more authoritarian and less authoritative control than Dutch mothers. We expect that in Turkish immigrant families the association between authoritarian control and maternal sensitivity may be positive, as opposed to Dutch families. We do not expect to find differences in parenting behaviors of Turkish immigrant mothers with regard to the gender of their toddlers. Parenting behaviors of Turkish immigrant mothers who report higher levels of acculturation are expected to be more similar to those of Dutch mothers.

**Method**

**Participants and procedure**

Second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers of 2-year-old children were recruited from the municipal registers of several cities and towns in the western and middle region of the Netherlands. Only second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers born in the Netherlands (with at least one of their parents born in Turkey) with a 2-year-old child (age 22 - 29 months) were selected to ensure the homogeneity of the sample and to control for confounding effects of ethnicity and migration. All correspondence was in the Turkish and the Dutch language. In total, 384 families were reached of whom 230 (60%) participated in this study by filling out questionnaires on child behavior problems and parenting practices. Unfortunately we were not able to collect any information on non-respondents. Only children for whom the primary parent was the mother (biological or otherwise) were eligible for the study. Of the 230 participating families, 155 families also participated in a videotaped 1-hour home visit during which mothers and children performed several tasks. Eight families were excluded from the group due to serious medical condition in child or mother, physical or mental disability in child or mother, lack of fluency in the Turkish and Dutch language, or interfering factors during a home-visit which made
The current study is an extension of the descriptive observational part of the SCRIPT study (Screening and Intervention of Problem behavior in Toddlerhood), with questionnaire and observational data of Dutch families with toddlers in the age range of 2 to 4 years. For a detailed description of the recruitment of Dutch participants and the procedures of the SCRIPT study we refer to Van Zeijl et al. (2007). For the present paper, we used the SCRIPT pretest laboratory observations for 70 24-month-old children ($M = 23.76$, $SD = 0.86$, range = 22-26, 47 boys) with mothers born in the Netherlands. In the SCRIPT study, these observations were only carried out for children who scored above the 75th percentile on the CBCL- Externalizing Problems scale of the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL/1½-5; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000) within their age group (scores ≥ 19). The selection of high scores on the CBCL has the advantage of increasing the likelihood of including families with extreme scores on the parenting behaviors under investigation. For this reason, and to be able to compare our findings to those from the SCRIPT study, we selected Turkish immigrant children who scored ≥ 19 on Externalizing Problems, resulting in a sample of 70 24-month-old Turkish children ($M = 25.15$, $SD = 1.52$, range = 22-29, 35 boys).

**Measures**

Internal consistencies of questionnaire data were assessed in the general Dutch ($N = 175$) and Turkish ($N = 175$) population screening samples of 2-year-olds (Yaman, Mesman, Van IJzendoorn, & Bakermans-Kranenburg, in press). The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL/1½-5) has previously been translated and validated in Turkish (Erol & Şimşek, 1997) and the Psychological Acculturation Scale has been used in the Netherlands and validated in research on immigrant groups (Stevens, Pels, Vollebergh, & Crijnen, 2004).

*Externalizing behaviors*

The Child Behavior Checklist for ages 1½ to 5 (CBCL/1½-5; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000) was used to assess child externalizing behaviors. We used the Turkish translation (Erol & Şimşek, 1997) and the Dutch translation (Koot, Van den Oord, Verhulst, & Boomsma, 1997) that have both been found to be valid and reliable. In the current study, the internal consistencies for Turkish and Dutch mother-reported CBCL were high for Externalizing Problems (.91/.90) and its
subscales: Oppositional (.86/.88) and Aggressive (.78/.77). For the Overactive scale the internal consistency was acceptable for both groups with .66 and .61, respectively.

*Maternal sensitivity*

During three problem-solving tasks (a construction task, a sorting task, and a jigsaw puzzle) mothers’ sensitive responsiveness to her child was measured, each task lasting five minutes. These tasks were somewhat difficult for 2-year-old children and therefore mothers were instructed to help their children in a way they would normally do. The observations were rated with the Erickson scales to measure mothers’ *Supportive presence, Intrusiveness, and Clarity of instruction* on 7-point scales (Egeland, Erickson, Moon, Hiester, & Korfmacher, 1990; Erickson, Sroufe, & Egeland, 1985). *Supportive presence* refers to the mother’s expression of emotional support and positive regard by encouraging, giving support and confidence, reassuring and acknowledging the child’s accomplishments on the tasks. *Intrusiveness* refers to the mother’s lack of respect of the child’s autonomy when exploring or in problem solving situations, by interfering with the child’s needs, desires, interests, or behaviors. *Clarity of instruction* reflects the mother’s ability to give her child instructions and feedback in a usable form, to structure the situation so that the child knows what the nature and goals of the task are, without solving the task herself. Scale scores were computed by averaging the scores for the separate tasks.

The scales were coded by the first author and a PhD colleague, who were first trained by the second author (the expert) to code tapes from the Dutch sample \((n = 20)\). The intraclass correlations (single rater, absolute agreement) for intercoder reliability between three pairs of coders ranged from .68 to .92 \((M = 0.78)\). Then, 20 tapes from the Turkish sample were translated and transcribed in Dutch by the first author, who speaks both the Turkish and Dutch language fluently, for the reliability check of coding the Turkish sample \((n = 20)\). The intraclass correlations (single rater, absolute agreement) for the Turkish sample were .71 for supportive presence, .76 for intrusiveness, and .71 for clarity of instruction. For the analyses, total maternal sensitivity was computed by summing the scores for supportive presence and clarity of instruction, and subtracting the score for maternal intrusiveness.

*Maternal discipline*

Specific maternal discipline strategies were observed during a four-minute clean-up task. After playing with attractive toys, the mother was asked to instruct her child to clean up the toys. The mother was allowed to help her child with three toys. Coding procedures were based on Kuczynski, Kochanska, Radke-Yarrow, and Girnius-Brown (1987) and Van der Mark, Van
Ijzendoorn, and Bakermans-Kranenburg (2002). Maternal authoritative control (positive feedback, positive atmosphere, induction, and understanding) and authoritarian control (commanding and physical interference) were observed. Positive feedback and creating a positive atmosphere involved giving compliments and making positive remarks when the child was cleaning up, and responding to what the child said (e.g., which toy wants to sleep in the basket?). Induction was coded when mothers explained why their child should not play further (even when this is not the real reason) and when mothers showed interest or were considerate of their child’s emotions when cleaning up the toys understanding was coded. Considering the negative discipline strategies, commanding was coded when mothers gave their child instructions to clean up in an authoritarian manner. When the mother used physical force to constrain the child from playing with the toys or to make the child clean up the toys, we coded this as physical interference. The number of times the mother had used a specific category was divided by the time of the episode and standardized to three minutes (see Alink et al., 2009).

All five coders (students with a Bachelor’s degree) spoke the Turkish and the Dutch language fluently and were blind to other data concerning the participants. First, a Dutch set was coded for intercoder reliability. Coders had a mean intraclass correlation (single rater, absolute agreement) with the expert of .80 for authoritative control (range = .71 - .91, n = 25) and .76 for authoritarian control (range = .71 - .86, n = 25). Then, the coders observed a Turkish set; the mean intraclass correlations (single rater, absolute agreement) for intercoder reliability (for all separate pairs of coders) were .84 (range = .74 - .97, n = 20) for authoritative control and .88 (range = .75 - .94, n = 20) for authoritarian control.

Acculturation
To measure the acculturation level of the mother, two components of acculturation were used, namely Turkish and Dutch language use (language acculturation) and psychological acculturation with regard to the Turkish and Dutch culture. With regard to language use Turkish immigrant mothers were asked how often they speak the Turkish and Dutch language with important others (their children, spouse, family members, and friends) (Van Oort et al., 2006). This scale consists of 12 items rated on a 5-point scale (ranging from 0, never, to 4, always/ very often). The internal consistencies for the use of the Turkish and Dutch language were .81 and .75 respectively. Regarding the psychological acculturation of the mothers, the adapted version of the Psychological Acculturation Scale (PAS) was used (Stevens et al., 2004). Emotional connectedness of the mothers to the Turkish (six items) and the Dutch culture (six items) (e.g., I feel comfortable around Dutch/ Turkish people) were rated on a 5-point scale (ranging from 0,
totally disagree, to 4, totally agree). The internal consistencies for the emotional connectedness to the Turkish and Dutch culture were .83 and .79 respectively.

Statistical Analyses

The data showed one outlier for authoritarian control in the Dutch group and in the Turkish immigrant group, and one outlier for authoritative control in the Turkish immigrant group. When outliers (|z| > 3.29) were winsorized (i.e., “moved in close to the good data”, Hampel, Ronchetti, & Rousseeuw, 1986) by replacement of the outlying scores with the next highest value (with |z| < 3.29) in the distribution, the results were the same. One multivariate outlier in the Turkish immigrant group was removed from the analyses.

We used ANOVA to examine differences between the groups and correlation analysis to investigate relations between parenting behaviors in the Turkish immigrant and Dutch group. To investigate whether patterns of associations between parenting behaviors could be captured with similar models in the Turkish immigrant and Dutch group, we performed a confirmatory factor analysis, using the program EQS (Bentler, 1989). We used multigroup analysis, which implies fitting a factor model to several groups simultaneously. Between-group constraints such as equal factor loadings or equal error variances can be formulated to make model estimations more similar between groups, and to investigate specific hypotheses about these similarities. Fitting a model without between-group constraints equals fitting the model to both groups separately, and combining the fit measures. The fit of a confirmatory factor analysis is represented by several indices, of which we report chi-square with degrees of freedom, the root mean square of approximation (RMSEA), and the comparative fit index (CFI; recommended by Bentler, 1990). For the fit to be acceptable, conventional criteria indicate that chi-square should be non-significant, CFI should be higher than .90 (preferably between .95 and 1.00), and RMSEA should be below 0.10. Wald statistics are computed in EQS to compare the current model to models in which particular estimated parameters are fixed to a specific value (mostly zero). Lagrange multiplier statistics are computed to compare a model to models in which particular restrictions are released.

Results

Preliminary analyses
First, we investigated if there were differences between the Turkish immigrant and the Dutch group in maternal age and education. Turkish immigrant mothers \((M = 26.86, SD = 2.99)\) were significantly younger than Dutch mothers \((M = 32.71, SD = 4.19); t(138) = 9.52, p < .01,\) and Turkish immigrant mothers had a lower educational level on a scale of 1 to 5 \((M = 2.83, SD = 0.72)\) than Dutch mothers \((M = 3.40, SD = 1.08); t(138) = 3.68, p < .01.\)

**Parenting in the Dutch and the Turkish immigrant groups**

First, we compared Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers on parenting behaviors (maternal sensitivity and control) without controlling for the effect of maternal age and education (see Table 3.1). We found significant differences between the mothers in overall maternal sensitivity and all its subscales, and in their use of authoritative control. Turkish immigrant mothers were less sensitive during the tasks: they were less supportive, gave less clear instructions, and were more intrusive than Dutch mothers. With regard to control strategies, Turkish immigrant mothers were less authoritative in their strategies during the clean-up task than Dutch mothers. No differences were found in authoritarian control. After controlling for maternal age and education, these differences between the groups remained (see Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1**

*Differences between the Dutch and Turkish immigrant groups on parenting behaviors*

|                      | Dutch \((n = 70)\) | Turkish \((n = 70)\) | Group differences \((F\)-values\) |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
|                      | Mean \((SD)\)     | Range             | Mean \((SD)\)     | Range             | Uncorrected    | Corrected¹                     |
| Sensitivity          | 6.38 (1.74)       | 1.6 - 9.8         | 2.65 (3.05)       | -2.8 - 9.5        | 77.36 **       | 32.95 **                       |
| Supportive presence  | 4.67 (0.93)       | 2.5 - 6.3         | 3.79 (1.38)       | 1.5 - 6.7         | 19.54 **       | 6.01 *                         |
| Intrusiveness        | 2.84 (0.77)       | 1.8 - 5.0         | 4.06 (1.21)       | 1.5 - 6.5         | 50.74 **       | 18.35 **                       |
| Clarity of instruction | 4.55 (0.56)      | 3.5 - 5.8         | 2.98 (0.94)       | 1.0 - 5.3         | 143.24 **      | 70.04 **                       |
| Control              |                   |                   |                   |                   |                 |                                 |
| Authoritative        | 12.80 (5.04)      | 3.0 - 25.5        | 9.88 (4.87)       | 1.7 - 22.2        | 12.16 *        | 4.41 *                         |
| Authoritarian        | 4.67 (4.24)       | 0.0 - 15.9        | 5.51 (4.11)       | 0.0 - 16.6        | 1.43           | 0.18                           |

*Note.* ¹ Controlled for maternal age and education; *p < .05; **p < .001

**Correlates of parenting behaviors in the Dutch and Turkish immigrant groups**
To examine the associations between maternal age, education, maternal sensitivity, and authoritarian and authoritative control Pearson correlations were computed (see Table 3.2). Higher maternal age was related to more sensitivity and supportive presence, and less intrusiveness in the Turkish immigrant group. In the Dutch group, age was not related to any of the parenting behaviors, but was positively related to maternal education. Low maternal education was associated with more intrusiveness and less maternal sensitivity in the Dutch group. In the Turkish immigrant group, lower education was related to less maternal sensitivity and clarity of instruction. We also analyzed the associations between parenting behaviors in both ethnic groups. In the Turkish immigrant group, authoritative control was related in the expected direction to all indicators of maternal sensitivity (more authoritative control relates to more supportive presence and clarity of instruction, and less intrusiveness). In the Dutch group, more authoritative control was related to less authoritarian control and less intrusiveness of the mothers. With regard to authoritarian control, more control was associated with more maternal intrusiveness in both ethnic groups and also with less maternal sensitivity in the Turkish immigrant group. Specifically correlations between supportive presence and the other parental behaviors were higher in the Turkish immigrant group.

Table 3.2

| Parenting correlates in the Dutch group and the Turkish immigrant group |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | 1.              | 2.              | 3.              | 4.              | 5.              | 5a.             | 5b.              | 5c.              |
| 1. Age mother   | -               | -.01            | .15             | -.12            | .34**           | .32**           | -.31**           | .21              |
| 2. Education    | .34**           | -               | .03             | -.17            | .25*            | .20             | -.19             | .28*             |
| 3. Authoritative control | .02            | .05             | -               | -.18            | .37**           | .35**           | -.30*            | .27*             |
| 4. Authoritarian control | -.11           | -.23            | -.38**          | -               | -.26*           | -.12            | .39**            | -.14             |
| 5. Sensitivity  | -.06            | .26*            | .18             | -.18            | -.94**          | -.82**          | .76**            | -                |
| 5a. Supportive Presence | -.10           | .15             | .03             | -.04            | .82**           | -               | -.68**           | .66**            |
| 5b. Intrusiveness | .02             | -.38**          | -.24*           | .32*            | -.75**          | -.34**          | -                | -.37**           |
| 5c. Clarity of instruction | .00            | .03             | .16             | -.05            | .72**           | .42**           | -.40**           | -                |

*Note. The correlation coefficients presented below the diagonal are for the Dutch group and above the diagonal for the Turkish immigrant group. *p < .05; **p < .01

To investigate whether these group differences in associations between aspects of parenting were substantial, we specified a one-factor structural equation model in which the parenting behaviors were indicators of one underlying parenting dimension. On substantive grounds, we allowed measurement errors of the following variables to be correlated: (a)
authoritarian and authoritative control, because these were observed using the same observation instrument; (b) authoritarian control and intrusiveness, because these both reflect a lack of respect for child autonomy; (c) intrusiveness and support, as these both indicate levels of (negative) involvement with the child, and (d) authoritative control and support, as both indicate positive involvement with the child. We also assumed error variances of the variables measured with the same instrument to be equal.

Fitting this one-factor model to both the Dutch and the Turkish immigrant group without any between group constraints resulted in an unsatisfactory fit; $X^2 = 16.60 \ (df = 8; \ p = 0.03)$, CFI = 0.945, and RMSEA = 0.125. Based on Lagrange multiplier statistics, we decided to improve fit by releasing the constraint of equal error variances between the sensitivity scales. Also, in accordance with the Wald statistics, we made the model more parsimonious by setting the error correlation between authoritative control and supportive presence to zero ($X^2_{\text{change}} = 0.003, \ p = 0.96$).

The resulting model is displayed in Figure 3.1. Fit indices for this model were satisfactory: $X^2 = 6.44 \ (df = 6, \ p = 0.38)$, CFI = 0.997, and RMSEA = 0.033. The results showed small (insignificant) loadings in both groups for authoritarian control, indicating that this variable is not needed for the factor. Also, we found relatively small loadings for authoritative control in both groups. However, authoritative and authoritarian control together did not provide a proper basis for a second factor. When (unstandardized) loadings were restricted to be equal between groups, the fit turned inadequate, indicating that the differences in loadings between the groups were indeed substantial. Thus, the observation instruments did not measure exactly the same factor in both groups, that is, the model was not measurement invariant (see Lubke, Dolan, Kelderman, & Mellenbergh, 2003). Most loadings, in particular for supportive presence, were higher in the Turkish immigrant group, reflecting the relatively high correlations between parenting behaviors in the Turkish immigrant group, specifically between supportive presence and the other behaviors.²

From the results in Figure 3.1 we derived that authoritarian control could be removed from the model for both groups, and different patterns of error correlations were found for the Turkish immigrant and for the Dutch group. In fact, for the Dutch group, a very simple model with loadings for authoritative control, supportive presence, intrusiveness, and clarity of instruction, with all error correlations set to zero, and without any constraints did fit as well ($X^2 =

---

1 If the fit of the unconstrained model was unsatisfactory, between group constraints only led to a decrease in model fit.
2 Note that error correlation between intrusiveness and supportive presence in the Turkish group was high but non-significant, due to its high standard error.
2.437, $df = 2$, $p = 0.30$, CFI = 0.984, RMSEA = 0.056). The four loadings resulting from this alternative model were similar to those in Figure 3.1.

Based on the fitted model, we computed an overall positive parenting variable by standardizing and then adding supportive presence, clarity of instruction, and authoritative control and subtracting intrusiveness, and we correlated this variable with maternal age and education in both groups. Positive parenting significantly correlated only with Turkish mothers’ age ($r = .33, p < .01$). We then compared the two groups and, as expected, Turkish immigrant mothers scored lower on the overall positive parenting variable $F (1, 138) = 76.45, p < .01$, even after controlling for maternal age and education, $F (1, 138) = 30.86, p < .01$.

**Turkish Immigrant Group**
Gender-differentiated parenting and the association between acculturation and parenting

We found no gender-differentiated parenting practices in both ethnic groups, which confirmed that Dutch and Turkish immigrant mothers do not rear their sons and daughters differently.

In the Turkish immigrant group only, we also examined the associations between the Turkish and Dutch language use, emotional connectedness to the Turkish and Dutch culture, maternal age and education on the one hand, and maternal sensitivity, and authoritarian and authoritative control strategies on the other hand. Mothers’ higher emotional connectedness to the Turkish culture was related to less authoritative control ($r = -0.25, p < 0.05$), and more use of the Turkish language was associated with more maternal sensitivity ($r = 0.26, p < 0.05$) and supportive presence ($r = 0.28, p < 0.05$). We found no other relations between Dutch and Turkish language use.
and emotional connectedness to the Dutch and the Turkish culture on the one hand, and maternal age, education, maternal sensitivity, and control on the other.

**Discussion**

Turkish immigrant mothers were observed to be less sensitive and to use less authoritative controlling strategies than Dutch mothers. No differences were found between the two groups in their use of authoritarian control. After controlling for maternal age and education, all differences in parenting behaviors between the groups remained significant. In both groups, parenting behaviors could be captured with similar models in which authoritarian control was not included in a one-factor model of positive parenting. This suggests that authoritarian control represents a different dimension than the other parenting behaviors, in both ethnic groups. We found no differences in gender-differentiated parenting in the two ethnic groups. With regard to maternal acculturation, Turkish immigrant mothers who felt emotionally more connected to the Dutch culture used more authoritative control, whereas mothers who spoke the Turkish language more frequently were more sensitive.

As expected, Turkish immigrant mothers were observed to be more intrusive than Dutch mothers, reflecting more demands without explanations, more (physical) interference in the child’s activities, and less respect for the child’s autonomy. In addition, Turkish immigrant mothers used less authoritative control than Dutch mothers. These results are consistent with previous studies among collectivistic oriented families in which dependence and obedience in children are encouraged, autonomy is not valued, and authoritative discipline strategies, such as verbal reasoning and induction, are less common. However, contrary to our expectation, no differences in authoritarian control were found between Turkish immigrant and Dutch mothers. This may be due to the fact that the current study included only second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers. Their parenting practices may be shifting from strict authoritarian control to more inductive reasoning and explaining (Pels et al., 2006).

Consistent with our hypothesis, Turkish immigrant mothers were less supportive during the problem-solving tasks than Dutch mothers. These findings confirm previous results that compared Turkish immigrant with Dutch native families (Leseman & Van den Boom, 1999). The context of a problem-solving task may have exacerbated differences in sensitivity between the two groups for two reasons. First, immigrant parents tend to have higher academic aspirations for their children than native parents of the same social class (Pels et al., 2006; Phalet & Andriessen, 2003), which may have led to mothers’ putting extra pressure on their children to perform well,
making them less sensitive to their children’s needs than Dutch mothers. Second, it is also
possible that Turkish immigrant mothers are less used to solving structured tasks (e.g., making
puzzles) with their children as this activity is less common in Turkish immigrant than in Dutch
families. However, the fact that Turkish immigrant mothers also show less authoritative control in
the clean-up paradigm does suggest that the problem-solving tasks were not solely responsible for
differences in supportive parenting behaviors.

When interpreting the ethnic group differences, we need to keep in mind that these
differences become smaller when maternal age and education are taken into account. Thus,
maternal age and education partially account for a certain amount of variance in group
differences. This does not take away the fact that Turkish toddlers are more often reared by
younger and lower educated mothers than Dutch toddlers and therefore as a group experience less
sensitive parenting and less authoritative control. However, age and education seem more
important than ethnicity in determining the parenting style of Turkish immigrant mothers.

Contrary to our hypothesis, we found that not only in the Dutch group, but also in the
Turkish immigrant group, more maternal intrusiveness was associated with lower levels of
supportive presence, higher levels of authoritarian, and lower levels of authoritative control. In
addition, authoritarian control was associated with lower levels of maternal sensitivity in the
Turkish immigrant group. Moreover, the patterns of associations among parenting behaviors for
the Dutch and the Turkish immigrant group were similar. This means that when Dutch and
Turkish immigrant mothers are more supportive, they are also less intrusive, give clearer
instructions, and discipline their children in a more authoritative manner. This pattern is
consistent with the literature on parenting styles showing that high support, respect for autonomy,
and positive control go together and reflect an authoritative parenting style (Maccoby & Martin,
1983). Thus, when parenting behaviors are observed, the structure of parenting behaviors in
families with individualistic and families with collectivistic cultural backgrounds is similar, a
finding also reported by Wu et al. (2002). We did find ethnically different patterns of error
correlations for the Turkish immigrant and for the Dutch group which is probably due to the fact
that the three scales of maternal support, intrusiveness, and clarity of instruction were coded by
one coder in the Turkish immigrant group, and by three different coders in the Dutch group,
which might have created more correlated measurement error in the Turkish immigrant group.

In both groups, authoritarian control did not load significantly on the parenting factor
suggesting that authoritarian control represents a different dimension than the other parenting
behaviors. As Turkish immigrant mothers were exposed to the Dutch individualistic society all
their lives, these mothers are probably acquainted with parenting practices of the host society
which can explain the similar patterns of associations found in both ethnic groups. However, as mentioned above, we did find that Turkish immigrant mothers were less supportive, which can not be explained by their collectivistic family values. As Turkish immigrant mothers belong to a minority group, it is possible that they experience stresses that affect their parenting (Bertrand, Hermans, & Leseman, 1998; Santos, Bohon, & Sánchez-Sosa, 1998). Indeed, the Turkish immigrant mothers from this study reported more daily stress than their Dutch counterparts (Yaman et al., in press).

Consistent with our hypothesis, second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers did not differ in their parenting behaviors towards their sons and daughters. This was also shown in a previous study among Turkish immigrant families with school-age children in which no differences were found in supportive parenting and authoritative control with regard to the gender of the children (Wissink et al., 2006). According to previous studies, a shift from conservatism with regard to gender roles towards more egalitarian ones is taking place among Turkish immigrant women in Western Europe (Phalet & Haker, 2004 as cited in Güngör & Bornstein, 2008). This may suggest that gender-differentiated parenting among second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers is also shifting in which boys and girls are treated more equally.

In our study, more maternal acculturation was associated with more authoritative control. Thus, acculturation is linked to parenting behaviors more typical of the host culture. On the other hand, Turkish immigrant mothers who spoke the Turkish language more often were more supportive in their interactions with their children. This finding suggests that cultural maintenance, in the form of ethnic language use, may also be advantageous in the parenting context.

There are some limitations of our study that need to be taken into account. First, observations of parenting behaviors in the Turkish immigrant and Dutch group were conducted in different environmental contexts (home versus laboratory) which may have inflated group differences. However, several studies did not find differences in maternal sensitivity and gentle discipline between the home and laboratory settings (e.g., Bornstein et al., 2006; Van der Mark, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & Van IJzendoorn, 2002). Further, mean level differences need not affect the associations between the parenting behaviors. Second, we observed sensitivity and discipline during tasks that were perhaps not so common in the Turkish culture. In future studies, parenting behaviors should also be observed during daily situations, such as mealtime, and bedtime. Despite these limitations, this study is one of the very few to observe parenting practices of second-generation Turkish immigrant mothers of toddlers in Europe.
In conclusion, our findings suggest that even in second-generation immigrant families the mean levels of parenting behaviors may still be different from those in the host culture, but that the patterns of associations between parenting behaviors are comparable. In future parenting intervention programs for Turkish immigrant families, a focus on Turkish mothers’ sensitivity and authoritative control towards their young children seems to be especially important.