The Comparative Analysis of the Perceptions of Parental Styles and Attitudes and Parental Attachment of University Students

Ayşe Dilek Öğretir-Özçelik[1]

---

[1] Associate Professor, PhD., Gazi University, Gazi Education Faculty, Primary Education Department, Early Childhood Education Programme, dilekogretir@gmail.com, ogretir@gazi.edu.tr

Abstract

Adolescence is an important stage for parental attitudes and parental attachment style may affect each other. In this study, university students were comparatively analyzed in terms of their perceptions about their parents' attitudes and their parental attachment styles. The sample of the study consists of 214 female and 187 male students from a university in Turkey. In order to measure children's perceptions of their parents' attitudes as well as children's demographic information, the researchers were prepared the 'Personal Information Form' and was implemented into the classroom settings. In addition, in order to measure attachment styles, the 'Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment Short Version (IPPA-S) was used. Participants were asked to complete The Parental Attitude Scale (PSC) in order to determine the adolescents' perceptions of their mothers and fathers attitudes. Data were analyzed using SPSS 20. Descriptive statistics, t-test and one-way ANOVA were used. Findings indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the adolescent perceptions of maternal and paternal style and parental attachment styles. Authoritative parenting style had more secure attachment than other three parenting styles (authoritarian, permissive/indulgent and negligent). Also, it had better results than the other three parenting styles for both maternal and paternal attachment sub-scales.

Key Words: Adolescents, Parental Attitudes, Attachment, Perception,

Introduction

Children are the sources of the next generation in the world and the families have had an objective bring up their children in a good environment. The upbringing of the children has exposed big responsibilities to the families in order to prepare a child for the social life. In the 21st century world, the parents have no longer duties to satisfy basic physical human needs of the children namely food, shelter, clothing, etc. Moreover, they have to meet the psychological needs of the children, love their children, help them to achieve their personal development and show an interest in their lives (Neeraja, 2008, p. 5). One of the decisive factors in the children development is the parental attitude toward their children and each other. If there are mutual love and respect in the family relations, it is highly likely that parental attitudes may cause healthy emotional development and decrease tension and conflicts in the family (Mangal, 2007, p. 100).

Family plays an important role for the individual attitudes and behaviors. Socialization process starts in the family environment. Many behavioral problems in adolescents may have rooted in the childhood upbringing especially unsuccessful mother-father-child relationship (Robinson, 2009). The social, emotional and moral development of the children mostly depends on interactions styles of mothers and fathers with each other as well as their children. The interaction between parents and child is closely affecting and affected by a variety of social outcomes including peer relations, moral development, achievement and aggression (Ogretir-Ozcelik, 2017a). During the childhood, the quality not the quantity of the parent-child relationship is an important factor for the socialization process. In a child development literature, it is a long tradition to study the effect of the parent-child relationship on the development of child's behavior, attitude and attachment. Most of the studies in the parental attachment and style usually follow Baumrind's hypothesis that parenting styles are contemplated to be an analytical process of socialization (Baumrind, 1968; Öğretir-Özçelik, 2017c).

Parenting style concerns with studying the relationships between parents and children. Parenting style combines several elements in order to create the emotional climate in which parents communicate with their attitudes about their child (McQueen, 2015). Parents perform

specific practices such as spanking to assure the child do his/her homework and involve children's activities. Parenting style shows the parents' overall feelings about the child through tone of voice, temper, emotional display, quality of attention and even body language (Bornstein and Zlotnik, 2009, p. 281).

Parenting style investigates parenting influences on children's development. The leading researcher in parenting style, Diana Baumrind, implemented comprehensive research by observing parents interaction with their children in their homes. She introduced the first typology with three parenting styles based on levels of responsiveness and control: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive (Baumrind, 1971; Öğretir-Özçelik, 2017b). The authoritative parenting style is characterized by high responsiveness the child's needs and at the same time demanding the child to comply with a reasonable set of limits and rules (Shaffer, 2009). It can be best exemplified by a democratic family environment in which adolescents are encouraged to share their opinions and participate in family decision-making process. The parent may play the authority figure and stay firm but respect and support the child's individuality and autonomy (Öğretir, 1999). According to Baumrind, the most successful parenting style is the authoritative parenting. When the parent uses this style, they balance control with warmth and created children who were socially competent and self-reliant (White and Schnurr, 2012, p. 59). Characteristics of the authoritative parenting are as follows: clear settings of standards by parents, an expectation of maturity from the child, use of commands and sanctions, firm enforcement of rules, open communications between parent and child, encouragement of verbal give-and-take in the family communication, respecting child's independence and recognition of the rights of both parents and children (Powell and Schmitt, 2016; Nevid, 2008, p. 316).

The second style is the authoritarian parent who displays high control and little warm. The parent discourages the child's autonomy, limits the child's emotional expression, and gives importance to obedience. The authoritarian parents are overcontrolling and rigid (Bjorklund and Blasi, 2012, p. 518). If the children questionize the parent and dare to ask why they follow the rules, the answer likely includes these phrases: "Because I am the parent and you are not." or "Because I say so." The authoritarian parents set absolute standards to attempt to control child behaviors. They emphasize respect for authority discourages parent-child give-and-take (Pressley and McCormick, 2007, p. 305).

The third style is permissive that conceptualizes the parent as tolerant and accepting. Permissive parent fails to restrict the child, uses little punishment, demands no mature behaviors from the child, and allows a high level of autonomy (Weiten and Lloyd, 2006, p. 364). The amount of parental warmth and affection toward the child is low. The parents show low levels of control. Baumrind later includes neglectful parenting that is a low level of acceptance and control (low emotional support and low limits). Also, many researchers found a high level of relationships between children's behaviors and attitudes and parenting styles (Weiten, et.al., 2012, p. 189).

Maccoby and Martin (1983) later revised the Baumrind's typology by testing the generalizability on more diverse sets of populations. They conceptualized parenting styles in two dimensions their orthogonal approach with a quadripartite model: responsiveness and demandingness. The first dimension, demandingness, is similar to the dimension of control. It refers to parental control and how much the parent expects the child to exhibit responsibility and maturity (Lerner et al., 2001, p. 486). Parents supervise their children activities, attempt to discipline the child and respond to the child request if he or she disobeys. This dimension can be operationalized as follows: psychological autonomy versus psychological control, permissiveness versus restrictiveness, overprotection versus autonomy and independence (Sigelman and Rider, 2012, p. 490). The second dimension, responsiveness, can be conceptualized with affection, acceptance, sharing, positive evaluation, emotional support,

equalitarian treatment, care, empathy, and closeness. In the other dimension, it includes emotional coldness, rejection, ignoring, neglecting, rejection and indifference (Levine and Munsch, 2014; Peterson, et al., 2012.pp. 23-24).

Many studies suggest that there is an equal contribution of mother and father on child development. The fathers may have a different influence on their children than the mothers. They can make an independent and unique input into their children social development especially their social behavior with peers. Although fathers may have involved fewer children development in terms of time and energy with quantitative terms, their impact on their children development qualitatively is rather important as mothers on social and cognitive development (Parke and Buriel, 2006, p. 438).

In early childhood, the study of attachment bonds between parent and child is primarily a core area of academic work (Bowlby, 1969). In recent scientific studies, it has seen the reconceptualization of attachment by shifting from early childhood through to adolescence. Some studies examine in a greater depth of the study of adolescents' actual attachment relationship and their parental attitude. From the childhood development perspective, adolescence is an important stage for critical change in emotional, behavioral and cognitive systems for attachment. Adolescents begin to apart themselves from their parents and acquire their own point of views (Newman and Newman, 2012, p. 329). The transition from childhood to adolescence can be equated to search for greater autonomy and independence from their parents (Breinbauer and Maddaleno, 2005). The parent may have a need to modify autonomy and connectedness in the family environment. However, the attachment relationship between the parent and adolescent still goes on if the adolescent has close, lasting and secure relationships and attachment bonds with his/her parent. In a high-context (collectivistic) culture society such as Turkey (Ogretir, 2008), even if adolescents behave independently from their parents, they can look for support in case of real need and they believe that their parents are available attachment figures. From a theoretical point of view, it is crucial to examine similarities and differences between the typical attachment style between parent and adolescent because of the significance of attachment in adolescence.

Methods

Research Model

The parenting style and adolescents' parental attachment have possible relationships with each other as well as other variables such as gender. As a result, the present study is crucial to evaluate whether there are any changes between parenting style and adolescents' attachment style among the university students in Turkey. The research question of the study is whether there is a statistically significant difference between parenting styles (authoritative, permissive, authoritarian, and negligent) and adolescents' parental attachment total score and subscale scores (trust, communication, alienation). The current study is an important contribution examining any effects of parenting style on parental attachment and vice versa in a different cultural context, specifically the Turkish case. It also helps parents, counselors, and other important institutions to realize the importance of parenting styles and parental attachment. It may produce future researchers on investigating the relationship among parenting styles, parental attachment sub-scales and other variables in different contexts. The current study employed descriptive and inferential statistical models.

Participants

The sample of the study was chosen in random sampling from the population of the study who was the university students provided demographic information about their age, department, class, place of birth, family type, parental marital status, number of children in the family, the sequence of the children, income status, and friendship relations with same sex and opposite sex. The study sample consisted of 187 (% 46,6) male and 214 (% 53,4) female students. The age range of the participants was as follows: 15-20 years old were 160 (% 39,9) and 21-25 years old were 241 (% 60,1).

Table 1. Demographic Results of the University Students

	Variables	n	%
	Female	214	53,4
Gender	Male	187	46,6
	Total	401	100
	15-20 years old	160	39,9
Age	21-25 years old	241	60,1
	Total	401	100

Data Collection Tools

For the data collection tools, the participants filled out the personal information form as well as two instruments. First, the parental attitudes scale (PAS) was used in this study. Second, the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA-S) short version was filled out by the participants.

Parental Attitude Scale (PAS)

The instrument was designed to measure parental attitudes and developed by Lamborn et al. (1991). In a short version, it has 26-item in 4-point Likert Scale that is based on 3 factors. The factors are Acceptance/Involvement, Control/Supervision, and Psychological Autonomy. There are 9 items in the Acceptance/Involvement dimension of the scale, 8 items in the Control/Supervision and 9 items in the Psychological Autonomy. The score of internal consistency coefficients for acceptance/involvement was 0.72. For control/supervision, the score of coefficiency was 0.76. The psychological autonomy was 0.82. The adaptation of the scale has been made by Yılmaz (2000) with reliability and validity tests of the scale in the Turkish language. It was indicated that for the acceptance/involvement sub-scale test-retest validity coefficient was 0.74, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was 0.60; for strictness/supervision the test-retest validity coefficient was 0.93 and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was 0.75; and for psychological autonomy, test-retest validity coefficient was 0.79 and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was 0.67.

Four parental attitudes are categorized from intersecting Acceptance/Involvement with Control/Supervision dimensions. Median values of the scores are used in assessing parental attitudes, where children whose scores are in the median range. It is distinguished that the parents of the children who are graded over the median in Acceptance/Involvement and Control/Supervision dimensions are "democratic", the parents of the children who are graded under the median in those dimensions are "negligent". The parents of the children who are graded under the median and the parents of the children who are graded over the median in the Acceptance/Involvement dimension are put in "authoritative" category. The parents of the children who are graded above median in Acceptance/Involvement dimension and the parents of the children who are graded under median in Control/Supervision dimensions are

categorized as "permissive". Psychological-autonomy dimension is left out of the assessment. There were four parental styles: Authoritative, permissive, democratic and negligent (Tura, 2017: 31-32).

In the form, the Acceptance/Involvement dimension has nine items with numbers of 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17. The psychological autonomy dimension is numbered in nine items in the form with these numbers: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18. All of these dimensions were used the 4-point Likert scale. The Control/Supervision dimension has eight items in the scale with numbers 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26. The first two items were given 1 to 7 scores if the answer is "no". After item number 21, the scale was used 3-Likert point as 1 for "no effort", 2 for "less effort", and 3 for "more effort" (Yılmaz, 2000).

In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha for control/supervision subscale was 0,749. The Cronbach Alpha score for acceptance/involvement was 0,727. The Cronbach Alpha score for psychological autonomy was 0,719.

Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment Short Version (IPPA-S)

The attachment to parents was assessed with a short version of Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) (Armsden and Greenberg, 1987). The instrument was developed to measure both cognitive and affective dimensions of attachment security and trust in the responsiveness and accessibility of parents. It was adapted to Turkish by Günaydın et.al. (2005). The study sample filled out a shortened version of the scale (IPPA-S) that was designed by Raja et al. The instrument is divided into three sub-scales in order to shed light on the quality of communication and the degree of trust and alienation in parent-adolescent relationships. The instrument thinks the parents as a source of psychological security. It has three subscales, although the use of the total scores is recommended over subscales scores. The total score can be used for the secure attachment. The three subscales are labeled as trust (T), communication (C), and alienation (A) for three dimensions of the attachment relationship. Trust refers to the adolescents' trust that parents and peers respect their needs and desires and understand each other. Communication refers to adolescents' perceptions that parents and peers are responsive and sensitive to their emotional states and evaluating the quality and extent of involvement and verbal and non-verbal communication with them. Alienation refers to adolescents' feelings of detachment, isolation, and anger experienced in attachment relationships with parents and peers (Guarnieri et al., 2010).

In the shortened version, the form has 12 items that were scored on a seven-point Likert scale. When the participants have higher scores, it correlates with a more secure attachment for overall and subscale scores. A 7-point Likert scale was used with categories of 1=never to 7= always. For example, "I tell my mother/father about my problems and troubles" is one of the 12 items in IPPA-S form.

In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha score for total maternal attachment was 0,861. The Cronbach Alpha score for maternal trust was 0,762. The Cronbach Alpha scores for maternal communication and alienation was 0,736 and 0,676, respectively. For total paternal attachment of the Cronbach Alpha, the score was 0,889. The paternal trust score of the Cronbach Alpha was 0,783. The paternal communication and alienation of the Cronbach Alpha were 0,836 and 0,758, respectively.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by using SPSS 20 software. Percentages, median, t-test and one-way analysis (ANOVA), Independent sample t-test were employed to analyze the differences between gender and maternal and paternal attachment subscales. ANOVA test results were

treated for the analysis of differences between maternal and paternal attachment subscales and maternal and paternal parenting styles.

Results

Results of t-test which was performed to determine whether there were significant differences in university students' maternal attachment sub-scales and gender .

Table 2. *t-Test Results of University Students' Perceived Maternal Attachment Styles by Gender*

Maternal Attachment Subscales	Gender	n	Mean	Std.Deviations	t-Test	
					t	p
Maternal Trust	Female	214	16,78	3,40	1,211	,227
	Male	187	18,22	3,61		
Maternal Communication	Female	214	21,37	4,27	4,251	**0,000***
	Male	187	20,02	4,24		
Maternal Alienation	Female	214	9,03	4,66	-3,300	**0,000***
	Male	187	10,60	4,89		
Maternal Attachment	Female	214	67,27	11,72	4,151	**0,000***
	Male	187	62,36	11,88		

There were statistically significant differences in sub-dimension points of maternal attachment and gender [t (401) = 4,151, p<.000]. The mean scores of maternal attachment of female students ($\overline{X}$ = 67,27) were much higher than the mean scores of maternal attachment of male students ($\overline{X}$ = 62,36). When the results for maternal communication attachment scores were compared, the results indicated statistically significant differences between gender [t(401)=4,251, p<.000]. The maternal communication scores of females ($\overline{X}$ =21,37) were much higher than the maternal communication scores of males ($\overline{X}$ =20,02). It is interesting to note that there were statistically significant differences between maternal alienation attachment subscale and adolescent gender. The results showed that maternal alienation sub-scale had much higher scores for male ($\overline{X}$ =10.60) than female ($\overline{X}$ =9.03) [t(401)= 3,300, p<.000]. However, there were no statistically significant differences between maternal trust attachment scores [t(401)=1,121, p<.227] by gender.

Table 3. *t-Test Results of University Students' Perceived Paternal Attachment Styles by Gender*

Paternal Attachment Subscales	Cinsiyet	n	Mean	Std.Deviations	t Testi	
					t	p
Paternal Trust	Female	214	22,83	4,98	3,269	**0,000***
	Male	187	21,06	5,87		
Paternal Communication	Female	214	20,04	5,21	2,355	0,019
	Male	187	18,78	5,50		
Paternal Alienation	Female	214	9,91	5,11	-3,528	**0,000***
	Male	187	11,86	5,93		
Paternal Attachment	Female	214	48,02	7,03	0,156	0,876
	Male	187	47,90	8,19		

In Table 3, the means, standard deviations, and t-test results of the paternal attachment sub-scales and gender were presented in order to analyze the effects of gender on parental attachment. Statistically significant difference was determined in sub-dimension points of paternal trust attachment sub-scale and gender [t (401) = 3,269, p<.000]. The mean scores of paternal trust attachment of female students ($\overline{X}$ = 22,83) were much higher than the mean scores of paternal trust attachment of male students ($\overline{X}$ = 21,06). Paternal alienation attachment subscale was significantly higher among female adolescents than male adolescents [t (401) = 3,528, p<.000]. The male students ($\overline{X}$ = 11,86) have statistically significant results on paternal alienation attachment than the female students ($\overline{X}$ = 9,91). It is noted that there were no statistically significant differences between paternal communication attachment subscales and gender. Similarly, results showed no significantly higher scores for paternal attachment scores by gender.

Table 4. *One-way ANOVA Test Results of the University Students' Maternal Parenting Styles and Maternal Attachment Style Sub-Scales*

Maternal Attachment Subscales	Maternal Parenting Style	n	Mean	Std.Deviations	One Way ANOVA	
					F	p
Maternal Trust	1.Neglectful	159	16,78	3,87	26,338	0,000*
	2.Permissive/ Indulgent	74	18,22	3,15		
	3. Authoritarian	67	18,86	2,87		
	4. Authoritative	101	20,36	2,15		
Maternal Communication	1. Neglectful	159	18,78	4,41	21,326	0,000*
	2.Permissive/ Indulgent	74	20,02	4,30		
	3.Authoritarian	67	21,83	4,29		
	4. Authoritative	101	22,70	3,36		
Maternal Alienation	1. Neglectful	159	12,00	5,08	28,460	,000*
	2.Permissive/ Indulgent	74	9,02	4,02		
	3.Authoritarian	67	9,55	4,25		
	4.Authoritative	101	6,93	3,50		

The relationship between the maternal attachment sub-scales and maternal parenting styles was examined whether there is a statistically significant relationship between two variables among the study sample. The means, standard deviations, and one-way ANOVA results were given in Table 4. According to the results, the scores of the attachment sub-scale of the maternal trust has statistically significant for maternal parenting styles for one-way ANOVA, F = 26,338; p<0.000. The mean score of the neglectful maternal style was (16,78±3,87). The mean score of the permissive-indulgent was (18,22±3,15). For the authoritarian maternal style, the score was (18,86±2,87). The score of the authoritative maternal style was (20,36±2,15). When we compare the maternal communication sub-scale and maternal parenting styles, there is a statistically significant difference F = 21,316, p. 0.000. In the maternal communication attachment subscale, the mean score of neglectful maternal style was (18,78±4,41). The permissive-indulgent and authoritarian maternal style had mean scores of (20,02±4,30) and (21,83±4,29), respectively. The mean score of the authoritative maternal style was (22,70±3,63). The one-way ANOVA result shows that the

difference between maternal alienation attachment style and maternal parenting style is a statistically significant F = 28,460, p. 0.000. The mean score of neglectful maternal style for maternal alienation was (12,00±5,08). The scores of the permissive-indulgent and authoritarian maternal style was (9,02±4,02) and (9,55±4,25), respectively. For the maternal alienation attachment subscale, the mean score of the authoritative maternal style was (6,93±3,50).

Table 5. *One-way ANOVA Test Results of the University Students' Maternal Parenting Styles and Maternal Attachment Style*

	Maternal Parenting Style	n	Mean	Std.Deviations	One Way ANOVA F	p
Maternal Attachment	1.Neglectful	159	58,13	11,80	47,620	0,000*
	2.Permissive/ Indulgent	74	65,87	10,89		
	3.Authoritarian	67	67,32	9,29		
	4.Authoritative	101	73,56	7,88		

In Table 5, the one-way ANOVA test results revealed that the total scores of maternal attachment and maternal parenting style were statistically significant, F = 47,620, p. 0.000. The mean score of the neglectful maternal style was (58,13±11,80). The mean score of the permissive-indulgent and authoritarian for the total score of maternal attachment was (65,87±10,89) and (67,32±9,29), respectively. The score of the authoritative maternal style for maternal attachment was the highest score (73,56±7,88).

Table 6. *One-way ANOVA Test Results of the University Students' Paternal Parenting Styles and Paternal Attachment Style Sub-Scales*

	Paternal Parenting Style	n	Mean	Std.Deviations	One Way ANOVA F	p
Paternal Trust	1.Neglectful	159	19,50	5,71	31,695	0,000*
	2.Permissive/ Indulgent	74	21,25	5,80		
	3.Authoritarian	67	23,95	4,09		
	4. Authoritative	101	25,20	3,10		
Paternal Communication	1.Neglectful	159	18,25	5,32	16,638	0,000*
	2.Permissive/ Indulgent	74	17,32	6,02		
	3.Authoritarian	67	21,34	4,88		
	4.Authoritative	101	21,65	3,99		
Paternal Alienation	1.Neglectful	159	13,27	5,65	27,946	0,000*
	2.Permissive/ Indulgent	74	11,06	5,63		
	3.Authoritarian	67	9,80	4,55		
	4.Authoritative	101	7,45	3,97		

In Table 6, one-way ANOVA was used to test for the statistically significant relationship between two variables, namely the paternal attachment sub-scales and paternal parenting styles. The means, standard deviations, and one-way ANOVA results were presented to analyze the effect of paternal parenting style and paternal attachment sub-scales

to each other. According to the results, the scores of the attachment sub-scale of the paternal trust has statistically significant for paternal parenting styles for one-way ANOVA, F = 31,695; p<0.000. The mean score of the neglectful paternal style was (19,50±5,71). The mean score of the permissive-indulgent was (21,25±5,80). For the authoritarian paternal style, the score was (23,95±4,09). The score of the authoritative paternal style was (25,20±3,10). When we compare the paternal communication sub-scale and paternal parenting styles, there is a statistically significant difference, F = 16,638, p. 0.000. In the paternal communication attachment subscale, the mean score of neglectful paternal style was (18,25±5,32). The permissive-indulgent and authoritarian paternal style had mean scores of (17,32±6,02) and (21,34±4,88), respectively. The mean score of the authoritative paternal style was (21,65±3,99). The one-way ANOVA result shows that the difference between paternal alienation attachment style and paternal parenting style is a statistically significant F = 27,946, p. 0.000. The mean score of neglectful maternal style for paternal alienation was (13,27±5,65). The scores of the permissive-indulgent and authoritarian paternal style was 11,06±5,63) and (9,80±4,55), respectively. For the paternal alienation attachment subscale, the mean score of the authoritative paternal style was (7,45±3,97).

Table 7. *One-way ANOVA Test Results of the University Students' Maternal Parenting Styles and Maternal Attachment Style*

	Paternal Parenting Style	n	Mean	Std.Deviations	One Way ANOVA F	p
Paternal Attachment	1.Neglectful	159	47,86	9,00		
	2.Permissive/ Indulgent	74	45,27	6,31	5,156	0,002*
	3.Authoritarian	67	49,88	7,16		
	4. Authoritative	101	48,85	5,54		

In Table 7, the one-way ANOVA test for paternal attachment and paternal parenting style displays statistically significant results, F = 5,156, p. 0.002. The mean score of the neglectful paternal style was (47,86±9,00). The mean score of the permissive-indulgent and authoritative for the total score of paternal attachment was (45,27±6,31) and (48,85±5,54), respectively. The score of the authoritarian paternal style for paternal attachment revealed the highest score (49,88±7,16).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the perceptions of the university students and adolescents differ between their parental attachment styles and parental styles. The findings in this study showed that parenting style may affect the secure attachment of the adolescents. In terms of the overall attachment characteristics, the study found some significant differences between parenting style sub-scales. This finding is consistent with other studies that report positive impact of authoritative parenting style on attachment. The positive impact, in turn, can result in less maternal and paternal distress and an increased possibility of secure attachment.

For the communication attachment sub-scale, the result is parallel to other reportings in the literature. When the parents have authoritative style, they have less communication barrier to their children. The presence of authoritative style can affect mother-adolescent and father-adolescent interaction in a positive way such as non-verbal communications and facial and postural behaviors as well as reciprocal smiling. In addition, the authoritative style may

increase the repertoire of the body and facial expressions and produce higher responsiveness between parent and adolescent (Öğretir, 2006). When the parent utilizes the authoritative style, both parent and adolescent understand verbal and non-verbal clues given by each other and give appropriate responses (Howe, 2006).

There should be at least three concerns to be analyzed in predicting attachment from the maternal and paternal point of views and parenting styles. The first is whether maternal and paternal attachment and parenting styles predict an independent and unique variance in parental attachment and attitude. That is, what is the contribution of parenting styles on parental attachment. Second, it should be noted that parenting behaviors especially parental control are more sensitive to cultural variations. The current study has indicated that culturally relevant factors may have effects on the universal parenting behaviors, such as warmth and rejecting parenting. Third, mothers are still seen as nurturing agent and fathers serve as the controlling agent in the majority of the cultures in the world. Similarly, the current study predicted that parenting styles differ in maternal and paternal attachment because the cultural variables may affect the university students' perceptions of their parents. The university students in Turkey may have higher levels of maternal trust and communication in authoritative parents than other three parenting styles because they perceived their authoritative parents more trustful and communicative.

The comparison between parenting style and attachment theory revealed that authoritative parenting is compatible with the accepting, sensitive, and cooperative parenting behaviors held up as attachment research. Authoritative parents resemble responsive attachment figures that pay special attention to the child's point of views and needs as well as use negotiation to push the child toward cooperation. They are leaders, not dictators (Bretherton et al., 1997). The attachment theory basic assumption is that effective parental behavior focuses basically on one criterion that is the attachment to the parent or other caregivers and psychological development in infancy.

Children who have authoritative parents tend to display self-confidence that their needs were met by the parent (Baumrind, 1991). They have the secure attachment with their primary caregivers because authoritative parenting is essentially supportive, responsive and warm (Doinita and Maria, 2015). On the opposite side, authoritarian parents have low self-esteem and show anxiety, aggression, and anger that is transmitted like psychological DNA to their children. Children who have permissive parents have low self-reliance and self-control (Baumrind, 1991). Permissive parents tend to withdraw their love from their children as a way of punishment. Both permissive and authoritarian parenting style are closely linked to insecurely attached children (resistant and avoidant). Because these parents are unable to self-regulate their emotional responses, they promote the more negative self-view in their children. Permissive and negligent parenting style is associated with fearfully attached and more avoidant children. The researchers have also indicated that there is a positive relationship between secure attachment style and authoritative parenting style (Karavasilis et.al., 2003).

It can be concluded that the study shows the importance of the parenting style on parental attachment for the child and adolescent development. The findings of the study will hopefully contribute to the studies in the field of child development and educational sciences.

References

Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs. Authoritative Parental Control. *Adolescence*, 3(11), 255–272.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monograph, 4*, (1, Pt.2).

Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P.A.

Cowan & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), Advances in family research (Vol. 2). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 111-163.

Bjorklund, David F. and Carlos H. Blasi. (2012). *Child and Adolescent Development: An Integrated Approach*, United States: Wadsworth.

Bornstein, M.H. and D. Zlotnik. (2009). Parenting Styles and their Effects, Janette B. Benson and Marshall M. Haith (eds.), *Social and Emotional Development in Infancy and Early Childhood*, New York: Elsevier, 280-293.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and lose: Vol. 1. Attachment.* New York: Basic Books.

Breinbauer, Cecilia and Matilde Maddaleno. (2005). *Youth: Choices and Change Promoting Healthy Behaviors in Adolescents*, Washington D.C.: PAHO.

Bretherton, I., B. Golby and E. Cho. (1997). Attachment and the Transmission of Values, J. Grusec and L. Kucszynski (eds.), *Handbook Series: Parenting and Children's Internationalization of Values*, New York: Wiley, pp. 103-134.

Doinita, Elena N. and N.Dorina Maria. (2015). "Attachment and Parenting Styles", *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol.203, August 2015, 199-204. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815049307 (Accessed on 30.01.2017).

Guarnieri, Silvia, Lucia Ponti and France Tani. (2010). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA): A Study on the Validity of Styles of Adolescent Attachment to Parents and Peers In an Italian Sample, *TPM*, Vol. 17, no.3, 103-130. http://www.tpmap.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/17.3.1.pdf

Howe D. Disabled children, parent-child interaction and attachment. *Child & family social work* 2006; 11:95-106.

Karavasilis, L., A.B.Doyle and D. Markiewicz. (2003). "Associations between Parenting Styles and Attachment to Mother in Middle Childhood and Adolescence", International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27 (2), 153-164. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0165025024400015 (Accessed on 30.01.2017).

Lerner, Jacqueline V., Richard M. Lerner and Jordan Finkelstein. (2001). *Adolescence in America: An Encyclopedia volume 1: A-M*, Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio.

Levine, Laura E. and Joyce Munsch. (2014). *Child Development: An Active Learning Approach*, 2nd ed., Los Angeles: Sage Pub.

Mangal, S.K. (2007). *Essentials of Educational Psychology*, New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology*. Vol. 4: Socialization, personality, and social development, New York: Wiley, 1-101.

McQueen, John P. (2015). *Reality-Based Parenting: How Parents of African Descent can Cultivate Loving Relationships with their Children*, Bloomington: Xlibris.

Neeraja, KP. (2008). *Essentials of Mental Health and Psychiatric Nursing vol.1*, New Delhi: Jaypee Brothers Medical Publishers.

Nevid, Jeffrey S. (2008). *Essentials of Psychology: Concepts and Applications*, 3rd ed., United States: Wadsworth.

Newman, Barbara M. and Philip R. Newman. (2012). *Development through Life: A Psychosocial Approach*, United States: Wadsworth.

Öğretir, A. D. (1999). *Alt ve Üst Sosyo-Ekonomik Düzeyde Altı Yaş Çocuklarının Sosyal Oyun Davranışlarıyla Ana-Baba Tutumları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*, Master Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çocuk Gelişimi ve Ev Ekonomisi Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Öğretir, A. Dilek. (2006). "Duygusal Gelişim ve Eğitim: Sözsüz İletişim, Problem Çözme ve

Sosyal Beceriler", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14, Mayıs 2006, 1-15.

Öğretir, A.D., (2008). The Relationship between Culture and the Conflict Resolution Styles: A Survey Method and a Statistical Analysis, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, *3* (2), 96-104. https://www.idosi.org/mejsr/mejsr3(2)/9.pdf (Retrieved on 18.02.2017).

Öğretir-Özçelik, Ayse Dilek. (2017a). Explanation and Understanding of Human Aggression: Freudian Psychoanalytical Analysis, Fromm's Neo-Freudian Perspective, and Bandura's Social Learning Theory, *International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research*, 2 (1), 2151-2164. http://ijsser.org/uploads/ijsser_02__133.pdf

Öğretir-Özçelik, Ayşe Dilek. (2017b). Investigating and Comparing the Relationship between Parental Monitoring Types and Perceived Parenting Styles of the Turkish Students, International Journal of Human Sciences, vol. 14, no.1, pp. 331-345. https://www.j-humansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/view/4400

Öğretir-Özçelik, Ayşe Dilek. (2017c). Examination of Social Skills of Pre-School Children in Turkey, European Journal of Education Studies, vol. 3, no.2, pp. 80-97.

Parke, Ross D. and Raymond Buriel (2006). "Socialization in the Family: Ethnic and Ecological Perspectives", Nancy Eisenberg (ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Social, Emotional and Personality Development* (volume 3), New York: John Wiley&Sons, 6th ed., 463-552.

Peterson, Gary W., Suzanne K. Steinmetz and Stephan M. Wilson. (2012). *Parent-Youth Relations:Cultural and Cross-cultural Perspectives*, New York: Routledge.

Powell, Douglas R. and Sara A. Schmitt. (2016). What Teachers Need to Know about Family Centered Practice, Leslie J. Couse and Susan L. Recchia (eds.), *Handbook of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, New York: Routledge, pp. 135-148.

Pressley, Michael and Christine McCormick (2007). *Child and Adolescent Development for Educators*, New York: Guilford Press.

Raja SN, McGee R, Stanton WR. Perceived attachments to parents and peers and psychological well-being in adolescence. *J. Youth Adolesc* 1992; 21:471-485.

Robinson, J. (2009). Empathy and Prosocial Behavior, Janette B. Benson and Marshall M. Haith (eds.), *Social and Emotional Development in Infancy and Early Childhood*, New York: Elsevier, 129-139.

Shaffer, David. R. (2009). Social and Personal Development, 6th ed., United States: Wadsworth.

Sigelman, Carol K. and Elizabeth A. Rider. (2012). *Life Span Human Development* 7e, New York: Wadsworth.

Tura, Gülşah. (2017). "Relations Of Peer-Victimization Exposure In Adolescents With The Perceived Social Support, Parental Attitude, School Success, School Change And Area Of Residence", *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 2017, 4 (1), 29-38. doi: 10.17220/ijpes.2017.01.004 http://www.ijpes.com/frontend//articles/pdf/v4i1/v04-i01-04pdf.pdf

Weiten, W., Dana S. Dunn and Elizabeth Y.Hammer. (2012). *Psychology Applied to Modern Life: Adjustment in the 21st Century*, United States: Wadsworth.

Weiten, Wayne and Margaret A. Lloyd. (2006). Psychology Applied to Modern Life: Adjustment in the 21st Century, 8th ed., United States: Wadsworth.

White, J. and M.P. Schnurr. (2012). "Developmental Psychology", Frederick T.L. Leong, et.al., *Internationalizing the Psychology Curriculum in the United States*, New York: Springer, 51-75.