FAMILY CONVERSATIONS ABOUT EMOTIONAL SHARED PAST EVENTS: THE TRIADIC EXAMINATION OF MOTHERS', FATHERS' AND CHILDREN'S MEMORY CHARACTERISTICS

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

BY

ELİF BÜRÜMLÜ

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

AUGUST 2017

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

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

_____

Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer
Head of Department

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

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument (METU, PSY) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar (METU, PSY) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hande Ilgaz (Bilkent Uni., PSY) _____

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

Name, Last name : Elif Bürümlü

Signature :

ABSTRACT

FAMILY CONVERSATIONS ABOUT EMOTIONAL SHARED PAST EVENTS: THE TRIADIC EXAMINATION OF MOTHERS', FATHERS' AND CHILDREN'S MEMORY CHARACTERISTICS

Bürümlü, Elif

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor : Assist. Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar

August 2017, 96 pages

The current study examines mother-father and child triads' memory conversations about positively and negatively charged past events. We especially aimed to investigate a) the extent to which parents' emotional conversation would change as a factor of child's gender, and b) composition of these conversations, referring to each family member's (mother, father, and child) individual conversational contribution to the overall composition of the family's reminiscing style. A hundred sixty-three participants consisting of 61 preschool aged children (M = 69.69, SD = 6.06), and both of their mothers (M_{age} = 35.76, SD = 4.89) and fathers (M_{age} = 39.26, SD = 5.07) participated. In light of the previous literature, it was anticipated that both parents

would use more and varied emotional memory characteristics when reminiscing with their daughters than they would do with their sons; regardless of child's gender, mothers would use more and varied emotional memory characteristics compared to fathers when reminiscing with their children; and finally mothers would use more and varied emotional characteristics when reminiscing with their daughters compared to with their sons in triadic memory conversations. Results indicated that both main effect of child's gender and parent type –with which parent children reminisce- on parental use of emotional memory characteristics was significant. However, the interaction effect of child's gender and parent type was not found to be significant. Additionally, mothers had the highest amount of word contribution to the triadic family reminiscing, whereas both children and mothers had the highest communicational contribution in terms of turn-takings to the oveall family composition of reminising. The findings of the current study were discussed with its limitations and future research directions.

Keywords: family reminiscing, shared emotional memory conversation, gender, gender differences in memory characteristics

ÖZ

ORTAK DUYGUSAL GEÇMİŞ OLAYLARLA İLGİLİ AİLE KONUŞMALARI: ANNELERİN, BABALARIN VE ÇOCUKLARIN ANI ÖZELLİKLERİNİN ÜÇLÜ OLARAK İNCELENMESİ

Bürümlü, Elif

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi : Yard. Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar

Ağustos 2017, 96 sayfa

Bu çalışma, anne-baba ve çocuk üçlülerinin, geçmişte beraber yaşadıkları, duygusal olarak olumlu ve olumsuz açıdan etkilendikleri olaylar üzerine yaptıkları konuşmaları incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmanın asıl amaçları, özellikle a) ebeveynlerin ortak anı konuşmalarında kullandıkları duygusal ifadelerin, çocukların hangi ebeveynle konuştuğunun (ebeyn türü: anne veya baba) ve çocuğun cinsiyetinin etkisiyle ne ölçüde farklılaşacağını ve b) her bir aile üyesinin (anne, baba ve çocuk), ailenin anı aktarma stillerine olan bireysel katkısına bakılarak, aile içi duygusal içerikli konuşmaların genel kompozisyonunu araştırmaktır. Çalışmaya, okul öncesi yaş aralığında olan 61 çocuk (M = 69.69, SD = 6.06), ile hem anneleri ($M_{yaş}$ = 35.76,

SD = 4.89) hem de babaları ($M_{yaş}$ = 39.26, *SD* = 5.07) olmak üzere toplam 183 katılımcı dahil edilmiştir. İlgili alan yazındaki çalışmalara dayanarak, yapılan üçlü aile anı konuşmalarında; ebeveynin kim olduğundan bağımsız olarak, kızlarıyla konuşan ebeveynlerin, oğullarıyla konuşanlara kıyasla, daha fazla ve çeşitli duygusal terimler kullanması; çocuğun cinsiyetinden bağımsız olarak, annelerin babalara kıyasla daha fazla ve çeşitli duygusal terimler kullanması ve buna ek olarak, annelerin kızlarıyla konuşurken daha fazla ve çeşitli duygusal terimler kullanması beklenmiştir. Çalışmanın sonuçları; hem çocuğun cinsiyetinin hem de hangi ebeveynin konuştuğunun, konuşmalardaki duygusal içeriği anlamlı biçimde farklılaştırdığını ortaya koymuştur. Ancak, hangi ebeveynin konuşuyor olduğu ile çocuğun cinsiyetinin etkileşim etkisi istatistiki olarak anlamlı bulunamamıştır. Buna ek olarak, üçlü aile anı aktarım sistemine, annelerin istatistiki olarak anlamlı biçimde en fazla sayıda kelime kullanarak miktarca en fazla katkı sağladığı gözlemlenirken; konuşmaları karşılıklı bir etkileşim haline getirerek konuşma sırası açısından en fazla katkı sağlayanların ise çocuklar ve anneler olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Mevcut çalışmanın bulguları, sınırlamalar ve gelecekteki araştırma yönergeleri ile tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: aile içi anı aktarımı, duygusal ortak geçmiş konuşmaları, toplumsal cinsiyet, bellek özelliklerinde cinsiyete bağlı farklılıklar

To My Parents & My Lovely Sister Ceren

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my special thanks to my academic advisor Assistant Professor Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar for her priceless guidance and motivation provided me during the thesis study and my graduate education. I would also like to thank my thesis committee members, Professor Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument and Assistant Professor Dr. Hande Ilgaz who provided my study valuable feedbacks, suggestions and contributions. In addition, I want to thank Professor Dr. Feride Acar for her support during my graduate years.

I would like to express grateful thanks to my parents, Yüksel and Ayşe, and to my dear sister Ceren. They have always been my side by providing all kind of support throughout my life. I am a very lucky person to have them. In addition, I want to thank 'Yükseller Company', specific to my father, and uncles, for being financial support, which helped me fulfill my academic goals.

Grateful thank is expressed to Enes Erkan Kısa for his endless support and love. I really appreciate for his existence in my life.

I would like to express special thanks to my thesis mate İlknur Çoban. I am very lucky to have her priceless support and friendship during my graduate years. Thanks to her valuable contributions, this study has been successfully ended up. I also want to thank my oldest but goldest academic sister Deniz Okay. We have not shared only the home, but also all our happy and stressful moments throughout seven years. She is a perfect friend and clinical psychologist that METU has given me. I would also like to thank my dear friends: Seçil Karakaya, Buse Tığoğulları, İbrahim Öztürk, Ceren Şimşek, Aykut Erdoğan and Barış Nigar for sharing my all good and stressful times, as well as for their emotional support and understanding during my endless academic works. Finally, thanks to METU, I have experienced lots of valuable times with the most special people, and I have always felt like at home.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM iii
ABSTRACT iv
ÖZ vi
DEDICATION viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS x
LIST OF TABLES xii
CHAPTER
1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Overview 1
1.2 Autobiographical Self and Memories 3
1.3 Gender Differences in Autobiographical Memory Characteristics 4
1.4 Interpersonal Context and Gender Differences in Autobiographical Memory Characteristics 5
1.5 Parent-Child Reminiscing about Emotional Shared Past 7
1.6 Triadic Family Memory Conversation about Emotional Shared Past 10
1.7 The Research Questions and Hypotheses of the Present Study 13
2. METHOD 15
2.1 Participants 15
2.2 Materials 15
2.2.1 Demographic Information Form 15
2.3 Coding Schemes 16
2.3.1 Total Emotion Words 16
2.3.2 Unique Emotion Words 17
2.3.3 Composition 17
2.4 Procedure 17
3. RESULTS 20
3.1 Data Screening 20

3.2 Descriptive Statistics 20
3.3 Correlations 23
3.4 Main Analyses: Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) 36
3.4.1 Assumptions for Mixed-Design ANOVA 36
3.4.2 Two-Way ANOVAs for Parental Differences in Emotional Conversation as a Factor of Child's Gender 40
3.4.3 Two-Way ANOVA for Each Family Member's Individual Contributions to the Composition of Triadic Family Conversation 52
4. DISCUSSION 63
4.1 Overview 63
4.2 Discussion of the Main Results 64
4.2.1 Results about Parental Differences in Emotional Memory Characteristics 64
4.2.2 Results about Each Family Member's Individual Contributions to the Composition of Triadic Family Conversation 69
4.3 Overall Discussion and Contributions of the Current Study 71
4.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies 73
4.5 Conclusions 74
REFERENCES 75
APPENDICES
Appendix A: Demographic Information Form 82
Appendix B: Ethical Permission 83
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form 84
Appendix E: Turkish Summary / Türkçe Özet 86
Appendix F: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU 96

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations and Minimum-Maximum Scores of Continuous Study Variables 21
Table 2. Frequencies and Percentiles of Categorical Study Variables 23
Table 3. Correlations between Variables in the Current Study 26
Table 4. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variences 37
Table 5. Mauchly's Test of Sphericity Results 39
Table 6. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices 40
Table 7. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Emotion Words within the Combination of Both Memories 43
Table 8. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Emotion Words within the Combination of Both Memories 43
Table 9. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within the Combination of Both Memories 45
Table 10. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within the Combination of Both Memories 45
Table 11. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Emotion Words within Positive Memory 47
Table 12. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within Positive Memory 47
Table 13. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Emotion Words within Positive Memory 48
Table 14. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within Positive Memory 48
Table 15. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Emotion Words within Negative Memory 50
Table 16. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within Negative Memory 50

Table 17. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Emotion Words within Negative Memory 51
Table 18. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within Negative Memory 51
Table 19. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Lines within the Combination of Both Memories 54
Table 20. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Lines within the Combination of Both Memories 54
Table 21. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Words within the Combination of Both Memories 55
Table 22. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Words within the Combination of Both Memories 55
Table 23. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Lines within Positive Memory 57
Table 24. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Words within Positive Memory 57
Table 25. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Lines within Positive Memory 58
Table 26. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Words within Positive Memory 58
Table 27. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Lines within Negative Memory 60
Table 28. Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Words within Negative Memory 60
Table 29. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Lines within Negative Memory 61
Table 30. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Words within Negative Memory 61

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Why do people recollect memories about their lives? How do their remembering and reminiscing differentiate in terms of construct and content, as well as availability and importance? Even when trying to answer these questions, we think about our memories, because remembering and reminiscing is mostly related to our well-being. In other words, having psychological continuity and well-being is possible only if we are able to construct our autobiographical memories and narrate them to others by means of relating our self to our parents, friends, community and the world (Fivush, Habermas, Waters, & Zaman, 2011). This construction of autobiographical remembering is mostly and first learned at home, while conversing about shared past with our parents.

Beginning from the very early years of life, human beings gradually shape their autobiographical self. Children are able to develop their narrative self in preschool years with the help of language and cognitive development (Neisser, 1988). Preschool years represent a critical stage of human development in terms of the construction of autobiography (Nelson, 2003). Hence, it is important to investigate preschool aged children's narratives and reminiscing styles.

Autobiographical self and narratives are individually shaped. They are not independent from the effects of environment. Therefore, it is inevitable that there are many individual differences in our memories' characteristics in terms of value, content and construct. Moreover, these differences emerge as a factor of individual differences, one of which is gender socialization. As a factor of gender, people's memory characteristics are mostly differentiated. Previous literature commonly

indicated that females have more condensed autobiographical memory characteristics in terms of length, detail, coherence, elaborativeness and valence (emotional tone) even during adolescence and preschool years (Buckner & Fivush, 1998).

Emotions are attached to our autobiographical narratives most of the time and considered as important. They make our memories vivid and meaningful for us. Since emotions have psychological functions in terms of adapting our surroundings and how we perceive our world (Kail, 2010), they are reflected on our personal past in terms of interpreting what we make out of our lives. Emotionally condensed memories and reminiscing styles are associated with this perception, and make our memories worthwhile to remember with its predominant affective content. In turn, acknowledging these emotions and reminiscing about them with other family members lead to higher psychological well-being (Fivush, Marin, Crawford, Reynolds, & Brewin, 2007). Especially in preschool years, reminiscing about emotionally important memories in a way of enriched emotional content contributes to their emotional skills and well-being (e.g., Van Bergen & Salmon, 2010).

Addressing children's memory characteristics related to their autobiographical and emotional selves requires investigating their interpersonal contexts, as well. Family environment, specifically mothers and fathers, has unique contributions to children's reminiscing styles. According to the cultural dynamic theory of autobiographical memory, young children, as active agents in their family dynamics, construct their autobiographical self cumulatively by interacting with their mothers and fathers. Therefore, their reminiscing styles mostly reflect parental practices about shared past (Wang, 2016). In addition, family systems theory also suggests that the family includes dynamic interactions among mother, father and child, which largely impacts children's positive development (Cox & Paley, 2003).

Considering this active interaction among family members, previous literature state that parent-child reminiscing styles and characteristics differ as a result of parent type -which parent children reminisce with- and child's gender. That is to say, being a mother or father, as well as reminiscing with a daughter or son largely influences the content and composition of memory conversations. To illustrate, it is widely

supported that mothers use more emotionally charged words compared to fathers (e.g., Fivush, Brotman, Buckner, & Goodman, 2000), and both parents use these characteristics more frequently when conversing about shared emotional memories, specifically with their daughters (e.g., Adams, Kuebli, Boyle, & Fivush, 1995). While investigating children's reminiscing and memory characteristics, it is important to include their familial contexts as a whole in order to fully understand the differentiated reminiscing pattern and autobiographical self.

In the current study, preschool aged children and both their mothers and fathers were asked to converse about a shared emotional memory. It was aimed to examine both parent type and the child's gender effects on mothers' fathers' and children's emotional memory characteristics in their triadic family conversations about emotionally positive and negative shared memories. In other words, how family members' conversational patterns differ as a factor of, first, parent type, and then child's gender was investigated. In addition, how each family member contributes to the overall composition of family's triadic reminiscing system was also examined.

1.2 Autobiographical Self and Memories

From birth until the very last moment, all our memories cumulatively contribute to our self-knowledge and direct us toward the future (Wang, 2013). According to Neisser (1988), those memories can be either experienced at a specific time and place in the past or take place repeatedly on several occasions and times, the accumulation of both specific and general memories across life span continually constructs individual thoughts, beliefs and sense of self. Especially personally salient autobiographical memories, which make us think about our experiences at a specific time in the past, go hand in hand with the attached emotions to those personally salient memories. These attached meanings and emotions to these past events, in turn constitute vivid and dynamic autobiographical self (Nelson & Fivush, 2004; Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). One's autobiographical life story including many meaningful and emotionally coherent narratives about self, helps answer the main questions about one's self (Fivush, 2008; Habermas & Bluck, 2000).

Emergence of self-understanding is a result of a continuous developmental process, and defined by autobiographical memories (Neisser, 1988). Beginning from very early ages, children gradually experience the emergence of physical, social, cognitive, representational, narrative, and finally, cultural selves. Considering the formation of autobiographical self, narrative self-understanding stage, encompassing the latter part of the preschool years, is critical, because the individual starts to form the earliest memories by integrating action with consciousness and differentiating self from others (Nelson, 2003). Furthermore, it is intensively highlighted that preschool years represent an important period of autobiographical memory system. It is supported by environment, especially by parental reminiscing, which promotes the formation of individual's unique narrative life history by combining individual experiences with others' identities and lives (Fivush et al., 2011; Fivush, 2008). Thus, when studying children's understanding about shared past events, focusing on children aged between 4 and 6 would be more explanatory and meaningful. These years in development highlight one's autobiographical memory system, in terms of the establishment of an individual's unique life story, and sense of an autobiographical self.

In terms of the development of autobiographical memory system, past conversations that take place within family are quite important. There are several individual factors that may also contribute to this development, one of which is gender socialization in family context.

1.3 Gender Differences in Autobiographical Memory Characteristics

Regarding our individually shaped autobiographical self, there are several individual differences as a result of our personal experiences and characteristics. Especially, in terms of one's gender and gender related experiences, individuals have different autobiographical memory characteristics in relation to composition, content, accessibility, valence and functional use. Previous research shows that females have more detailed, coherent and emotionally expressive autobiographical memory characteristics, as for the ones mentioned above, in comparison to males. Moreover, gender differences in autobiographical memories of women and men are theorized to

be rooted from early years in life, particularly, from reminiscing with parents. For example, Buckner and Fivush (1998) examined gender differences in 7-year-old children's autobiographical memories and found that girls were more likely to have longer, more detailed and coherent autobiographical memories than boys. Furthermore, females' personal narratives were more evaluative and elaborative than males' narratives were, during preschool years (Fivush et al., 2000; Haden, Haine, & Fivush, 1997) and adolescence (Bohanek & Fivush, 2010; Zaman & Fivush, 2011).

In addition to the length and coherence differences in autobiographical memory, based on the child's gender, there are also considerable differences in emotional expressivity through their autobiographical memories. For instance, girls were found to be emotionally more expressive in their personal narratives. They had more relation- and interpersonal-oriented narratives as compared to boys (Fivush et al., 2000, Fivush, 1998). In sum, there are systematic differences in the ways that preschooler girls and boys remember their personal past.

Considering children's gender related autobiographical narrative and emotional orientation differences, which has been widely examined in the literature, an important question needs to be answered: why does gender matter or how does it considerably affect children's autobiographical self? Especially in terms of explaining and speculating about the reasons why there are systematic gender differences in autobiographical remembering, it is about the dynamic and interpersonal interactions. Hence, one has to consider the broader cultural context behind children's gender-related autobiographical differences (Fivush, 1998; Wang, 2016).

1.4 Interpersonal Context and Gender Differences in Autobiographical Memory Characteristics

Contemporary theorists suggested that children's gender development can be ideally explained by multiple factors such as biological, cognitive and social processes (Leaper & Friedman, 2007) including cultural practices and dynamics. These dynamics also constitute the foundation of autobiographical memory system (Wang, 2016). According to the cultural dynamic theory of autobiographical memory,

individuals play a part in the dynamic cultural relations with their environment including social and cultural variables. Then, they are able to construct their autobiographical self cumulatively in time and space, provided and defined by those transactions with the dynamic environment (Wang, 2016). In addition, this theory argues that children, as the active agents in those interactions, develop their autobiographical self by acquiring knowledge about their self and objectives of the past from their everyday actions, enacted individually or interpersonally with their families, peers, school and even with the media (Wang, 2016).

Children are exposed to gender-related socio-cultural values beginning from the very early years of life, they experience differentiated gender socialization processes, based on society's expectations about being a female or a male (Bem, 1981). According to Bem's *Gender Schema Theory*, from the moment of birth, individuals infer those gender-related knowledge from cultural context, and transfer them into their gender-typed behaviors (1981). In other words, children are engaged in interpersonal interactions, and socially learn different gender roles imposed by the culture. Within time, they gradually integrate that learned gender-typed information into their identity, which also feeds into the formation process of autobiographical self, providing them an outlet about whom, what and how to remember (Wang, 2016; Fivush, 2011). To illustrate, currently, a study examined parent-adolescent pairs in Turkish context by means of a qualitative method, and asked each adolescent about what kind of a woman or man they would like to be in the future, and each mother about what kind of a woman or man their daughter or son would like to be in the future (Işık-Baş, Şahin-Acar, & Özen-Çıplak, in press). At the end of the study, it was demonstrated that gender schemas belonging to the mothers were projected onto adolescents' attitudes toward being a women or men. That is, both mothers and adolescents were found to have parallel gender themes and expectations that attribute feminine characteristics to women and masculine traits to men for their future self.

A mass body of memory research revealed that women remember their autobiographical memories more vividly, in detail and usually provide richer context information with more voluminous memories (Buckner & Fivush, 1998; Pillemer, Wink, DiDonato, & Sanborn, 2003; Ely & Ryan, 2008). This consistent gender

difference in remembering personal past has been theorized to emerge through early parent-child conversations, since parents reminisce with their daughters and sons in a different fashion. Considering such importance of interpersonal context on the integration of children's autobiographical selves with their environment (Fivush et al., 2011), parental factors could be said to have a primary role on children's development from the moment of birth, and they should be examined in terms of children's gendered patterns in autobiographical memories and emotional expressions. Previous literature showed that parental reminiscing styles in early childhood are significantly related to children's later developmental outcomes, through coherent autobiographical memories and differentiated sense of self (Fivush, Bohanek, & Zaman, 2010; Fivush et al., 2011). Elaborative style of parental reminiscing about memories, which contains more questions, explanations, evaluations, negotiations about internal states and emotion references, is positively correlated with children's higher cognitive, language and socio-emotional skills through psychologically well-constructed past and present self (Fivush & Nelson, 2006). Children who discuss more frequently about past events with their parents are more likely to retrieve and recall new information in detail (Sales, Fivush, & Peterson, 2003), and consequently more likely to have better memory skills and a more elaborative style in reminiscing (Fivush, Haden, & Reese, 2006). In sum, parents who frequently discuss about shared and unshared memories with their children, lead their children to have a rich and elaborative reminiscing style with well-established socio-emotional skills, including positive and negative affect in those personal memories.

1.5 Parent-Child Reminiscing about Emotional Shared Past

According to the current literature, emotions have functions that contribute to individual's physical and psychological well-being by promoting their social adaptation (Kail, 2010). That is to say, having feelings about someone or something and talking about those feelings considerably help people to understand and interpret their social worlds, and make meaning out of those events. Thus, one may argue that emotionally more explanatory and evaluative reminiscing styles have a strong relationship with children's higher psychological well-being, through better coping

skills, as compared to non-emotional reminiscing styles that are low in emotional content (Fivush et al., 2007; Sales, Fivush, Parker, & Bahrick, 2005). Moreover, children who experienced emotionally more enriched parental reminiscing style, are also more likely to have a more advanced emotion understanding (Van Bergen, & Salmon, 2010), and emotion-regulation skills (Fivush, Edwards, & Mennuti-Washburn, 2003). Another line of research suggests that children, even in early ages, reveal more external locus of control when they are engaged in parental reminiscing about emotional past experiences (Bird, Reese, & Tripp, 2006). High levels of effortful control in the emotional reminiscing elicit children's emotion regulation skills, by means of higher emotion capacity and self-esteem (Bost, Choi, & Wong, 2010; Bohanek, Marin, Fivush & Duke, 2006). In sum, emotionally rich and elaborative parental reminiscing styles are developmentally beneficial, and help children's autobiographical self and familial reminiscing style development.

Many research revealed that both parent and children show emotionally more intense memory structure when reminiscing about both emotionally positive and negative-shared memories. For instance, individuals were found have longer, more coherent, significant and vivid memories when discussing highly positive and negative emotional memories as compared to moderately emotional ones (Bohanek, Fivush, & Walker, 2005). Then, the studies examining the parent-child emotional conversation found that both parents (Sales et al., 2003) and children (Fivush, Hazzard, Sales, Sarfati, & Brown, 2003) used more questions and explanations about their thoughts, feelings and emotions in reminiscing, especially about highly negative and highly positive emotional memories. Thus, one of the main aims of the current study is to examine parent-child emotional reminiscing in the frame of highly positive and negative emotional past experiences.

Several previous studies investigating parent-child emotional past conversations highlighted the contribution of various emotional states and discussions about different emotions to the content of these memories, but ignored the specific examination of unique emotional expressions (e.g., Bohanek et al., 2005; Fivush, Sales, & Bohanek, 2008; Bohanek & Fivush, 2010).The current study also examines unique emotional words, which leads to differentiate the variety of emotional

expressions from the repetitions of the same ones, and makes a unique contribution to the existing literature in those terms.

The current study contributes to the parent-child emotional reminiscing literature by making direct comparisons based on both child's gender and parent type while investigating emotional content of parent-child reminiscing. That is, the roles of mothers, fathers, daughters and sons were directly compared in the context of parent-child reminiscing. Considering the relevant literature, there are only a few studies that systematically examined both the child's gender and parent type differences in parent-child emotional reminiscing. To illustrate, Fivush and Wang investigated emotional conversation of mothers and their preschool aged children, and compared both mothers' and children's emotional memory conversations based on child's gender. However, the results showed that there was no effect of child's gender on maternal reminiscing in shared emotional memories (2005). In another study, Fivush and her colleagues investigated 9-12-year-old children's and both of their parents' emotional content in memory conversations when discussing about emotional events, and compared them based on only parent type (2009). This time, they found parent type related differences only in reminiscing style but not in emotional content. That is, mothers were more elaborative when discussing with their children than fathers were, whereas fathers and mothers were similar in terms of their use of emotion words when discussing emotional events (Fivush et al., 2009).

In one study, Adams and her colleagues (1995) studied parent-child conversations about shared emotional memories with preschool aged children and parent dyads, and tried to compare parents' and children's emotion content in past conversations in relation to both child's gender and parent's type. The results showed that parental use of emotional states did not change according to the parent's type, yet, the emotional pattern significantly changed based on the child's gender. In fact, both parents used emotionally more intense content when reminiscing with their daughters than they did with sons (Adams et al., 1995). Moreover, another study of Fivush and her colleagues (2000) focused on memory conversation of preschool aged children and their parents, and again examined the emotional memory characteristics of family members in relation to both child's gender and parent type. Based on separate

mother-child and father-child dyadic emotional conversations, it was found that mothers spoke more and used more emotional characteristics than fathers, and also daughters had emotionally more enriched content as compared to sons' conversations. Finally, for negative emotional events, both parents were found to be more emotionally expresiive while reminiscing especially with their daughters than they did with their sons (Fivush et al., 2000).

These previous studies showed the differences among family members in reminiscing, yet all of them used parent-child dyads rather than a triadic context including child, mother and father, to the best of our knowledge. Thus, a triadic examination of family context in reminiscing would be a salient contribution to the existing literature.

1.6 Triadic Family Memory Conversation about Emotional Shared Past

Previous literature investigated gender related differences in parent-child reminiscing systematically; however, there are no consistent results about the use of emotional references based on both parent type and child's gender. One reason for the inconsistent results could be that even though this line of research included comparisons based on both parent type and child's gender, the comparisons are made by means of dyadic conversations. In other words, most of the previous research recruited children and only one parent, either mother or father, for comparing merely differences in reminiscing about child's gender. On the other hand, other studies recruited children and both parents, but conducted two separate parental reminiscing as dyadic conversations -mother-child and father-child- and again ignored the triadic family conversational system.

On another note, regarding the importance of natural settings in the family studies, there are only a few studies that performed both dyadic and triadic conversations and then compared their composition and content; yet, none of those studies were about memory conversations. For example, Lindsay and Caldera (2006) investigated the interactions between infants around one-year-old and their parents by examining the content differences between triadic (mother-father-child) and dyadic (mother-child) family interactions. It was found that mothers behaved in a more supportive,

sensitive and emotional ways while they were interacting in dyadic setting than they were in the triadic ones. Although fathers were not compared in terms of dyadic or triadic interactions, that research underlined the interactional differences reflected on the content of the conversational setting. In another study, Stoneman and Brody's study examined the difference between two dyadic (mother-child and father-child) and a triadic (mother-father-child) conversations with two-year-old children (1981). After comparing those conversations in terms of length and conversational turns, it was concluded that mothers spoke longer and more frequently in both dyadic and triadic conversations whereas fathers spoke more in dyadic compared to triadic conversations (Stoneman & Brody, 1981).

In light of previous research, one may argue that maternal dominance in family conversational system was the primary cause of the pattern of results in those studies, with culturally shaped differentiated roles of mothers and fathers. There is a strict distinction between paternal and maternal tasks based on the traditional gender roles and stereotypes predominantly universally; and one of the most distinct activities is the care of a child or parenting activities (Renk et al., 2003), both in Turkish (e.g., Çopur, Erkal, Doğan, & Şafak, 2010) and Western cultures (e.g., Bonney, Kelley, & Levant, 1999) In detail, domestic task sharing was examined with a large sample including Turkish adults, and it was found that in spite of socioeconomic increase of women in recent years they still have more responsibilities related to child caring and parenting as compared to men (Çopur et. al., 2010). It was stated that mothers in Turkish culture are mostly influenced by traditional attitudes based on the society's gender roles, therefore, they share more time with their children, such as playing, socializing and talking, as compared to fathers, even when they are involved in works outside the house (Çopur et. al., 2010). In addition, mothers seem to fully internalize the concept of mothering (Arandell, 2000) that is shaped by cultural structure, and undertake all child-related responsibilities, hence, they have a more active role in their children's life and spend more time with them (Forcey, 1994). Based on the cultural construals of motherhood, they have more conversational contributions to daily family interactions as compared to fathers (Bohanek, Fivush, Zaman, Lepore, Merchant, & Duke, 2009). As a result, it could be said that mothers

play a supervisor role and adopt the role of fathers in triadic interactions, while fathers adopted a supporting role in the family's own interaction system.

Considering the family as a cornerstone of a culture, addressing interactions among family members as a whole is important while investigating children's memory characteristics. Family Systems Theory also states that family system is composed of dynamic interactions between its components, which, in turn, largely affect children's development (Cox & Paley, 2003). When thinking about family as a whole and a system, it is inevitable to deduce that mothers' and fathers' social role assumptions have a strong relationship with the child's characteristics. The current study aims to contribute to the literature with the extent of each family member level factors of emotional conversation, and uniquely examines triadic parent-child emotional reminiscing and its relation to the parent type and the child's gender within the family system as a whole.

In the present study, the triadic memory conversations about emotionally positive and negative shared past events among both parents and their 5 and 6.5-year-old children were investigated. Those ages should reflect children's more advanced formation phase of the autobiographical self and memory system. Preschoolers usually begin to talk about their personal past around 3 years of age, however in terms of conversational style, they become more participating towards the end of preschool years. Especially in a task involving three parties and more complicated in nature, we specifically aimed to recruit children from the late years of preschool, so that they could participate in these triadic conversations more easily and freely (Bauer, Leventon, & Varga, 2012). Although children's measurable contribution to these conversations is still not guaranteed, they contribute to these conversations by means of conversational turns. To be more specific, previous literature showed that young children are able to be involved in one-to-one interactions by having conversational turns, which makes it easier to adjust to an interactive conversation in terms of the interlocutor (Gratier et al., 2015). Children are more likely to produce some nonverbal cues or verbal utterances (e.g., hmm, ok, yeah, uh-huh) while the interlocutor is talking. Those utterances actually provide the active speaker with feedback about his/her talking, hence he or she becomes able to sustain the

conversation (Ward & Tsukahara, 2000). This phenomenon is also called *turn-taking*, and included in the pragmatics of language because of promoting effective communication with others (Wiemann & Knapp, 1975). Thus, it would be valuable to address children's any kind of contributions to the triadic family memory conversation, since most of the previous research focused on the content rather than turn-taking of children in memory conversations.

1.7 The Research Questions and Hypotheses of the Present Study

The main purpose of the current study is firstly examining gender differences in emotional characteristics used in the triadic mother-father-child reminiscing about highly emotional memories. In detail, it is aimed to compare parents' emotional memory characteristics based on the child's gender and parent type -which parent children reminisce with-. Here, as mentioned above, children being in that age range might not show the sufficient level of utterance and emotional references in the memory conversations, and it would be difficult to differentiate children's specific emotional references directed to each parent. Thus, the current study mainly compares parental emotional memory characteristics differences in triadic past conversations, as factors of child's gender and parent type.

The current study secondly aims to explore each family member's (mother, father, child) contributions to the composition of family's triadic conversational system during reminiscing about shared memories. Here, the child's outcome in terms of memory conversational characteristics was also included while comparing each family member's total contribution to the overall composition of the family's triadic emotional memory conversations.

In concordance with the study's aims and relevant literature findings, the main research question is the following: during triadic family memory conversations, how do parents talk about emotionally charged shared past events with their children? Specifically, whether being a mother or a father, or child's gender, would be related the way they talk about those shared emotional memories?

In line with these research questions, the hypotheses of the current study are as follows:

1- In triadic family conversations about both highly positive and negative shared emotional memories, as well as in the combination of them (when emotionally positive and negative memories collapsed), parents would use more (total number of emotion words) and varied (total number of unique emotion words) emotional terms when reminiscing with their daughters compared to with their sons.

2- In triadic family conversations about both highly positive and negative shared emotional memories, as well as in the combination of them, regardless of child's gender, mothers would use more and varied emotional terms compared to fathers.

3- Considering the interaction of both child's and parent's gender, we expect that mothers, who reminisce with daughters, would use more and varied emotional terms compared to with sons in both highly positive and negative shared emotional memories, as well as in the combination of them.

Finally, it is aimed to examine how each family member contributes -in terms of the total number of turn-takings and words- to the overall composition of family's triadic memory conversation system. This research question would be explored via comparing three family members: mother, father, and child.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

A hundred eighty-three participants were recruited from Ankara, Turkey. They composed of 61 5 and 6.5-year-old children (M = 69.69, SD = 6.06), and their parents including both mothers (M_{age} = 35.76, SD = 4.89) and fathers (M_{age} = 39.26, SD = 5.07). 54.1% of children were females and the rest was male (33 females; 28 males). All families were two-parent and living together. In terms of families' socioeconomic status (SES), 96.8% percent of mothers reported their SES as middle or upper-middle, whereas 1.6% of them stated their SES as high, and 1.6% of them low level. 95.1% of fathers also reported their SES as middle or upper-middle, while 4.9% of them reflected their SES as high level. Education level of parents ranged from primary school to graduate level. 54.1% of all mothers had Bachelor's degree, whereas 8.2% of them had primary or secondary school degree (high school degree: 24.6%; graduate degree: 13.1%). On the other hand, 59% of the fathers had Bachelor's degree, while 4.9% of them had primary or secondary school degree (high school degree: 19.7%; graduate degree: 16.4%). Moreover, children were healthy (only two of them had visual impairment) and 96.7% of them have experienced some kind of preschool education.

2.2 Materials

2.2.1 Demographic Information Form

Parents were asked about their demographic information in an online format via Qualtrics. The form included the questions about both mother's and father's age, education level, occupation, family's perceived SES as well as child's birthdate and gender (see Appendix A). Regarding the potential impacts of children's age,

families' education and income level on the study's results, those variables were controlled for data screening goals.

2.3 Coding Schemes

In the present study, main coding schemes that were emphasized on the emotional content of the triadic family memory conversations were the number and variety of the emotional words used by each family member. Thus, these conversations were coded both for parents and child conversation lines separately. In addition, the conversation of each family member was coded separately for highly positive and highly negative emotional memory conversations.

Two independent coders were responsible for the coding of all transcriptions; one of them coded all transcribed texts and the other one coded 20% of them. At the end of the study, intercoder reliability was calculated as from .88 to .97 for children's, from .96 to .98 for fathers'; and from .97 to .99 for mothers' coding.

2.3.1 Total Emotion Words

Each emotion was counted separately for mothers', fathers' and children's conversations. Emotion words that were focused on the present study include specific emotional reactions (e.g., happy, sad, fear, excited, anger) and emotional behaviors (e.g., smiling, laughing, crying). The words like good and bad were only counted if they referred to any feeling states (e.g, the mother says, "you felt bad, didn't you?"), but were not taken into account if they referred to a behavior (e.g., the father says, "you are a good boy"). Furthermore, as suggested in the emotional reminiscing literature, the current study expected that both parents and children would use emotion words in congruence with the event valence (e.g., using more negative emotion words while reminiscing about the negative emotional event); and there would be few numbers of cross-valenced emotion words in conversations (Bohanek et al., 2005; Sales et al., 2005). Therefore, total number of emotion words (including both positive and negative emotion words) was counted within each of positively and negatively charged memories belonging to each family member.

2.3.2 Unique Emotion Words

In order to identify the variety of emotion words used by each family members, the number of unique emotion words were counted separately for mothers', fathers' and child's conversations. In detail, as each family member might have repetitions for the same emotion words; the total number of emotion words cannot reflect various emotional states and behaviors that family members use in these memory conversations. Thus, for this coding scheme, each different emotion word used by parents and children was counted once, and then the total number of unique emotions was calculated for each family member. Again, when counting unique emotion words, the present study did not differentiate the emotion words as positive or negative within each positively and negatively charged memories.

2.3.3 Composition

In order to compute each family member's unique contributions to the triadic family conversations, total number of lines (which is called turn-takings) and total number of words of mothers, fathers and children were calculated separately. First of all, the total number of lines of each family member was counted within each of emotionally negative and positive memory conversations, as well as within the combination of both negative and positive emotional memories as a whole conversation. Then, for the total number of words, again each family member's total number of words was counted within each of emotional conversation and the whole conversation.

2.4 Procedure

Ethical approval was obtained from Middle East Technical University (METU) Human Subjects Ethics Committee (see Appendix B). After this step was completed, eligible families were found and asked whether they were willing to participate in this study. Then, the main researcher invited the child, and both of her/his parents to the Child and Adolescent Development Laboratory at METU campus.

After the arrangement of appointments, two researchers separately met with each of the attended families in the laboratory at a prescheduled time, and started to run the study's tasks. In the laboratory, first of all, families were informed about the study's

content and process, and they were asked to give consent for the participation of themselves and their child (informed consent form for each family member) (see Appendix C). Verbal assents were obtained from children. After two audio-recorders were placed around the family, the parents were instructed to think about specific, one-point in time and highly emotionally-charged-memories that had been experienced by both parents and the child together from any time within the past one year. Then, the researcher asked parents to select two of those nominated events; one of emotional events was highly positive, and the other emotional event was highly negative.

After the selection of emotional events by the consensus of both parents, each member of the family was asked to sit together in a comfortable and quiet place in the laboratory, as the child sat in the middle of the parents for triadic emotional memory conversation. Researcher asked parents to discuss these two pre-determined highly emotional events with their children as naturally as possible, and they were especially given a notice about the need for speaking with their children instead of only speaking with each other. As in the most of research in relevant literature (e.g., Sales et al., 2003; Bohanek et al., 2005; Wang & Fivush, 2005), the order of discussion of positive and negative emotional events was counterbalanced within the sample; and each discussion part lasted five minutes, 10 minutes in total. After the family conversation started, the researcher sat at a distance in the same room, behind the screen, and controlled the time for reminding the endings of each emotional conversation. If families exceeded the allocated time for those conversations, one of the researchers walked towards the other side of the screen and told the parents that time was up; yet, if they stopped conversing before 5 minutes, researchers did not intervene and invited parents for the next task. At the end of the both negative and positive emotional conversations, each parent was placed at the computer in the laboratory one by one for the completion of demographic information form. While the parent was filling out the online form, he or she simultaneously listened to white noise for removing external factors of distractors. Meanwhile, other parent and child continued to participate in another study's task.

All conversations were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim in the original language, Turkish, for the coding and analyses, and a second researcher double-checked the accuracy of transcriptions by comparing those with audio-recordings.

At the end of the study, each family was given a brief verbal feedback about positive parenting behaviors during the family conversation (e.g., your gestures were so appropriate that makes your child very comfortable), and the researcher kindly thanked each family member for their participation. In addition, researchers gave parents a brief and informative brochure about parenthood issues. Each child was given a gift of representational METU diploma for their participation.

All statistical analyses were conducted by IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 22th version for the current study. In addition to the correlation analyses as descriptive, a set of two-way ANOVA was performed while testing the study hypotheses.

Results were presented in the next session.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Data Screening

Before the analyses, all data were examined through the program of IBM SPSS in terms of the accuracy of data entry, distribution of scores and missing values. Since all dependent variables of the study included researcher-coded data and participants' demographics were only collected via Qualtrics in electronic format. This online questionnaire was adjusted not to let any questions, to be left unanswered, thus there was no excluded case based on the missing data. Exceptionally, only two participants were observed as not informing about fathers' date of birth; however, because of being random those missing values were replaced with the mean of the sample. In addition, two children's chronological ages were less than the sample's mean (M = 69.69). After conducting the study analyses with and without those two families, the results did not significantly change; so that those cases were excluded from the data. Except from them, there was no any outlier case in the data set. Thus, the final sample size did not change and included 61 out of 63 cases for the further analyses.

3.2 Descriptive Statistics

Prior to the main analyses, descriptive statistics were examined for the sample. Based on the final data, descriptive characteristics of total of 183 participants (61 children, 61 mothers, 61 fathers) are presented in Table 1 and Table 2. Table 1 shows means, standard deviations and minimum-maximum score ranges of the continuous variables, whereas Table 2 shows the frequencies and percentiles of categorical variables.

Table 1. *Means, Standard Deviations and Minimum-Maximum Scores of Continuous Study Variables*

Variables	*M* *(N = 61)*	*SD* *(N = 61)*	*Minimum-Maximum* *(N = 61)*
Child Variables			
Age (months)	69.69	6.06	57-83
Sibling Number	0.70	0.59	0-2
For the Combination of Emotionally Negative and Positive Memories			
Total Number of Emotion Words	6.77	5.38	0-31
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	3.62	2.15	0-11
Total Number of Lines	74.56	22.45	32-137
Total Number of Words	257.21	99.17	96-478
For Negative Memory			
Total Number of Emotion Words	4.07	3.63	0-20
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	2.28	1.72	0-9
Total Number of Lines	34.34	12.84	6-75
Total Number of Words	116.56	55.85	12-249
For Positive Memory			
Total Number of Emotion Words	2.70	2.76	0-11
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	1.74	1.40	0-6
Total Number of Lines	40.39	12.01	17-67
Total Number of Words	139.10	55.03	51-266
Maternal Variables			
Age (years)	35.76	4.89	24.17-47.50
For the Combination of Emotionally Negative and Positive Memories			
Total Number of Emotion Words	17.07	10.38	0-41
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	6.84	3.60	0-21
Total Number of Lines	68.07	23.35	20-106
Total Number of Words	464	179.35	75-808
For Negative Memory			
Total Number of Emotion Words	9.49	6.31	0-27

Table 1 (continued)

Variables	*M* *(N = 61)*	*SD* *(N = 61)*	*Minimum-Maximum* *(N = 61)*
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	4.10	2.45	0-12
Total Number of Lines	31.46	12.26	2-57
Total Number of Words	226.46	96.47	17-466
For Positive Memory			
Total Number of Emotion Words	7.57	5.98	0-23
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	3.48	2.54	0-12
Total Number of Lines	36.11	12.37	12-59
Total Number of Words	236.39	95.90	58-440
Paternal Variables			
Age (years)	39.26	5.07	26.42-57.58
For the Combination of Emotionally Negative and Positive Memories			
Total Number of Emotion Words	9.92	6.20	0-24
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	5.03	2.71	0-13
Total Number of Lines	56.13	21.36	23-119
Total Number of Words	338.74	153.07	89-806
For Negative Memory			
Total Number of Emotion Words	6.46	4,94	0-19
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	3.30	2,26	0-10
Total Number of Lines	27.23	11,74	9-56
Total Number of Words	172.21	83,14	34-442
For Positive Memory			
Total Number of Emotion Words	3.46	3.19	0-16
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	2.16	1.79	0-8
Total Number of Lines	29.23	11.69	10-63
Total Number of Words	166.52	83.18	43-418

Table 2. *Frequencies and Percentiles of Categorical Study Variables*

Variables	*Children (N = 61)*		*Mothers (N = 61)*		*Fathers (N = 61)*	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
Child Gender						
Female	33	54.1				
Male	28	45.9				
Child Preschool Education Status						
Having Education	57	93.4				
No Education	4	6.6				
Child Health Status						
Having A Disorder	2	3.3				
No Disorder	59	96.7				
Parental Education Status						
Primary School Degree			4	6.6	1	1.6
Secondary School Degree			1	1.6	2	3.3
High-School Degree			15	24.6	12	19.7
Bachelor's Degree			33	54.1	36	59
Graduate Degree			8	13.1	10	16.4
Perceived SES						
Low			1	1.6	0	0
Low-Middle			0	0	0	0
Middle			41	67.2	36	59
Middle-Upper			18	29.5	22	36.1
Upper			1	1.6	3	4.9

3.3 Correlations

Bivariate correlation analyses were performed for the correlations among all study variables. Regarding emotionally positive and negative memory conversations separately, correlation coefficient values were presented in Table 3.

There were many significant relations among study variables of child's gender and each family member's emotional expression and composition. In terms of child's gender (1= Female; 2 = Male), firstly, it was significantly correlated with children's

total number of emotion words (r = -.324, p < .05) and unique emotion words (r = -.315, p < .05) in the combination of both memories. Child's gender was significantly correlated with child's total number of emotion (r = -.291, p < .05) and unique emotion words (r = -.362, p < .001). In addition, child's gender was significantly correlated with mothers' total number of unique emotion words (r = -.295, p < .05) in negative memory conversations.

Besides of child's gender, considering the combination of both memory conversations, mothers' total number of emotion words was positively correlated with mothers' total number of unique emotion words (r = .735, p < .001), total number of line (r = .354, p < .001), total number of words (r = .541, p < .001); and children's total number of emotion words (r = .274, p < .05), total number of unique emotion words (r = .281, p < .05); while negatively correlated with fathers' total number of words (r = -.271, p < .05). Mothers' total number of unique emotion words was positively correlated with mothers' total number of line (r = .397, p < .001), total number of words (r = .464, p < .001), fathers' total number of unique emotion words (r = .282, p < .05); and children's total number of unique emotion words (r = .327, p < .001). Mothers' total number of line was positively correlated with mothers' total number of words (r = .742, p < .001) and children's total number of line (r = .540, p < .001). In addition, mothers' total number of words was negatively correlated with fathers' total number of words (r = -.348, p < .001).

Within the combination of both memory conversations, fathers' total number of emotion words was positively correlated with fathers' total number of unique emotion (r = .850, p < .001), total number of line (r = .277, p < .05), total number of words (r = .534, p < .001); and children's total number of emotion words (r = .344, p < .001); whereas negatively correlated with mothers' total number of line (r = -.422, p < .001) and total number of words (r = -.435, p < .001). In addition, fathers' total number of unique emotion words was positively correlated with fathers' total number of line (r = .269, p < .05) and words (r = .493, p < .001); while negatively correlated with mothers' total number of words (r = -.265, p < .05). Fathers' total number of line was positively correlated with fathers' total number of words (r = .728, p < .001), and with children's total number of line (r = .600, p < .001).

Within the combination of both memory conversations, children's total number of emotion words was positively correlated with children's total number of unique emotion words ($r = .828$, $p < .001$), and total number of words ($r = .304$, $p < .05$); as well as with mothers' total number of unique emotion words ($r = .301$, $p < .05$). Children's total number of unique emotion words was positively correlated with children's total number of words ($r = .391$, $p < .001$). In addition, children's total number of line was positively related to children's total number of words ($r = .476$, $p < .001$).

Table 3. *Correlations between Variables in the Current Study*

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Child's Gender (1= Female. 2 = Male)	1									
2	Mother's Total Number of Emotion Words in the Combination of Memories	-.153	1								
3	Father's Total Number of Emotion Words in the Combination of Memories	-.239	.022	1							
4	Child's Total Number of Emotion Words in the Combination of Memories	-.324*	.274*	.344**	1						
5	Mother's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in the Combination of Memories	-.234	.735**	.128	.301*	1					
6	Father's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in the Combination of Memories	-.219	.133	.850**	.250	.282*	1				
7	Child's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in the Combination of Memories	-.315*	.281*	.130	.828**	.327**	.202	1			
8	Mother's Total Number of Lines in the Combination of Memories	.057	.354**	-.422**	-.006	.397**	-.229	.105	1		
9	Father's Total Number of Lines in the Combination of Memories	-.090	-.108	.277*	-.070	-.037	.269*	-.081	.141	1	
10	Child's Total Number of Lines in the Combination of Memories	.079	-.095	-.094	-.046	.003	-.066	.068	.540**	.600**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	Mother's Total Number of Words in the Combination of Memories	.025	.541**	-.435**	-.032	.464**	-.265*	.019	.742**	-.217	.036
12	Father's Total Number of Words in the Combination of Memories	-.016	-.271*	.534**	-.068	-.204	.493**	-.146	-.348**	.728**	.150
13	Child's Total Number of Words in the Combination of Memories	-.095	-.225	-.122	.304*	-.037	-.192	.391**	.245	.200	.476**
14	Mother's Total Number of Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.188	.854**	-.008	.303*	.595**	.094	.323*	.329**	.003	-.006
15	Father's Total Number of Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.180	.019	.860**	.290*	.144	.676**	.046	-.417**	.289*	-.097
16	Child's Total Number of Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.291*	.096	.317*	.883**	.132	.206	.732**	-.045	-.018	.024
17	Mother's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Negative Memor	-.295*	.634**	.126	.331**	.852**	.228	.377**	.301*	.057	.016
18	Father's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.180	.090	.770**	.307*	.297*	.811**	.188	-.278*	.233	-.101
19	Child's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.362**	.090	.143	.785**	.204	.155	.855**	.019	-.054	.082
20	Mother's Total Number of Lines in Negative Memory	-.016	.314*	-.406**	.004	.412**	-.192	.141	.925**	.211	.524**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
21	Father's Total Number of Lines in Negative Memory	-.072	-.056	.197	-.121	.036	.176	-.117	.160	.920**	.543**
22	Child's Total Number of Lines in Negative Memory	.091	-.149	-.062	-.041	.001	-.075	.067	.415**	.575**	.925**
23	Mother's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	.029	.404**	-.427**	-.038	.371**	-.270*	.015	.724**	-.099	.143
24	Father's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	-.037	-.246	.533**	-.128	-.173	.466**	-.200	-.350**	.683**	.131
25	Child's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	-.099	-.222	-.026	.300*	-.087	-.074	.426**	.155	.193	.422**
26	Mother's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.067	.836**	.046	.155	.648**	.131	.147	.268*	-.192	-.159
27	Father's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.186	.013	.610**	.220	.026	.605**	.181	-.173	.090	-.032
28	Child's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.249	.407**	.253*	.786**	.412**	.217	.650**	.048	-.112	-.122
29	Mother's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.148	.678**	.158	.237	.829**	.283*	.204	.301*	-.094	-.052
30	Father's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.122	.112	.506**	.151	.079	.637**	.181	-.130	.075	-.060

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
31	Child's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.134	.382**	.097	.509**	.401**	.208	.635**	.137	-.110	-.013
32	Mother's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.080	.379**	-.412**	.001	.347**	-.241	.077	.945**	.026	.439**
33	Father's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	-.061	-.171	.304*	-.015	-.123	.298*	-.032	.099	.910**	.555**
34	Child's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.099	.060	-.096	-.052	.030	-.024	.042	.570**	.485**	.863**
35	Mother's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	.004	.572**	-.392**	-.022	.485**	-.233	.015	.645**	-.298*	-.071
36	Father's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	.007	-.252	.449**	.003	-.203	.441**	-.069	-.290*	.657**	.144
37	Child's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	-.041	-.185	-.175	.231	-.032	-.283*	.267*	.259*	.187	.425**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
11	Mother's Total Number of Words in the Combination of Memories	1									
12	Father's Total Number of Words in the Combination of Memories	-.516**	1								
13	Child's Total Number of Words in the Combination of Memories	-.104	.001	1							
14	Mother's Total Number of Emotion Words in Negative Memory	.456**	-.149	-.048	1						
15	Father's Total Number of Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.471**	.532**	-.076	.066	1					
16	Child's Total Number of Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.137	-.003	.420**	.256*	.329**	1				
17	Mother's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Negative Memor	.335**	-.076	.106	.724**	.252*	.294*	1			
18	Father's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.308*	.464**	-.135	.121	.860**	.341**	.386**	1		
19	Child's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Negative Memory	-.153	-.093	.488**	.245	.171	.865**	.381**	.282*	1	
20	Mother's Total Number of Lines in Negative Memory	.668**	-.254*	.308*	.348**	-.416**	-.012	.379**	-.277*	.078	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	Father's Total Number of Lines in Negative Memory	-.159	.643**	.169	-.010	.256*	-.093	.079	.181	-.090	.200
22	Child's Total Number of Lines in Negative Memory	-.090	.187	.513**	-.066	-.074	.043	-.006	-.123	.106	.444**
23	Mother's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	.917**	-.401**	-.002	.427**	-.471**	-.093	.331**	-.344**	-.115	.743**
24	Father's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	-.521**	.920**	-.072	-.177	.596**	-.076	-.063	.515**	-.151	-.313*
25	Child's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	-.187	.079	.878**	-.105	-.123	.389**	-.012	-.172	.457**	.222
26	Mother's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	.458**	-.313*	-.341**	.427**	-.036	-.103	.337**	.029	-.101	.178
27	Father's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.116	.213	-.119	-.118	.121	.107	-.147	.164	.013	-.145
28	Child's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	.118	-.129	.040	.254*	.132	.404**	.258*	.150	.392**	.023
29	Mother's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	.415**	-.224	-.224	.333**	.062	-.025	.472**	.170	-.008	.255*
30	Father's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.091	.197	-.165	-.026	.059	-.002	-.133	.107	-.031	-.101

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
31	Child's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	.211	-.171	.065	.234	-.091	.170	.212	.025	.224	.111
32	Mother's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.751**	-.408**	.137	.318*	-.399**	-.065	.233	-.256*	-.034	.775**
33	Father's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	-.241	.690**	.218	-.016	.257*	.044	.006	.227	-.012	.185
34	Child's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.197	.075	.282*	.109	-.094	-.026	.047	-.062	.002	.496**
35	Mother's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	.919**	-.550**	-.184	.393**	-.419**	-.170	.269*	-.259*	-.179	.491**
36	Father's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	-.428**	.920**	.074	-.097	.383**	.070	-.076	.339**	-.021	-.153
37	Child's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	-.020	-.050	.885**	.018	.002	.362**	.166	-.079	.402**	.311*

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
21	Father's Total Number of Lines in Negative Memory	1									
22	Child's Total Number of Lines in Negative Memory	.555**	1								
23	Mother's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	-.097	.010	1							
24	Father's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	.682**	.152	-.477**	1						
25	Child's Total Number of Words in Negative Memory	.140	.534**	-.118	-.035	1					
26	Mother's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.087	-.189	.251	-.241	-.274*	1				
27	Father's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.014	-.006	-.100	.112	.140	.146	1			
28	Child's Total Number of Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.113	-.136	.049	-.150	.071	.438**	.288*	1		
29	Mother's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	.000	-.036	.248	-.181	-.183	.826**	.211	.495**	1	
30	Father's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.015	-.047	-.075	.101	.092	.223	.892**	.296*	.290*	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31	Child's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	-.111	-.034	.137	-.194	.097	.416**	.330**	.767**	.494**	.383**
32	Mother's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.055	.274*	.656**	-.360**	.043	.323*	-.181	.088	.296*	-.142
33	Father's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.687**	.498**	-.082	.557**	.223	-.279*	.192	-.088	-.182	.157
34	Child's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.413**	.629**	.285*	.076	.163	-.012	-.040	-.068	-.025	-.030
35	Mother's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	-.191	-.168	.695**	-.488**	-.212	.577**	-.113	.182	.521**	-.079
36	Father's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	.501**	.192	-.261*	.694**	.180	-.335**	.280*	-.087	-.230	.260*
37	Child's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	.184	.378**	.107	-.062	.582**	-.341**	-.344**	-.027	-.261*	-.388**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued)

	Variables	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
31	Child's Total Number of Unique Emotion Words in Positive Memory	1						
32	Mother's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.169	1					
33	Father's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	-.075	-.018	1				
34	Child's Total Number of Lines in Positive Memory	.032	.544**	.475**	1			
35	Mother's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	.268*	.729**	-.361**	.079	1		
36	Father's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	-.122	-.392**	.714**	.061	-.524**	1	
37	Child's Total Number of Words in Positive Memory	-.052	.172	.186	.339**	-.147	-.030	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

3.4 Main Analyses: Analyses of Variance (ANOVA)

A set of analyses of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for testing the hypotheses of the current study. First of all, a set of mixed design two-way ANOVA was performed to test the hypotheses related to study's aim of investigating the extent to which parents' emotional conversation would change as a factor of child's gender. Then, in order to examine each family member's compositional contribution -in terms of lines and words- to their triadic emotional conversations, again two-way ANOVAs were conducted. Within each ANOVA analysis, child's gender (girls, boys) was a between-subjects factor, whereas family member type (mother, father, children) was a within-subjects factor.

3.4.1 Assumptions for Mixed-Design ANOVA

Before conducting each analysis, a set of assumptions of mixed-design two-way ANOVA was examined: The homogeneity of variance, sphericity, and the homogeneity of inter-correlations.

The homogeneity of variance assumption of ANOVA was controlled through the Levene's F test, and the test results was presented in Table 4. According to the test results, the assumption was met for most of dependent variables, whereas it was violated for a few of them (4 out of 36 variables). In the literature, it is suggested that ANOVA could be still conducted even if the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated, because this is a robust analysis (Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner, & Barrett, 2004). Therefore, further analyses were performed.

The sphericity assumption of ANOVA was checked by using Mauchly's test. As presented in Table 5, for most of the dependent variables, this assumption was violated. Thus, throughout this section, the corrected degrees of freedom were reported by using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity where the assumption was violated.

Table 4. *Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variences*

Dependent Variables	*F*	*df1*	*df2*	*p*
The Combination of Emotionally Negative and Positive Memories				
Mother Total Number of Emotion Words	.345	1	59	.559
Father Total Number of Emotion Words	.285	1	59	.595
Child Total Number of Emotion Words	6.082	1	59	.017*
Mother Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	2.352	1	59	.130
Father Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	1.105	1	59	.297
Child Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	5.431	1	59	.023*
Mother Total Number of Lines	1.106	1	59	.297
Father Total Number of Lines	.298	1	59	.587
Child Total Number of Lines	.001	1	59	.975
Mother Total Number of Words	.009	1	59	.923
Father Total Number of Words	.535	1	59	.467
Child Total Number of Words	.096	1	59	.758
Emotionally Negative Memory				
Mother Total Number of Emotion Words	.271	1	59	.604
Father Total Number of Emotion Words	.149	1	59	.701
Child Total Number of Emotion Words	3.624	1	59	.062
Mother Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	.639	1	59	.427
Father Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	.820	1	59	.369
Child Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	5.433	1	59	.023*

Table 4 (continued)

Dependent Variables	*F*	*df1*	*df2*	*p*
Mother Total Number of Lines	.129	1	59	.721
Father Total Number of Lines	.005	1	59	.942
Child Total Number of Lines	.284	1	59	.596
Mother Total Number of Words	.069	1	59	.793
Father Total Number of Words	.234	1	59	.630
Child Total Number of Words	1.967	1	59	.166
Emotionally Positive Memory				
Mother Total Number of Emotion Words	.012	1	59	.913
Father Total Number of Emotion Words	.955	1	59	.332
Child Total Number of Emotion Words	6.433	1	59	.014*
Mother Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	2.296	1	59	.135
Father Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	.212	1	59	.647
Child Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	.381	1	59	.539
Mother Total Number of Lines	1.930	1	59	.170
Father Total Number of Lines	.026	1	59	.872
Child Total Number of Lines	.367	1	59	.547
Mother Total Number of Words	.277	1	59	.601
Father Total Number of Words	2.342	1	59	.131
Child Total Number of Words	.044	1	59	.836

Note: N = 61. *$p < .05$; **$p < .001$

Table 5. *Mauchly's Test of Sphericity Results*

Dependent Variables	χ^2	*df*	*p*	ε
For the Combination of Emotionally Negative and Positive Memories				
Total Number of Emotion Words	24.793	2	.000**	.742
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	3.439	2	.179	.946
Total Number of Lines	17.374	2	.000**	.794
Total Number of Words	22.126	2	.000**	.759
For Emotionally Negative Memory				
Total Number of Emotion Words	14.287	2	.001*	.821
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	.620	2	.734	.989
Total Number of Lines	6.296	2	.043*	.907
Total Number of Words	17.411	2	.000**	.794
For Emotionally Positive Memory				
Total Number of Emotion Words	24.458	2	.000**	.744
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	11.916	2	.003*	.843
Total Number of Lines	19.414	2	.000**	.779
Total Number of Words	19.184	2	.000**	.780

Note: N = 61. *$p < .05$; **$p < .001$

Finally, the homogeneity of inter-correlations assumption was controlled by the test of Box's M. The test results were presented in Table 6. In order to meet this assumption, we should reject the null hypothesis. The results for our study variables showed that the assumption was met for most of the study variables, while only two of them were statistically significant ($p < .05$). Since this test is very sensitive and those two significance values did not approach .001 level, further analyses were performed.

Table 6. *Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices*

Dependent Variables	*F*	*df1*	*df2*	*p*
For the Combination of Emotionally Negative and Positive Memories				
Total Number of Emotion Words	2.586	6	23398.153	.017*
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	1.807	6	23398.153	.093
Total Number of Lines	.222	6	23398.153	.970
Total Number of Words	.780	6	23398.153	.585
For Emotionally Negative Memory				
Total Number of Emotion Words	1.504	6	23398.153	.172
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	1.714	6	23398.153	.113
Total Number of Lines	.320	6	23398.153	.927
Total Number of Words	.879	6	23398.153	.509
For Emotionally Positive Memory				
Total Number of Emotion Words	2.264	6	23398.153	.035*
Total Number of Unique Emotion Words	.978	6	23398.153	.438
Total Number of Lines	.924	6	23398.153	.476
Total Number of Words	.720	6	23398.153	.634

Note: N = 61. *$p < .05$; **$p < .001$

3.4.2 Two-Way ANOVAs for Parental Differences in Emotional Conversation as a Factor of Child's Gender

The current study aimed to examine child's gender and parent type effects on parental use of emotional memory characteristics in emotionally charged and triadic memory conversations. Thus, parental use of emotion words and unique emotion words were dependent variables, while child gender and parent type were independent variables that both have two levels as female and male.

In order to assess the effects of both child's gender and parent type on parental use of emotional memory characteristics, a set of 2 x 2 (Child Gender [girls, boys] x Parent Type [mother, father]) mixed-design two-way ANOVA was firstly conducted[1]. Since both conversations were triadic in nature -meaning including both parents and the child-, although we did not have any specific hypothesis about child outcomes, 2 x 3 (Child Gender [girls, boys] x Family Member Type [mother, father, child]) mixed-design two-way ANOVAs were separately performed for each dependent variable of total number of emotion words and unique emotion words in each positive and negative memory, as well as in the combination of those memories (emotionally positive and negative memories collapsed). By including child as the third level in the second factor (family member type), a) both mother and father contributions in these memory conversations could be tested in line with the hypotheses and in tune with the triadic nature of those conversations, and b) child outcomes in these conversations were explored and this way contributed to the results. Here, child's gender was between-subjects factor with two levels; and family member type was within-subjects factor with three levels: mother, father, and child. In addition, it would be worth to state that since exactly the same pattern of results, in terms of main and interaction effects of child's gender and parent type on parental use of emotional words, was obtained by means of both 2 x 2 and 2 x 3 ANOVAs, and the latter and more extensive one was reported and interpreted throughout this section.

In terms of individual use of total number of emotion words, for the combination of both memories, ANOVA results (see Table 7), and group means and standard deviations (see Table 8) were presented. Accordingly, it was found that there was a significant main effect of child's gender on family members' total use of emotional words, which means that each family member's use of emotional words was significantly affected by the gender of child whom parents were reminiscing with, $F(1, 59) = 6.562$, $p = .013$, $\eta_p^2 = .100$). In tune with the hypotheses, triadic memory

[1] In terms of total number of emotion words, there were significant main effects of child gender [$F(1, 59) = 3.983$, $p = .051$, $\eta_p^2 = .063$]and parent type [$F(1, 59) = 21.183$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .264$], while there was no significant interaction effect, $F(1, 59) = .004$, $p = .947$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$).
In terms of total number of unique emotion words, similarly, there were significant main effects of child gender [$F(1, 59) = 5.131$, $p = .027$, $\eta_p^2 = .080$]and parent type [$F(1, 59) = 12.857$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .179$]; however, there was no significant interaction effect, $F(1, 59) = .247$, $p = .621$, $\eta_p^2 = .004$).

conversation including mother-father-daughter revealed significantly more emotion words in terms of individual use of mothers, fathers, and children as compared to mother-father-son triads. Moreover, a significant main effect of family member type (being mother, father or child) on individual use of total emotion words was found, $F(1.484, 87.548) = 33.923$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .365$. In tune with the hypotheses, post hoc comparisons based on Bonferroni adjustment indicated that the mean scores of mothers ($M = 17.07$, $SD = 10.38$, 95% $CI = [14.28, 19.6]$) was significantly different from both fathers' ($M = 9.92$, $SD = 6.20$, 95% $CI = [8.24, 11.36]$, $p < .001$), and children's ($M = 6.77$, $SD = 5.38$, 95% $CI = [5.31, 7.95]$, $p < .001$) mean scores. Additionally, fathers' and children's mean scores were significantly different from each other ($p = .002$). On the other hand, in contrast with the hypotheses, the interaction effect between child's gender and family member type was not found to be statistically significant, $F(1.484, 87.548) = .021$, $p = .951$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$.

Table 7. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Emotion Words within the Combination of Both Memories*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	6.562	.013*	.100
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.456	1.484	33.923	.000**	.365
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.998	1.484	.021	.951	.000
Error		87.548			

Note: N = 61. *$p < .05$; **$p < .001$

Table 8. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Emotion Words within the Combination of Both Memories*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	18.515	9.602	15.357	11.163	17.066	10.381
Fathers	11.273	6.351	8.321	5.716	9.918	6.198
Children	8.364	6.397	4.893	3.011	6.771	5.38

Considering individual use of total number of unique emotion words, for the combination of both memories, the ANOVA results (see Table 9), and group means and standard deviations were indicated. The main effect of child's gender was significant in tune with the hypotheses, $F(1, 59) = 7.901$, $p = .007$, $\eta_p^2 = .118$. As indicated in Table 10, each family member in families with daughters, mother-father-daughter triads used significantly higher number of unique emotion words while reminiscing about emotional memories, compared to each family member in families with sons. There was a significant main effect of family member type, $F(2, 118) = 24.940$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .297$. As expected, post hoc comparisons showed that the mean scores of mothers ($M = 6.84$, $SD = 3.60$, 95% $CI = [5.86, 7.67]$) were significantly different from both fathers' ($M = 5.03$, $SD = 2.71$, 95% $CI = [4.3, 5.67]$, $p = .002$) and children's ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 2.15$, 95% $CI = [3.04, 4.1]$, $p < .001$) mean scores. In addition, fathers' and children's mean scores were significantly different from each other ($p = .002$). However, in contrast with the hypotheses, there was no statistically significant interaction effect of child's gender and family member type on individual use of unique emotion words, $F(2, 118) = .154$, $p = .858$, $\eta_p^2 = .003$.

Table 9. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within the Combination of Both Memories*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	7.901	.007*	.118
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.539	2	24.940	.000**	.297
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.996	2	.154	.858	.003
Error		118			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 10. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within the Combination of Both Memories*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	7.606	4.062	5.929	2.761	6.836	3.597
Fathers	5.576	2.99	4.393	2.233	5.033	2.714
Children	4.242	2.411	2.893	1.548	3.623	2.154

Within only emotionally positive memory conversation, the mixed ANOVA results were presented in Table 11 and 12, while descriptive statistics could be seen in Table 13 and 14 in terms of total number of emotion and unique emotion words, separately. First of all, there was only significant main effect of family member type on individual use of total number of emotion words, $F(1.488, 87.793) = 30.265$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .339$. Post hoc comparisons showed that mothers' mean scores ($M = 7.57$, $SD = 5.98$, 95% $CI = [5.9, 9.09]$) were significantly different from both fathers' ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 3.19$, 95% $CI = [2.6, 4.22]$, $p < .001$,) and children's ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 2.77$, 95% $CI = [1.96, 3.34]$, $p < .001$). Yet, fathers' and children's mean scores were not significantly different from each other ($p = .313$). In addition, neither the main effect of child's gender [$F(1, 59) = 2.196$, $p = .144$, $\eta_p^2 = .036$], nor the interaction effect of child's gender and family member type [$F(1.488, 87.793) = .093$, $p = .856$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$] on total number of emotion words was found to be statistically significant. Second of all, in terms of total number of unique emotion words, the only significant main effect was family member type, $F(1.687, 99.517) = 19.066$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .244$. Post hoc comparisons indicated that mothers' mean scores ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 2.54$, 95% $CI = [2.79, 4.1]$) were significantly different from both fathers' ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.79$, 95% $CI = [1.69, 2.61]$ $p = .001$) and children's ($M = 1.74$, $SD = 1.40$, 95% $CI = [1.36, 2.08]$, $p < .001$) mean scores. Yet, fathers' and children's mean scores were not significantly different from each other ($p = .224$). Again, neither the main effect of child's gender [$F(1, 59) = 1.887$, $p = .175$, $\eta_p^2 = .031$], nor the interaction effect of child's gender or family member type [$F(1.687, 99.517) = .237$, $p = .751$, $\eta_p^2 = .004$] were found to be statistically significant.

Table 11. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Emotion Words within Positive Memory*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	2.196	.144	.036
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.534	1.488	30.265	.000**	.339
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.997	1.488	.093	.856	.002
Error		87.793			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 12. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within Positive Memory*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	1.887	.175	.031
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.613	1.687	19.066	.000**	.244
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.993	1.687	.237	.751	.004
Error		99.517			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 13. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Emotion Words within Positive Memory*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	7.939	6.067	7.143	5.955	7.574	5.979
Fathers	4	3.666	2.821	2.42	3.459	3.186
Children	3.333	3.237	1.964	1.875	2.705	2.765

Table 14. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within Positive Memory*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	3.818	2.92	3.071	1.98	3.475	2.54
Fathers	2.364	1.981	1.929	1.538	2.164	1.791
Children	1.909	1.508	1.536	1.261	1.738	1.401

Within the negative memory conversation, as in the combination of both memories, the same pattern of results was found for emotional memory characteristics. ANOVA results were shown in Table 15 and 16, whereas the group means and standard deviations could be seen in Table 17 and 18 for total number of emotion and unique emotion words, separately. There was a significant main effect of child's gender both for total number of emotion words [$F(1, 59) = 6.080$, $p = .017$, $\eta_p^2 = .093$] and total number of unique emotion words [$F(1, 59) = 8.755$, $p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .129$]. In line with the hypotheses, triadic memory conversation including mother-father-daughter revealed significantly more emotion words in terms of individual use of mothers, fathers, and children as compared to mother-father-son triads. Furthermore, there was a significant main effect of family member type both in terms of total number of emotion words [$F(1.642, 96.854) = 20.709$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .260$], and unique emotion words [$F(2, 118) = 16.132$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .215$]. In terms of total emotion words, in line with the hypotheses, post hoc comparisons showed that the mean score of mothers ($M = 9.49$, $SD = 6.31$, 95% $CI = [7.79,11]$) was significantly different from both fathers' ($M = 6.46$, $SD = 4.95$, 95% $CI = [5.13, 7.65]$, $p = .012$) and children's ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 3.63$, 95% $CI = [3.08, 4.88]$, $p < .001$). In addition, fathers' and children's mean scores were significantly different from each other ($p = .002$). In terms of total unique emotion words, the mean scores of mothers ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 2.45$, 95% $CI = [3.43, 4.65]$) were not significantly different from fathers' ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 2.26$, 95% $CI = [2.69, 3.84]$, $p = .073$); yet, they significantly differed from children's ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 1.72$, 95% $CI = [1.81, 2.64]$, $p < .001$). In addition, fathers' and children's mean scores were significantly different from each other ($p = .005$). On the other hand, the interaction effect of child's gender and family member type was not found to be statistically significant in terms of both total number of emotion [$F(1.642, 96.854) = .061$, $p = .911$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$] and unique emotion words [$F(2, 118) = .502$, $p = .607$, $\eta_p^2 = .008$].

Table 15. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Emotion Words within Negative Memory*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	6.080	.017*	.093
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.535	1.642	20.709	.000**	.260
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.998	1.642	.061	.911	.001
Error		96.854			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 16. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within Negative Memory*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	8.755	.004*	.129
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.628	2	16.132	.000**	.215
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.985	2	.502	.607	.008
Error		118			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 17. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Emotion Words within Negative Memory*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	10.576	5.863	8.214	6.674	9.492	6.308
Fathers	7.273	4.659	5.5	5.182	6.46	4.945
Children	5.031	4.194	2.929	2.448	4.066	3.633

Table 18. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Unique Emotion Words within Negative Memory*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	4.758	2.538	3.321	2.127	4.098	2.447
Fathers	3.667	2.146	2.857	2.353	3.295	2.261
Children	2.849	1.955	1.607	1.1	2.279	1.724

First set of hypotheses about parental differences in emotional memory characteristics as a factor of child's gender was met within emotionally negative memory conversations. Although the main effect of child's gender was not found to be significant within the emotionally positive memory conversations, for the combination of both memories, our first hypothesis was still supported; and it was concluded that both parents made significantly more and varied emotional references while reminiscing with their daughters, compared to with their sons.

There was a significant main effect of the parent type both in emotionally positive and negative memory conversations, as well as in the combination of both memories. There was only one unexpected finding that mothers did not use more varied emotional words than fathers within emotionally negative memory conversations. Nevertheless, they were found to be using more emotion words compared to fathers within those conversations. Thus, our second hypothesis was supported for the most of part, and it was concluded that mothers used significantly more and varied emotional memory characteristics as compared to fathers during triadic memory conversations about highly negative and positive emotional shared past.

Our third hypothesis, including the interaction effect of child's gender and parent type, was not supported. That is, mothers, who reminiscence with daughters, did not use more and varied emotional characteristic.

3.4.3 Two-Way ANOVA for Each Family Member's Individual Contributions to the Composition of Triadic Family Conversation

One aim of the current study was to explore the composition of memory conversations among three members of the families. In order to assess family member type effects on the composition of family conversation, 2 x 3 (Child Gender [girls, boys] x Family Member Type [mother, father, child]) mixed-design two-way ANOVAs was separately conducted and reported for each of dependent variables of total number of lines and words within each of negative and positive memory conversations, as well as within the combination of both memories. In tune with the hypotheses, family member type would be the main interest in terms of exploring the

composition of these conversations, yet we explored the composition of both memories according to child's gender.

Considering each family member's total number lines, for the combination of both memories, it was found that there was a significant main effect of family member type (being mother, father or child) on individual's total number of lines, $F(1.589, 93.736) = 18.956$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .243$ (see Table 19). The group means and standard deviations were presented in Table 20. Post hoc comparisons indicated that mothers' mean scores of total lines ($M = 68.07$, $SD = 23.35$, 95% $CI = [62.13, 74.22]$) were significantly different than fathers' ($M = 56.13$, $SD = 21.26$, 95% $CI = [50.46, 61.49]$, $p = .006$); but not significantly different from children' s ($M = 74.56$, $SD = 22.45$, 95% $CI = [68.9, 80.5]$, $p = .076$) mean scores. In addition, fathers' and children's mean scores were significantly different from each other ($p < .001$). On the other hand, there was neither a significant main effect of child's gender [$F(1, 59) = .030$, $p = .863$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$], nor the interaction effect of child's gender or family member type, $F(1.589, 93.736) = .841$, $p = .411$, $\eta_p^2 = .014$.

Regarding individual's total number words used within the combination of both memories, the results showed that the main effect of family member type was significant, $F(1.518, 89.587) = 24.114$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .290$ (see Table 21). Descriptive statistics were presented in Table 22. Post hoc comparisons showed that mothers ($M = 464$, $SD = 179.35$, 95% $CI = [417. 88, 510.84]$) used significantly higher total number of words than both fathers ($M = 338.74$, $SD = 153.08$, 95% $CI = [298. 86, 378.21]$, $p = .004$) and children ($M = 257.21$, $SD = 99.17$, 95% $CI = [230.86, 282.04]$, $p < .001$). In addition, fathers had significantly higher total number of words than children ($p = .003$). However, again, neither the main effect of child's gender [$F(1, 59) = .098$, $p = .755$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$], nor the interaction effect of child's gender or family member type [$F(1.518, 89.587) = .104$, $p = .848$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$] was found to be statistically significant.

Table 19. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Lines within the Combination of Both Memories*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	.030	.863	.001
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.490	1.589	18.956	.000**	.243
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.964	1.589	.841	.411	.014
Error		93.736			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 20. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Lines within the Combination of Both Memories*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	66.849	24.708	69.5	22.001	68.066	23.349
Fathers	57.879	22.822	54.071	19.701	56.131	21.357
Children	72.939	22.854	76.464	22.232	74.557	22.453

Table 21. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Words within the Combination of Both Memories*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	.098	.755	.002
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.449	1.518	24.114	.000**	.290
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.994	1.518	.104	.848	.002
Error		89.587			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 22. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Words within the Combination of Both Memories*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	459.97	177.224	468.75	184.973	464	179.353
Fathers	341	139.113	336.071	170.65	338.738	153.075
Children	265.788	104.201	247.107	93.75	257.213	99.167

Within only positive memory conversation, similar pattern of results with the combination of both memories was found both for total number of lines (see Table 23) and total number of words (see Table 24). The group means and standard deviations can be seen in Table 25 and 26 in terms of both lines and words respectively. Considering each family member's total number lines, there was only the main effect of family member type [$F(1.557, 91.867) = 20.422$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .257$]; yet, there was neither a significant main effect of child's gender [$F(1, 59) = .177$, $p = .676$, $\eta_p^2 = .003$] nor the interaction effect of child's gender and family member type [$F(1.557, 91.867) = .677$, $p = .475$, $\eta_p^2 = .011$]. Post comparisons demonstrated that children's mean scores of total lines ($M = 40.39$, $SD = 12.01$, 95% $CI = [37.39, 43.59]$) were significantly different than both mothers' ($M = 36.12$, $SD = 12.37$, 95% $CI = [32.9, 39.39]$, $p = .018$); and fathers' ($M = 29.23$, $SD = 11.69$, $p < .001$, 95% $CI = [26.15, 32.2]$) total line. In addition, mothers' and father's mean scores were significantly different from each other ($p = .007$). On the other hand, regarding individual's use of total number of words, there was a significant main effect of family member type [$F(1.561, 92.071) = 18.627$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .240$], whereas the main effect of child's gender [$F(1, 59) = .011$, $p = .918$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$] and the interaction effect of child's gender and family member type were not significant [$F(1.561, 92.071) = .018$, $p = .961$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$]. Post hoc comparisons showed that mothers ($M = 236.39$, $SD = 95.9$, 95% $CI = [211.57, 261.29]$) used significantly higher total number of words than both fathers ($M = 166.53$, $SD = 83.18$, 95% $CI = [145.01, 188.13]$, $p = .003$) and children ($M = 139.1$, $SD = 55.04$, 95% $CI = [124.66, 153.17]$, $p < .001$). In addition, fathers were not significantly different from their children ($p = .117$).

Table 23. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Lines within Positive Memory*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	.177	.676	.003
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.483	1.557	20.422	.000**	.257
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.975	1.557	.677	.475	.011
Error		91.867			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 24. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Words within Positive Memory*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	.011	.918	.000
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.561	1.561	18.627	.000**	.240
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.999	1.561	.018	.961	.000
Error		92.071			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 25. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Lines within Positive Memory*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	35.212	13.432	37.179	11.146	36.115	12.373
Fathers	29.879	12.477	28.464	10.858	29.23	11.687
Children	39.303	11.836	41.679	12.311	40.393	12.014

Table 26. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Words within Positive Memory*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	236.03	101.732	236.821	90.401	236.393	95.903
Fathers	166	75.035	167.143	93.284	166.525	83.18
Children	141.152	54.705	136.679	56.326	139.098	55.035

Within negative memory conversation, a similar pattern of results in tune with only positive, and both positive and negative memories collapsed, was found both in terms of total number of lines (see Table 27) and words (see Table 28). The group means and standard deviations can be seen in Table 29 and 30 in terms of both lines and words, respectively. First of all, regarding total number of lines, there was a significant main effect of family member type [$F(1.813, 106.993) = 8.943$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .132$]; however, there was neither a significant main effect of child's gender [$F(1, 59) = .001$, $p = .971$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$] nor the interaction effect of child's gender and family member type [$F(1.813, 106.993) = .701$, $p = .485$, $\eta_p^2 = .012$]. Post comparisons indicated that children's mean scores of total lines ($M = 34.34$, $SD = 12.84$, 95% $CI = [31.12, 37.76]$) were significantly different than fathers' ($M = 27.23$, $SD = 11.74$, 95% $CI = [24.13, 30.2]$, $p < .001$); but not significantly different from mothers' ($M = 31.46$, $SD = 12.26$, 95% $CI = [28.27, 34.62]$, $p = .253$). In addition, mothers' and father's mean scores were not significantly different from each other ($p = .100$). On the other hand, in terms of total number words, there was a significant main effect of family member type [$F(1.588, 93.701) = 22.853$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .279$], whereas the main effect of child's gender [$F(1, 59) = .199$, $p = .657$, $\eta_p^2 = .003$] and the interaction effect of child's gender and family member type were not found to be statistically significant [$F(1.588, 93.701) = .134$, $p = .827$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$]. Post hoc comparisons showed that mothers ($M = 226.46$, $SD = 96.47$, 95% $CI = [201.69, 251.68]$) used significantly higher total number of words than both fathers ($M = 172.21$, $SD = 83.14$, 95% $CI = [150.43, 193.5]$, $p = .025$) and children ($M = 116.56$, $SD = 55.85$, 95% $CI = [101.7, 130.51]$, $p < .001$) did. In addition, fathers used significantly higher total number of words than children did ($p < .001$).

Table 27. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Lines within Negative Memory*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	.001	.971	.000
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.708	1.813	8.943	.000**	.132
Child's Gender x Family MemberType	.966	1.813	.701	.485	.012
Error		106.993			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 28. *Mixed ANOVA Results for Total Number of Words within Negative Memory*

Source	*Wilks' Λ*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η_p^2
Child's Gender		1	.199	.657	.003
Error		59			
Family Member Type	.454	1.588	22.853	.000**	.279
Child's Gender x Family Member Type	.994	1.588	.134	.827	.002
Error		93.701			

Note: N = 61. *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 29. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Lines within Negative Memory*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	31.636	12.457	31.25	12.252	31.459	12.262
Fathers	28	11.657	26.321	11.991	27.23	11.742
Children	33.273	12.608	35.607	13.234	34.344	12.844

Table 30. *Group Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Words within Negative Memory*

Family Member Type	*Child's Gender*					
	Girls (*N* = 33)		Boys (*N* = 28)		Total (*N* = 61)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Mothers	223.939	92.13	229.429	102.986	226.459	96.474
Fathers	175	75.637	168.929	92.517	172.213	83.14
Children	121.606	60.773	110.607	49.86	116.557	55.848

The present study had coherent results about the composition of triadic memory conversations. To sum up, even though each family member's total number of line did not differentiate based on the child's gender, it mostly differentiated as a factor of the type of the member (being mother, father or child) in both emotionally positive and negative memory conversations. That is, children had the most total number of lines (turn-takings) and showed similarity with mothers' use, while fathers had the fewest number of lines throughout positive and negative memory conversations, as well as within the combination of both memories.

In terms of total number of words, our findings strongly showed that mothers used more words than both fathers and children did; and fathers used more words than did children within the conversations in emotionally positive and negative memories separately, as well as the combination of them.

All findings of the current study were discussed in the next section.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview

The current study aimed to examine the triadic memory conversations about emotionally positive and negative shared past among both parents and their preschool aged children. We aimed to investigate, how parents talk about their shared emotional memories with their children. Specifically, the effects of child's gender and family member type on triadic family conversational system about highly positive and negative emotional memories were examined. Our findings indicated that both the main effects of *child's gender* and *family member type* were statistically significant. In other words, both parents used more -*emotion words*- and varied -*unique emotion words*- emotional memory characteristics while reminiscing with their daughters than they do with their sons; and mothers used more and varied emotional memory characteristics during triadic family reminiscing about highly emotional memories. In addition, the current study aimed to investigate how each family member contributed to the overall composition of family's triadic reminiscing conversation system; and uniquely examined this type of memory conversations in terms of the total number of *turn-takings* and *words*. The results demonstrated that mothers had the highest amount of contribution into the triadic family reminiscing, in terms of total use of words. On the contrary, children, who used the least number of words compared to either parents; had the highest mean score, and equal communicational contribution along with mothers, in terms of turn-takings to the overall family composition of reminiscing. Throughout the next sections, findings of the present study were extensively discussed in line with the relevant literature, as well as with the contributions of the study into the existing literature, and its limitations and further directions.

4.2 Discussion of the Main Results

4.2.1 Results about Parental Differences in Emotional Memory Characteristics

4.2.1.1 Main Effect of the Child's Gender

In the current study, it was specifically hypothesized that there would be a significant main effect of the child's gender; in other words, parents would use more (total number of words) and varied (total number of unique emotion words) emotional terms when reminiscing with their daughters than they would do with their sons, in both emotionally positive and negative memory conversations. As predicted, our findings showed that this main effect was significant; so that the child's gender was found to be effective on the way of mothers', fathers' and children's talk during the triadic family memory conversations about emotional memories. That is, the emotional memory characteristics, in terms of both total emotion and unique emotion words, belonging to each family member in triads, were strongly influenced by the child's gender, with whom the parents were reminiscing.

In line with the previous literature, our study indicated that both parents used more emotion words while reminiscing with their daughters as compared to reminiscing with their sons. An extensive line of research, examining the effect of child's gender on parent-child emotional reminiscing, supported this finding. Previous research suggests that both mothers and fathers make more emotional references while talking with their daughters about shared past events, compared to their sons (Adams, 1995; Fivush et al., 2000; Aznar & Tenenbaum, 2015). Moreover, in congruence with the study findings of Fivush and Wang (2005), results showed that, in addition to the number of emotion words used, the variety of emotional expressions (unique emotion words) was strongly affected by the child's gender. In other words, both parents used more total number of unique emotion words, meaning more varied emotional characteristics, when they were reminiscing with their daughters than they were with their sons. As it was extensively discussed in previous literature, both parents attribute more relational orientation to their daughters than they do for their sons, and this relatedness in social relationships concerns expression of emotions, as well.

Furthermore, previous literature found that both parents used more and varied emotion words with their daughters more frequently, yet these studies examined dyadic memory conversations. In other words, to the best of our knowledge, the current study has been the first one to demonstrate the same effects in triadic - mother, father and child- memory conversations.

Considering our findings about unique emotion words, we exactly had the same pattern with the results about total emotion words. This was an important finding, which indicated that the current study had robust results in terms of families' use of emotional memory characteristics. By means of controlling total use of various emotional words, the current study eliminated the possible inflation effect of emotional repetition in the results. Within the memory conversation literature, repetitiveness is intensely examined, because it refers to the low elaborative style of parents. Parents, who use the same questions and utterances almost verbatim and more frequently, are more likely to repeat themselves; and they cannot be more productive in terms conversational contribution into the parent-child reminiscing system. Eliminating their repetitiveness in terms of finding the same effect in unique emotion words, referred to more robust results about the parental reminiscing patterns in emotional past conversations (Reese, Haden, & Fivush, 1993). Thus, our results have strongly supported the significant effect of child's gender on parental use of emotional memory characteristics, even when we eliminated their repetitions. In this case, one may argue that, rather than the inflated findings based on the repetition of parents, the use of more and various emotional memory characteristics during family memory conversations is mostly related to deeply seated gender schemas and attributions. In line with the Bem's *Gender Schema Theory* (1981), people have some cognitive gender schemas, including different attributions to the femininity and masculinity, that impacts both their affection and behaviors. That is to say, parents' attitudes and behaviors toward their children are mostly shaped by gender-related stereotypes and expectations of the society in which they are involved. Accordingly, they could attribute emotionality to the feminine characteristics, specifically to their daughters, hence, they could use emotionally

more intense memory characteristics while they were reminiscing with their daughter, compared to sons.

As *Family Systems Theory* suggested, family is composed of mother, father and children dynamic interactions; and it is important to address each family member level factors while examining parent-child relationship and its effects on child outcomes (Cox & Paley, 2003). In line with this theory, beyond the parent-child dyadic interaction, the current study extensively examined all family dynamics, including simultaneous multiple interactions among them (e.g., mother-child, father-child, mother-father) (McHale & Fivaz-Depeursinge, 1999). That is, in addition to the hypothesized parental memory characteristics, our findings uniquely indicated that not only parental emotional memory characteristics, but the way of children's talking about emotions in triadic memory conversations was also affected by the child's gender. Depending on whether parents reminisce with their daughters or with their sons, affected each family member's emotional contributions into their memory conversations, favoring daughters for emotional emphases. Each member of mother-father-daughter triads used significantly more emotion and unique emotion words as compared to the members of mother-father-son triads. This finding indicates that, in addition to the adults, children could also be affected by the society's gender schemas; and girls could disclose their emotions easily during those triadic memory conversations compared to boys.

4.2.1.2 Main Effect of the Family Member Type

The current study originally hypothesized that there would be a significant main effect of parent type; in other words, regardless of child's gender, mothers would use more and varied emotional terms as compared to fathers in triadic family conversations about both highly positive and negative emotional events. In line with the hypotheses, results indicated that the main effect of family member type was significant; so that emotional memory characteristics used in the triadic memory conversations were strongly affected by membership in a family, as being a mother, father or a child. In detail, it was found that mother's, father's and child's emotional

contributions into those conversations differentiated both in terms of their use of total number of emotions, and total number of unique emotion words.

Our study uniquely examined family member type effect on family's reminiscing system in a triadic context. In a similar fashion with the study of Fivush and her colleagues (2000), which compared mother-child and father-child dyads separately, our findings suggested that mothers used more and varied emotion words than did fathers during triadic memory conversations about shared emotional memories. In addition to the hypothesized parental differences in emotional characteristics during the triadic memory conversation, our extensive findings showed that children had the fewest total number of emotion words as compared to both parents. To be more precise, mothers had the largest amount of emotional contribution -in terms of both quantity and variety- into the triadic memory conversations, whereas children came behind all other family members. In consistent with the literature, mothers were found to be more engaged with their children, and to be emotionally more expressive than fathers while reminiscing about their shared memories (Zaman & Fivush, 2013; Fivush et al., 2000). This is rational, because females were found to be more likely to disclose their emotions and discuss them by the means of gender socialization process including both individual and contextual factors, and shaping females' and males' emotional experiences and interpretations differently (Brody, 1997; Chaplin, 2015). In terms of children's lower amount of emotional contribution into the conversations, of course they are at more disadvantageous place as compared to adults in terms of social, cognitive and language development. The literature supports our finding by suggesting that children's internal states used in reminiscing about emotional experiences increase with age by means of cognitive and language development (Bauer, Burch, Van Abbema, & Ackil, 2007) Thus, our study has reflected coherent findings with the previous literature.

Additionally, the results about total number of unique emotions indicated similar pattern with the results of total number of emotion words. Specifically, family member type was effective that differentiated individual use of emotional memory characteristics during triadic family reminiscing, even when we controlled their emotional repetition. Those parallel findings indicated that our results did not emerge

randomly. Instead, in line with the study of Lindsay and Caldera (2006), it reflected a strong and consistent pattern that draws attention to the differential treatment of family members in triadic familial contexts based on socially assigned roles and expectations.

4.2.1.3 Interaction Effect of the Child's Gender and Parent Type

Our specific hypothesis was that mothers, who reminisce with daughters, would use more and varied emotional terms during triadic memory conversations about shared emotional memories. However, there was no significant interaction effect of child's gender and parent type on parental use of emotional memory characteristics either during emotionally positive, or negative memory conversations, or overall when these two were collapsed.

In spite of significant main effects of child's gender and family member type on individual use of total number of emotion and unique emotion words, the reason why we could not find an interaction might be explained in in a couple of ways. First of all, in line with the literature, suggesting that both parents made more emotional references when reminiscing with their daughters as compared to sons (Adams, 1995; Fivush et al., 2000; Fivush & Wang, 2005; Aznar & Tenenbaum, 2015), it was found that each member of the family which includes mother-father-daughter used significantly more and varied emotional memory characteristics during triadic conversations as compared to mother-father-son triads. In this regard, the current study replicated and extended findings of the existing literature, even though our hypothesis about interaction was rejected. Second of all, the effect of child's gender on emotional contributions into triadic memory conversations was strong that each family member had very distinctive use of emotional characteristics while reminiscing with daughters and sons. That is, considering the confidence intervals of each family member, there were very distinct distributions for mothers', fathers' and children's use of total number of emotion and unique emotion words as a factor of child's gender, which could not allow the effects of other factors to disclose. In addition, the design of the current study, including both within- and between-subjects factors, requires larger sample size for more consistent results. However, due to the

laboratory setting of the current study, limited number of participants could be effective on this finding. If the number of participants had been higher, a significant interaction effect might have been observed for this study. Thus, findings of the present study should be replicated with higher sample size.

In addition to what have been discussed throughout this section, all our findings about parental differences in emotional memory characteristics reflected similar pattern of results both for emotionally negative and positive memories. Within emotionally positive memory conversations, parental use of emotional memory characteristics was not found to be significantly affected by child's gender. However, this effect was found for emotionally negative conversations, as well as the combination of emotionally negative and positive memory conversations. Regarding the considerable amount of mean differences between emotions having been discussed in positive and negative memory conversations, the reason why we obtained this kind of a result might be ideally explained by the survival value of discussing about negative emotional events. The literature supported that parent-child conversations about highly negative emotional events were found to be more comprehensive, and included more mental states and emotional references compared to the conversations about positive events (Fivush et al., 2008; Ackil, Van Abbema, & Bauer, 2003). Since the negative events might be more effective in children's well-being, parents could have more concern about helping their children. In addition, since females are attributed a more relational role, and stereotyped as being emotionally weak and helpless, both parents could try to understand and interpret especially their daughters' emotional experiences well. Another contribution of the present study was demonstrating this pattern, which had been found in Western literature before, in Turkish cultural context and in accordance with gender socialization norms in it.

4.2.2 Results about Each Family Member's Individual Contributions to the Composition of Triadic Family Conversation

Beyond the emotional content of triadic memory conversation, the current study had the aim of examining each family member's compositional contributions into those

conversation. Specifically, how each family member contributes to the overall composition of family's triadic memory conversation system was investigated. Without specific hypotheses, mothers, fathers and children were compared in terms of the total number of words and lines within those triadic conversations. Our results indicated that there was a significant effect of family member type on individual contribution into the composition of triadic conversation. That is to say, family members had different amount of contributions, in terms of volume and turn-takings, into the overall composition of emotional memory conversations.

In terms of volume, it was found that, among all family members (mother, father, and child), mothers had the highest total number of words during the triadic memory conversations about shared emotional memories, whereas children had the fewest total number of words within those conversations. Fathers were found to be placed between mothers and children. Considering parental differences in volume, the literature has predominantly supported mothers' use of higher number of word than fathers' use during both dyadic (Fivush et al., 2000) and triadic parent-child interactions (Stoneman & Brody, 1981); although the findings about triadic conversations were not derived from memory conversations. On the other hand, regarding children's fewer words contributions into those family conversations, it can be argued that they have limited linguistic capacity compared to their parents, who are adults. Since children are limited in their cognitive, language and socio-cultural development, as well as immature autobiographical self; preschool aged children are more likely to provide very low amount of word while reminiscing about their autobiographical memories, compared to adults (Fivush, 2011).

In terms of turn-takings, mothers were found to have significantly higher number of lines than fathers within those triadic conversations. However, in contrast with the volume, children were not found to be at the end of the ranking at this time. Instead, their contributions of turn-takings -meaning total number of lines- were not found to be significantly different from their mothers. In fact, there was a trend that approaching significance level favoring children's highest contribution. This is a novel finding in the related literature. Considering both children's use of volume and turn-taking characteristics in those conversations, the current study demonstrated that

it is not the case that preschool aged children do not exist in family memory conversational system; rather they contribute efficiently yet with shorter sentences. Based on the literature, turn-takings, emerged in parent-child interaction, promotes the heathy communication of family by providing them the chance of self-expression and mutual understanding (Kent-Walsh, Binger, & Hasham, 2010). To sum up, in spite of their linguistic limitation, children have unique contributions into the family memory conversational system by providing short yet frequent feedbacks to the other members in conversation, and through those turn-takings utilize triadic memory conversations.

All our findings that have been discussed throughout this section reflected the same pattern of results for emotionally negative and positive memory conversations, as well as the combination of them. That is to say, this study had very consistent results about family members' compositional contributions to the triadic conversational system, which increase the generalizability of the findings.

4.3 Overall Discussion and Contributions of the Current Study

Our findings supported the study's first two specific hypotheses of main effects of child's gender and parent type on parental emotional memory characteristics in mother-father-child triadic conversations about shared emotional memories. It was found that each family member used more and varied emotional terms while reminiscing with their daughters compared to with their sons; and, regardless of child's gender, mothers used more and varied emotional terms than both fathers and children did, during those triadic memory conversations. With regard to these findings, the current study has replicated the mainstream findings about child's gender and parent type separately placed in the memory literature. In addition to the support for those separate findings, the current study has filled a gap in the existing memory conversations literature by combining both child's gender and parent type effects on families' emotional memory characteristics; and those effects were uniquely found to be effective in triadic conversational settings, as well.

To the best of our knowledge, considering emotional variety in those conversations, the current study has contributed to the literature by examining number of unique

emotion words, in addition to the total number of emotion words, within a triadic family setting. Having very similar patterns of findings in terms of total number of emotion words and total number of unique emotion words is one of the most important strengths of the current study that have contributed to the literature by eliminating possible effects of emotional repetitions and inflated results about emotional memory characteristics.

Another important line of findings indicated that, in triadic memory conversations, there was a significant main effect of family member type. That is, mothers had the highest volume in terms of total number of words. On the other hand, even though children had the lowest level of word contribution into those conversations, they outnumbered both mothers and fathers in terms of turn-takings. In this regard, to the best of our knowledge, the current study has a novel memory coding scheme -total number of line- and uniquely contributed to the existing literature by examining each family member's number of turn-takings which is widely investigated in pragmatics rather than the autobiographical memory literature.

One interesting finding of the current study is worth to be discussed: there was no significant main effect of child's gender for family members' contributions to the overall composition of triadic memory composition, whereas a strong main effect of child's gender was found for their emotional contributions. That is, the finding of child's gender effect on parental reminiscing is only valid for emotional characteristics; and parents used more emotional reminiscing style when conversing with their daughters. This line of findings has supported that the way of parental reminiscing in triadic family conversations about shared emotional memories differentiated only in terms of emotional memory characteristics rather than in terms of volume or turn-takings. Therefore, one can argue that emotional characteristics, included in parent-child reminiscing, actually reflect parents' deeply-seated gender schemas that attribute emotional characteristics to the females, considering acceptable nature of emotion expressions and relatedness for females.

4.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies

First of all, future studies should replicate the findings of current study for generalizability. Regarding the nature of the current study's design, the required sample size was higher than the amount of we had -80 families when family member type was set only to parents. In detail, having both within- and between-subjects factor requires larger sample size in order to increase the statistical power in ANOVA test. Of course, this type of research that is qualitative in terms of codings and hard to recruit participants, usually might not have the ideal sample size. Still, future studies might recruit a larger sample and replicate these findings.

Although controlled laboratory settings implemented by the current study help to remove possible effects of confounding variables, it could negatively affect the participants' performance. In other words, even though the researchers tried to kindly communicate with each family member for their easier warming-up, participants could be negatively influenced by the unfamiliar researchers, laboratory environment and unrestrainable observer effect, which in turn, their probability of having concentration problems and false pretence might be increased. For example, restricted time allocated to each family could results in difficulties in terms of focusing on an emotionally important and shared past event for both selection and conversation phases. Especially, as children were observed to need more time for focusing on a conversational task than we have assumed, further studies might provide more time to warm-up the family for more productive memory conversations. On the other hand, the laboratory settings including lots of social agents could be advantageous for the mothers. As women are more comfortable in social contexts, they could adopt the role of fathers more easily in such laboratory setting, which in turn, they could behave more relaxed and active way in terms of contributions to those family conversations. Those laboratory-setting problems would remain as limitations even if we have conducted home-visits.

Additionally, we have tried to control multiple demographics of the participants in the phase of analyses. However, most of the variables were found to be strongly correlated with each other, and some of the correlations were random. Furthermore,

based on the nature of study design, adding even one more variable into our model would require far greater size of sample in order to be statistically appropriate. In addition, we had no specific hypothesis about the demographic information of the participants along with our study variables, so none of these variables were included. Future research might draw attention to other possible individual differences.

4.5 Conclusions

To the best of our knowledge, the current study has been the first one to demonstrate; a) main effects of both child's gender and family member type together in emotionally positive and negative memories, b) that both parents used more emotion and unique emotion words while conversing with their daughters, and their daughters followed the same lead, in a triadic memory conversation, c) that these findings were very similar in terms of total number of emotion words and unique emotion words, so that they were far from the inflations, d) that a significant main effect of child's gender was only found for the emotional memory characteristics of families -not for their contributions into the overall composition-, which reflected parents' deeply-seated gender schemas, rather than the random results, e) that mothers used highest number of emotion words, unique emotion words, and total number of words in these triadic memory conversations, f) that children scored lowest when it came to volume of conversation, yet they had the highest mean for turn-taking in these conversations, demonstrating their active participation in these memory conversations, g) that all these findings regarding the main effects are consistent within themselves and independent from each other, due to lack of an interaction effect, and finally h) that findings of previous literature -except for the triadic conversational setting- were replicated in Turkish familial system. All taken together, the current study demonstrated novel findings and contributed to the existing literature uniquely. Future studies should focus more onto the familial memory conversations, triadic or crowder, or in different cultural contexts, in order to elicit the gist of family dynamics as a whole, contributing into reminiscing practices.

REFERENCES

Ackil, J. K., Van Abbema, D. L., & Bauer, P. J. (2003). After the storm: Enduring differences in mother–child recollections of traumatic and nontraumatic events. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 84*(4), 286-309.

Adams, S., Kuebli, J., Boyle, P. A., Reese, E., & Eppen, M. (1995). Gender differences in parent-child conversations about past emotions: A longitudinal investigation. *Sex Roles, 33*(5), 309–323.

Arendell, T. (2000). Conceiving and Investigating Motherhood: The Decade's Scholarship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*(4), 1192–1207.

Aznar, A., & Tenenbaum, H. R. (2015). Gender and age differences in parent–child emotion talk. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 33(*1), 148-155.

Bauer, P. J., Burch, M. M., Van Abbema, D. L., & Ackil, J. K. (2007). Talking about twisters: Relations between mothers' and children's contributions to conversations about a devastating tornado. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 8*(4), 371-399.

Bauer, P. J., Leventon, J. S., & Varga, N. L. (2012). Neuropsychological assessment of memory in preschoolers. *Neuropsychology review, 22*(4), 414-424.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354-364.

Bird, A., Reese, E., & Tripp, G. (2006). Parent–child talk about past emotional events: Associations with child temperament and goodness-of-fit. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 7*(2), 189-210.

Bohanek, J. G., & Fivush, R. (2010). Personal narratives, well-being, and gender in adolescence. *Cognitive Development, 25*(4), 368–379.

Bohanek, J. G., Fivush, R., & Walker, E. (2005). Memories of positive and negative emotional events. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19*(1), 51–66.

Bohanek, J. G., Fivush, R., Zaman, W., Lepore, C. E., Merchant, S., & Duke, M. P. (2009). Narrative interaction in family dinnertime conversations. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 55*(4), 488–515.

Bohanek, J. G., Marin, K. A., Fivush, R., & Duke, M. P. (2006). Family narrative interaction and children's sense of self. *Family Process, 45*(1), 39–54.

Bonney, J. F., Kelley, M. L., & Levant, R. F. (1999). A model of fathers' behavioral involvement in child care in dual-earner families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 13*(3), 401–415.

Bost, K. K., Choi, E., & Wong, M. S. (2010). Narrative structure and emotional references in parent–child reminiscing: Associations with child gender, temperament, and the quality of parent–child interactions. *Early Child Development and Care, 180*(1-2), 139-156.

Brody, L. R. (1997). Gender and emotion: Beyond stereotypes. *Journal of Social Issues, 53*(2), 369-393.

Buckner, J. P., & Fivush, R. (1998). Gender and self in children's autobiographical narratives. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 12*(4), 407-429.

Chaplin, T. M. (2015). Gender and emotion expression: A developmental contextual perspective. *Emotion Review, 7*(1), 14-21.

Conway, M. A., & Pleydell-Pearce, C. W. (2000). The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. *Psychological Review, 107*(2), 261-288.

Çopur, Z., Erkal, S., Doğan, N., & Şafak, S. (2010). Sharing and spending time on domestic tasks: A Turkish sample. *Journal of Comparative Studies, Winter 3*(2), 510-525.

Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (2003). Understanding families as systems. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 12*(5), 193–196.

Ely, R., & Ryan, E. (2008). Remembering talk: Individual and gender differences in reported speech. *Memory, 16*(4), 395–409.

Fivush, R. (1998). Interest, gender, and personal narrative: How children construct self understanding. In L. Hoffman, A. Krapp, K.A. Renninger, & J. Baumert (Eds.), *Interest and learning, Proceedings of the Seeon Conference on Interest and Gender* (pp. 58–73). Olshausenstrasse, Kiel: IPN.

Fivush, R. (2008). Remembering and reminiscing: How individual lives are constructed in family narratives. *Memory Studies, 1*(1), 49-58.

Fivush, R. (2011). The development of autobiographical memory. *The Annual Review of Psychology, 62*(1), 559-582.

Fivush, R., & Nelson, K. (2006). Parent–child reminiscing locates the self in the past. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24*(1), 235–251.

Fivush, R., & Wang, Q. (2005). Emotion talk in mother-child conversations of the shared past: The effects of culture, gender, and event valence. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 6*(4), 489–506.

Fivush, R., Bohanek, J. G., & Zaman, W. (2010). Personal and intergenerational narratives in relation to adolescents' well-being. In T. Habermas (Ed.), The development of autobiographical reasoning in adolescence and beyond. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 131*, 45–57.

Fivush, R., Brotman, M. A., Buckner, J. P., & Goodman, S. H. (2000). Gender differences in parent-child emotion narratives. *Sex Roles, 41*(3), 233-253.

Fivush, R., Edwards, V. J., & Mennuti-Washburn, J. (2003). Narratives of 9/11: Relations among personal involvement, narrative content and memory of the emotional impact over time. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 17*(9), 1099-1111.

Fivush, R., Habermas, T., Waters, T. E.A., & Zaman, W. (2011). The making of autobiographical memory: Intersections of culture, narratives and identity. *International Journal of Psychology, 46*(5), 321-345.

Fivush, R., Haden, C. A., & Reese, E. (2006). Elaborating on elaborations: Role of maternal reminiscing style in cognitive and socioemotional development. *Child Development, 77*(6), 1568–1588.

Fivush, R., Hazzard, A., Sales, J. M., Sarfati, D. and Brown, T. (2003). Creating coherence out of chaos? Children's narratives of emotionally positive and negative events. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 17*(1), 1–19.

Fivush, R., Marin, K., Crawford, M., Reynolds, M., & Brewin, C. R. (2007). Children's narratives and well-being. *Cognition & Emotion, 21*(7), 1414 – 1434.

Fivush, R., Marin, K., Mcwilliams, K., & Bohanek, J. G. (2009). Parent gender and emotional focus in relation to child well- being. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 10*(3), 210–235.

Fivush, R., Sales, J. M., & Bohanek, J. G. (2008). Meaning making in mothers' and children' s narratives of emotional events. *Memory, 16*(6), 579-594.

Forcey, L. R. (1994). Feminist perspectives on mothering and peace. In E. N. Glenn, G. Chang, & L. R. Forcey (Eds.), *Mothering: Ideology, experience, and agency*, 355-375. New York: Routledge.

Gratier, M., Devouche, E., Guellai, B., Infanti, R., Yilmaz, E., & Parlato-Oliveira, E. (2015). Early development of turn-taking in vocal interaction between mothers and infants. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*(1167), 236-245.

Habermas, T., & Bluck, S. (2000). Getting a life: The emergence of the life story in adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(5), 748-769.

Haden, C. A., Haine, R. A., & Fivush, R. (1997). Developing narrative structure in parent-child reminiscing across the preschool years. *Developmental Psychology, 33*(2), 295–307.

Işık-Baş, H., Şahin-Acar, B., & Özen-Çıplak, A. (in press). Anne-ergen çiftlerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri algısının içerik analizi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları.*

Kail, R. (2010). Emotional Development. *In Children and Their Development* (5th ed., pp. 312-341). New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Kent-Walsh, J., Binger, C., & Hasham, Z. (2010). Effects of parent instruction on the symbolic communication of children using augmentative and alternative communication during storybook reading. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 19*(2), 97-107.

Leaper, C., & Friedman, C. K. (2007). The Socialization of Gender. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research* (pp. 561-587). New York: The Guilford Press

Lindsey, E. W., & Caldera, Y. M. (2006). Mother–father–child triadic interaction and mother – child dyadic interaction: Gender differences within and between contexts. *Sex Roles, 55*(7), 511–521.

McHale, J. P., & Fivaz-Depeursinge, E. (1999). Understanding triadic and family group interactions during infancy and toddlerhood. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 2*(2), 107-127.

Morgan G. A., Leech, N. L., Gloeckner, G. W., & Barrett, K. C. (2004). *SPSS for introductory statistics*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey.

Neisser, U. (1988). Five kinds of self-knowledge. *Philosophical Psychology, 1*(1), 35-59.

Nelson, K. (2003). Narrative and self, myth and memory: Emergence of the cultural self. In Fivush, R., & Haden, C.A. (Eds.). *Autobiographical memory and the construction of a narrative self: Developmental and cultural perspectives* (pp. 3-27). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Nelson, K., & Fivush, R. (2004). The emergence of autobiographical memory: A social cultural developmental theory. *Psychological Review, 111*(2), 486-511.

Pillemer, D. B., Wink, P., DiDonato, T. E., & Sanborn, R. L. (2003). Gender differences in autobiographical memory styles of older adults. *Memory, 11*(6), 525–532.

Reese, E., Haden, C. A., & Fivush, R. (1993). Mother-child conversations about the past: Relationships of style and memory over time. *Cognitive development, 8*(4), 403-430.

Renk, K., Roberts, R., Roddenberry, A., Luick, M., Hillhouse, S., Meehan, C., ... & Phares, V. (2003). Mothers, fathers, gender role, and time parents spend with their children. *Sex Roles, 48*(7), 305-315.

Sales, J. M., Fivush, R., & Peterson, C. (2003). Parental reminiscing about positive and negative events. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 4*(2), 185–209.

Sales, J. M., Fivush, R., Parker, J., & Bahrick, L. (2005). Stressing memory: Long-term relations among children's stress, recall and psychological outcome following hurricane Andrew. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 6*(4), 529–545.

Stoneman, Z., & Brody, G. H. (1981). Two's company, three makes a difference: An examination of mothers' and fathers' speech to their young children. *Child Development, 52*(2), 705–707.

Van Bergen, P., & Salmon, K. (2010). The association between parent-child reminiscing and children's emotion knowledge. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 39*(1), 51–56.

Wang, Q. (2013). *The autobiographical self in time and culture* (pp. 1-32). New York, NY: Oxford. University Press.

Wang, Q. (2016). Remembering the self in cultural contexts: A cultural dynamic theory of autobiographical memory. *Memory Studies, 9*(3), 295-304.

Wang, Q., & Fivush, R. (2005). Mother–child conversations of emotionally salient events: exploring the functions of emotional reminiscing in European-American and Chinese families. *Social Development, 14(*3), 473-495.

Ward, N., & Tsukahara, W. (2000). Prosodic features which cue back-channel responses in English and Japanese. *Journal of pragmatics, 32(*8), 1177-1207.

Wiemann, J. M., & Knapp, M. L. (1975). Turn- taking in conversations. *Journal of communication, 25*(2), 75-92.

Zaman, W., & Fivush, R. (2011). When my mom was a little girl…: Gender differences in adolescents' intergenerational and personal stories. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(3), 703–716.

Zaman, W., & Fivush, R. (2013). Gender differences in elaborative parent-child emotion and play narratives. *Sex roles*, *68*(9-10), 591.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Demographic Information Form

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

Çocuğunuzun Doğum Tarihi: ___/____/___

Çocuğunuzun Cinsiyeti: Kız / Erkek

Çocuğunuz okul öncesi bir kuruma (kreş, anaokulu, yuva vs.) devam etti mi?

☐ Evet ☐ Hayır Evet ise süresi: ___

Çocuğunuzun kendisi dışındaki kardeş sayısı: _____

Kardeşlerinin yaşları ve cinsiyetleri (büyükten küçüğe doğru sıralayarak yazınız):_____

Çocuğunuzun herhangi bir fiziksel ve/veya ruhsal bir rahatsızlığı var mı?

☐ Evet ☐ Hayır Evet ise ne olduğunu belirtiniz:_____

Eğitim Durumunuz:
- ☐ İlkokul mezunuyum.
- ☐ Ortaokul mezunuyum.
- ☐ Lise mezunuyum.
- ☐ Üniversite mezunuyum.
- ☐ Yüksek Lisans/Doktora mezunuyum.

Hangisi ailenizin sosyo-ekonomik statüsünü tanımlar?:
- ☐ Alt
- ☐ Ortanın altı
- ☐ Orta
- ☐ Ortanın üstü
- ☐ Üst

Ailenizde (aynı evde) sürekli olarak yaşayan kişi sayısı: _____

Appendix B: Ethical Permission

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

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

Sayı: 28620816/ 158

08 MART 2017

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Yrd. Doç. Dr. Başak ŞAHİN ACAR;

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız yüksek lisans öğrencisi Elif BÜRÜMLÜ'nün ***"Duygusal İçerikli Anılar Hakkında Aile Konuşmaları: Anne, Baba ve Çocuğun Anı Özelliklerinin Üçlü olarak İncelenmesi"*** başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay **2017-SOS-035** protokol numarası ile **08.03.2017 – 30.10.2017** tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Canan SÜMER
İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başkanı

Prof. Dr. Mehmet UTKU
İAEK Üyesi

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL
İAEK Üyesi

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR
İAEK Üyesi

Doç. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
İAEK Üyesi

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN
İAEK Üyesi

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK
İAEK Üyesi

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

VELİ ONAY FORMU

Sevgili Veli,

Bu araştırma Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü Öğretim Görevlisi Yard. Doç. Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar danışmanlığında Psk. Elif Bürümlü tarafından yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında yürütülmektedir. Çalışmanın genel amacı; anne, baba ve çocukların birlikte katıldığı geçmişe ait duygusal anı içerikli aile konuşmalarını incelemektir. Bu amacı gerçekleştirebilmek için sizin ve çocuğunuzun çalışmamıza katılımınıza ihtiyaç duymaktayız.

Çalışmaya katılmayı onayladığınız takdirde, sizlerin ve çocuğunuzun birlikte dahil olacağı kısa bir konuşma gerçekleştirmeniz istenecek ve ardından sizden bazı anketlere yanıt vermeniz beklenecektir. Çalışma süresince verilen bilgiler tamamen gizli tutulacak olup sadece bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılacaktır. Ayrıca bu çalışma, sizi veya çocuğunuzu olumsuz olarak etkileyebilecek hiçbir öge içermemektedir.

Bu formu imzaladıktan sonra istediğiniz zaman katılımcılıktan ayrılma hakkına sahipsiniz. Araştırma sonuçlarının özeti istediğiniz üzerine tarafımızdan size ulaştırılacaktır.

Araştırmayla ilgili sorularınızı aşağıdaki e-posta adreslerini kullanarak bize yöneltebilirsiniz.

Saygılarımızla,

Yard. Doç. Dr. Başak Şahin-Acar
basaks@metu.edu.tr

Psk. Elif Bürümlü
elif.burumlu@metu.edu.tr

Lütfen bu araştırmaya katılmak konusundaki tercihinizi aşağıya imzanızı atarak belirtiniz.

Bu araştırmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum. Çocuğumun da bu araştırmaya katılmasını kabul ediyorum. Çalışmayı istediğim zaman yarıda kesip bırakabileceğimi biliyorum ve verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı olarak kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

Adı-Soyadı	Tarih	İmza
_____	____/____/____	_____

Appendix E: Turkish Summary / Türkçe Özet

İnsanlar neden hayatlarına dair anılar biriktirir? Anıları hatırlama ve aktarma stilleri yapı, içerik, ulaşılabilirlik ve atfedilen önem bakımından neden farklılık gösterir? Bu soruları cevaplamaya çalışırken bile birçok anımız aklımıza gelir. Çünkü anıları hatırlama ve onlar hakkında konuşma psikolojik sağlığımızla büyük oranda ilişkilidir. Bir diğer deyişle, psikolojik devamlılık ve iyi olma hali, ancak otobiyografik belleğimiz ve onları başkalarıyla paylaşarak kendimizi ailemize, arkadaşlarımıza ve dünyaya kaynaştırdığımız sürece mümkündür (Fivush et al., 2011). Otobiyografik bellek ise ilk olarak ve büyük çoğunlukla evde, ve çocukluk sırasında ebeveynlerle yapılan ortak anılar hakkındaki konuşmalar sayesinde oluşur.

İnsanoğlunun otobiyografik belleği, yaşamının ilk yıllarından başlayarak kademeli bir biçimde oluşur ve şekillenir. Özellikle okul öncesi yaşlardan itibaren, dil ve bilişsel gelişimin de katkılarıyla, çocuklar *anlatı benliğini* (narrative self) büyük oranda geliştirir (Neisser, 1988). Bireyin otobiyografik gelişimini kapsayan okul öncesi yaşlar, insan gelişimin en kritik dönemini temsil eder (Nelson, 2003). Bu nedenle, okul öncesi dönemdeki bireylerin anılarının ve onları aktarma stillerinin araştırılması çok önemlidir.

Otobiyografik bellek ve anlatılar bireysel olarak şekillense de, çevreden bağımsız olması imkansızdır. Bu sebeple, anıların değerinin, içeriğinin ve yapısının kişiden kişiye farklılaşması doğal bir sonuçtur. Anılarımızdaki bireysel farklılıklara neden olan en önemli etkenlerden biri ise *toplumsal cinsiyet sosyalleşmesi* (gender socialization) ve buna dair süreçtir. Toplumsal cinsiyet faktörünün bir sonucu olarak, insanların otobiyografik bellek özellikleri büyük ölçüde farklılaşmaktadır. İlgili literatürdeki çalışmaların büyük çoğunluğu, kadınların daha uzun, ayrıntılı, bütünlüklü ve duygusal yönden daha açıklayıcı anılara sahip olduğunu, hatta cinsiyete dayalı bu farklılıkların ergenlik ve okul öncesi dönemlerde de sıkça gözlendiğini ortaya koymuştur (Buckner & Fivush, 1998).

Otobiyografik belleğimizle çoğu zaman ilişkilendirdiğimiz duygular ise, anılarımızı daha canlı ve anlamlı kıldığı için büyük önem taşır. Dünyayı algılamamıza ve çevreye adapte olmamıza yardımcı olmak gibi birçok psikolojik işleve sahip olan duygular, anılarımızı daha kolay yorumlamamıza katkı sağlayarak kendi geçmişimize de yansırlar (Kail, 2010). Duygusal içeriği yoğun olan bellek ve aktarma stilleri ise bu yorumlama yeteneğiyle ilişkili olup, onları hatırlamaya değer kılar. Bu duyguları benimsemek ve diğer aile üyeleriyle paylaşmak da bireyin psikolojik sağlığını olumlu yönde etkilemektedir (Fivush et al., 2007). Özellikle okul öncesi yıllarda, duygusal açıdan önemli olan anıları, yoğun bir duygusal içerikle hatırlamak ve aktarmak, bireyin duygusal becerileri ve iyi olma haline önemli katkıda bulunur (ör., Van Bergen & Salmon, 2010).

Otobiyografik ve duygusal benliklerine bağlı olarak çocukların bellek özelliklerine değinmek, kişilerarası bağlamlarını da araştırmayı gerektirir. Özellikle anneler ve babalar olmak üzere, aile ortamı, çocukların anı aktarma stillerine eşsiz katkılarda bulunur. *Otobiyografik belleğin kültürel dinamik teorisi*ne (the cultural dynamic theory of autobiographical memory) göre, küçük çocuklar, aile dinamiklerindeki en aktif bireyler olarak, otobiyografik benliklerini, anneleri ve babaları ile etkileşim içerisinde birikimsel olarak kurarlar. Bu nedenle, çocukların anı aktarma stilleri çoğunlukla ilgili ebeveyn uygulamalarını yansıtır (Wang, 2016). Buna ek olarak, *aile sistemleri teorisi* (family systems theory) ailenin anne, baba ve çocuk arasında dinamik etkileşimler içerdiğini ve bunun da çocukların gelişimini olumlu yönde etkilediğini göstermektedir (Cox & Paley, 2003).

Aile üyeleri arasındaki bu aktif etkileşimi göz önünde tutarak, önceki literatür ebeveyn-çocuk anı aktarma stilleri ve özelliklerinin, çocukların hangi ebeveynle konuştuğunun (ebeveyn türü: anne veya baba) ve çocuğun cinsiyetinin bir sonucu olarak farklılık gösterebileceğini belirtmektedir. Bir diğer deyişle, ailenin ortak anılarının aktarımı sırasında, hangi ebeveynin konuştuğunun yanı sıra, kız veya oğlan çocuğuyla konuşuluyor olması, aktarılan konuşmanın içerik ve yapısını büyük ölçüde etkiler. Bu konuyla ilgili olarak yapılan çalışmalar, annelerin babalara kıyasla daha çok duygusal ifade kullandıklarını yaygın şekilde desteklemektedir (örn., Fivush, Brotman, Buckner, & Goodman, 2000). Ayrıca, paylaşılan duygusal anılar hakkında

oğullarıyla konuşan ailelere kıyasla, kızlarıyla konuşan ebeveynler daha sık ve çeşitli duygusal ifadeler kullanmaktadır (örn., Adams, Kuebli, Boyle, & Fivush, 1995). İlgili literatürdeki tüm bu çalışmalar ise ya sadece çocuğun cinsiyeti ya da ebeveyn türüne bağlı olarak bellek özelliklerinde farklılıkları incelemiştir. Her ikisinin de etkilerini inceleyen birkaç çalışmanın ise ya sadece anne-çocuk ve baba-çocuk konuşmaları arasında ikili karşılaştırmalar yaptığı, ya da anne-baba-çocuk üçlü karşılaştırmalarını anı konuşmalarından farklı bağlamlarda inceledikleri tespit edilmiştir. Bildiğimiz kadarıyla, ebeveynlerin ve çocukların toplumsal cinsiyetinin paylaşılan duygusal geçmiş hakkındaki konuşmalarına olan etkisi, daha önce üçlü bağlamda hiç incelenmemiştir. Bu nedenle, ailenin etkileşim ve ortak anılarla ilgili aktarım sistemini anne, baba ve çocuğu birlikte bir bütün olarak ele alarak inceleyen bu çalışmanın, otobiyografik bellek ve anıların aktarımda meydana gelen bireysel farklılıkları tam anlamıyla anlayabilmek açısından ilgili literatüre katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmüştür.

Bu çalışma, anne-baba ve çocuk üçlülerinin, geçmişte beraber yaşadıkları, duygusal olarak olumlu ve olumsuz açıdan etkilendikleri olaylar üzerine yaptıkları konuşmaları incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmanın asıl amaçları şunlardır: anne-baba-çocuk üçlü anı aktarımında a) ebeveynlerin konuşmalarında kullandıkları duygusal ifadelerinin, ebeveyn türü ve çocuğun cinsiyetinin etkisiyle ne ölçüde farklılaşacağını incelemek, b) her bir aile üyesinin (anne, baba ve çocuk), ailenin anı aktarma stillerine olan bireysel katkısına bakılarak, aile içi duygusal içerikli konuşmaların genel kompozisyonunu araştırmak.

Çalışmanın amaçlarına bağlı olarak, ilgili literatürdeki bulgular ışığında, anne-baba-çocuk üçlülerinin paylaşılan duygusal geçmiş hakkındaki konuşmalarını nasıl farklılaşacağı aşağıdaki gibi hipotez edilmiştir.

1- Hem olumlu hem de olumsuz duygusal anılarla ilgili üçlü aile konuşmalarında kız çocuğu olan ebeveynler, oğlu olanlara kıyasla, daha fazla (toplam duygusal kelime sayısı) ve çeşitli (toplam farklı duygusal kelime sayısı) duygusal terim kullanacaktır.

2- Hem olumlu hem de olumsuz duygusal anılarla ilgili üçlü aile konuşmalarında, çocuğun cinsiyetinden bağımsız olarak, anneler babalara kıyasla daha çok ve çeşitli duygusal terim kullanacaktır.

3- Çocuğun ve ebeveynin cinsiyetinin etkileşim etkisini düşündüğümüzde, hem olumlu hem de olumsuz duygusal anılarla ilgili üçlü aile konuşmalarında, kızlarıyla konuşan anneler daha çok ve çeşitli duygusal terimler kullanacaklardır.

Çalışmaya, 5 ve 6.5 yaş aralığında olan 61 çocuk (M = 69.69, SD = 6.06) ile hem anneleri ($M_{yaş}$ = 35.76, SD = 4.89), hem de babaları ($M_{yaş}$ = 39.26, SD = 5.07) olmak üzere toplam 183 katılımcı dahil edilmiştir. Çalışmaya katılan aileler sadece birlikte yaşayan aileleri kapsamaktadır. Ebeveynlerden alınan bilgilere göre, ailelerin büyük çoğunluğu orta ve orta üstü sosyoekonomik statüde yer almaktadır. Eğitim seviyesi açısından, çoğu anne ve baba en az üniversite mezunu olduğunu belirtirken, %96.7'sı ise çocuklarının bir süredir okul öncesi bir eğitim kurumuna devam ettiğini vurgulamıştır.

Çalışmayı gerçekleştirmek amacıyla her bir aile için ayrı gün ve saatlerde randevular ayarlanarak, anne-baba-çocuk üçlüleri Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kampüsü içerisinde yer alan ODTÜ Çocuk ve Ergen Gelişimi Laboratuvarı'na davet edilmiştir. Laboratuvara gelen aile üyeleriyle gerçekleşen kısa bir tanışma ve kaynaşma sürecinden sonra, aile bireylerinden laboratuvarda bulunan koltuğa yanyana ve çocuk iki ebeveynin arasında kalacak biçimde oturmaları rica edilmiştir. Aileye çalışmanın içeriği ve prosedürü hakkında kısa bir bilgi verildikten sonra, anne ve babadan ayrı ayrı kendileri ve çocuklarının gönüllü katılımına dair gerekli imzalamaları istenmiş ve ailenin de izniyle iki farklı ses kayıt cihazı açılarak çalışma başlatılmıştır.

Çalışma içerik olarak duygusal anı aktarımını incelediğinden, öncelikle anne ve babalara son bir yıl içerisinde ailecek beraber yaşadıkları ve çocuğu duygusal açıdan oldukça olumlu ve olumsuz biçimde etkilediklerini düşündükleri anılar hakkında düşünmeleri istemiştir. Verilen kısa bir süre sonunda ebeveynlerden, kısaca not aldıkları bu duygusal anılar içerisinden ortak olarak bir olumlu ve bir olumsuz anı olmak üzere iki farklı anı seçmeleri beklenmiştir. Daha sonra tüm aile bireylerinden,

anne ve babanın ortak olarak kararlaştırdıkları bu anıları, her birini beşer dakika olmak üzere toplam 10 dakika süreyle ailecek tartışmaları istenmiştir. Duygusal içerikli anıların konuşulma sırası literatürde olduğu gibi, gelen aile sayısının yarısında olumlu anı ile, diğer yarısında ise olumsuz anı ile başlatılarak karışık dengelenmiştir (counterbalanced). Ailenin anı aktarımı sırasında araştırmacılar laboratuvarda yer alan paravanın arka tarafında beklemiş ve verilen süre dolmadan aileye hiçbir şekilde müdahale etmemişlerdir.

Her iki anı aktarımı da sona erdiğinde, önce anne ve daha sonra baba olmak üzere ayrı ayrı, laboratuvarın arka tarafında yer alan bilgisayara davet edilerek hem ebeveynin kendisi hem de çocukla ilgili olarak kişisel soruların yer aldığı (örn., doğum tarihi, eğitim düzeyi, sosyoekonomik statü) demografik bilgi formunu elektronik ortamda doldurmaları istenmiştir. Demografik formun doldurulması esnasında ebeveyne kulaklık takılarak beyaz ses verilirken, diğer ebeveyn ve çocuk ise başka bir çalışmanın görevini yerine getirmiştir. İki ebeveyn de formu doldurduğunda ise çalışma sonlandırılmıştır.

Çalışmanın görevleri bittikten sonra araştırmacı tarafından tek tek tüm aile bireylerine sadece olumlu yönlerden oluşan geri bildirimler verilmiştir (örn., konuşma sırasında göz teması kurmaya önem gösterdiniz). Ayrıca, ebeveynlere aile iletişimi hakkında araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanan kısa bir bilgilendirme broşürü ve çocuğa katılımı için temsili bir ODTÜ diploması hediye edilmiştir.

Çalışma sırasında alınan ses kayıtları orijinal dilde (Türkçe) metin haline getirilmiştir. Ailelere ait tüm yazılı kopyalar esas araştırmacı tarafından kodlanırken, yazılı kopyaların %20'si ikinci bir araştırmacı tarafından tekrar kodlanarak iki araştırmacı arasındaki güvenilirlik değerleri hesaplanmış ve .88 ile .99 arasında olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Çalışmadaki kodlamalar her bir aile bireyi (anne, baba ve çocuk) için ayrı ayrı yapılmış olup olumlu ve olumsuz olaylar için de ayrı ayrı hesaplanmıştır. Çalışmanın amaçlarına bağlı olarak, kodlama şemaları ise üç başlıkta toplanabilir: toplam duygusal kelime sayısı, toplam farklı duygusal kelime sayısı ve kompozisyon (toplam satır sayısı ve toplam kelime sayısı). Toplam duygusal sözcük sayısı

kodlanırken, tüm duygusal tepkiler ve davranışları temsil eden sözcükler sayılarak her bir aile bireyi için ayrı ayrı toplanmıştır. Farklı duygusal kelimeler kodlanırken ise birebir yinelenen ve aynı sözcük köküne sahip duygusal sözcükler göz ardı edilerek, her duygu yalnızca bir defa sayılmış ve her aile bireyinin kaç çeşit duygusal kelime kullandığı ayrı ayrı toplanarak duygusal kelime çeşitliliği hesaplanmıştır. Toplam satır sayısı kodlanırken de her bir aile bireyinin konuşma süresince ne kadar satıra sahibi olduğu (ne kadar konuşma sırası aldığı- *turn-taking*) toplanarak hesaplanmıştır. Son olarak, üçlü anı aktarımı sırasında kaç kelime konuştukları her bir birey için ayrı ayrı toplanarak hesaplanmıştır.

Çalışma sorularını test edebilmek için öncelikle her bir aile bireyine ait demografik bilgiler ve kodlamalar veri olarak girilmiş, olası veri girişi hataları ve eksiklikleri kontrol edilmiştir. Olumlu ve olumsuz anı konuşmaları için yapılan ayrı analizlere ek olarak ikisinin birleşimi için de aynı analizler tekrarlanmıştır. Çalışmanın hipotezleri, bağımlı değişken olarak sadece ebeveyn konuşmalarındaki farklılıkları karşılaştırmayı hedeflerken, analizler sırasında sonucu değiştirmediği görülerek ve üçlü aile kompozisyonunu incelemek amacıyla çocuk konuşmaları da analizlere katılmıştır. Böylece ebeveyn türü değişkeni aile bireyi türü (anne, baba veya çocuk) olarak değiştirilmiş ve sonuçlar bu doğrultuda daha kapsamlı olarak raporlanıp tartışılmıştır.

Çalışmanın ilk amacı olan anıların duygusal içeriğiyle ilgili bireysel farklılıkları karşılaştırmak için, her bağımsız değişken ve olumlu, olumsuz ve ikisinin kombinasyonları (olumlu ve olumsuz anı konuşmaları birleştirilip bir bütün olarak düşünüldüğünde) için de ayrı olmak üzere bir dizi Varyans Analizi (ANOVA) yapılmıştır. Deney deseni ise 2 x 3 (çocuğun cinsiyeti [kız, oğlan] x aile bireyi türü [anne, baba, çocuk]) karışık faktörlü desendir. Bu desende çocuğun cinsiyeti denekler arası değişken olup, aile bireyi türü denek içi değişkendir.

Öncelikle anıların kombinasyonunda hem çocuğun cinsiyeti hem de aile bireyi türünün, toplam duygusal kelime sayısı ve toplam farklı duygusal kelime sayısına olan temel etkileri anlamlı olarak bulunmuştur. Ancak çocuğun cinsiyeti ve aile birey türünün etkileşiminin bu değişkenler üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi bulunamamıştır.

Sadece olumsuz anı konuşmalarını ele alırsak, kümülatif olarak bakılan anı konuşmalarıyla tamamen aynı sonuç örneğine rastlanmıştır. Olumlu anı konuşmaları için yapılan analizlerde de aile birey türünün temel etkisi ve etkileşim etkisi yukarıdaki diğer bulgularla benzerlik gösterirken, burada farklı olarak, çocuğun cinsiyetinin hem toplam duygusal kelime sayısı hem de toplam farklı duygusal kelime sayısına olan temel etkisi anlamlı bulunamamıştır. Bu bulgulara dayanarak, çalışmanın ilk iki hipotezinin büyük ölçüde doğrulandığını söyleyebiliriz. Ayrıntılı olarak, ilk hipotezdeki çocuğun cinsiyetinin temel etkisini düşünürsek, anne-baba-kız üçlülerindeki her bir bireyin, anne-baba-oğlan üçlülerindekilere oranlara daha çok ve çeşitli duygusal terimler kullandığını göstermiştir. İkinci hipotezimizdeki aile bireyi türünün temel etkisini ele aldığımızda ise, annelerin babalardan daha çok ve çeşitli duygusal terimler kullandığını, çocukların ise duygusal ifade olarak anne ve babalarından geride olduğu saptanmıştır. Öngörülenin aksine, çocuğun cinsiyeti ve aile birey türünün etkileşimi hiçbir analizde anlamlı bulunamamış ve kızı olan annelerin daha çok ve çeşitli duygusal ifadeler kullandığı hipotezi doğrulanamamıştır.

İlgili literatürde yer alan çalışmalar da bu çalışmanın üçlü anı konuşmalarındaki duygusal ifade farklılıklarına yönelik bulgularını desteklemektedir. Çocuğun cinsiyetinin anlamlı temel etkisini ele alırsak, literatürde anne-çocuk ve baba-çocuk ikililerinin anı aktarım sistemini inceleyen çalışmalar da destekliyor ki, kızlarıyla anıları hakkında konuşan anneler ve babalar, oğullarıyla konuşanlara oranla, daha çok ve çeşitli duygusal ifade kullanıyorlar (Adams, 1995; Fivush ve ark., 2000; Aznar & Tenenbaum, 2015; Fivush & Wang, 2005). Bu bulgunun sadece toplam duygusal kelime sayısı için değil, yinelenen ifadeleri attığımızda (toplam farklı duygusal kelime sayısı) da geçerli olması ise, bu çalışmanın güçlü yönlerinden biri olup yöntemsel olarak da literatüre önemli katkı sağlamıştır.

Bu çalışmanın bulguları arasında yer alan, ebeveyn türünün anılardaki duygusal ifade farklılıkları üzerine anlamlı temel etkisini düşünürsek, Fivush ve arkadaşları (2000) da anne-çocuk ve baba-çocuk ikililerini karşılaştırdıkları bir çalışmada, bu çalışmayla benzer bulgulara sahip olup, anı aktarımı sırasında annelerin babalara kıyasla duygusal ifadeleri daha sık ve çeşitli kullandıklarını savunmuştur.

Hipotez ettiğimiz üzere bu iki temel etkiye bağlı olarak desteklenen bulgular, ailenin ortak anı aktarım sisteminde toplumsal cinsiyet normlarına dayanan duygusal ifade farklılıklarına işaret etmektedir. *Bem'in toplumsal cinsiyet şeması teorisi*nde de savunulduğu gibi, toplumun insanların cinsiyeti hakkında sahip olduğu bazı bilişsel şemalar vardır (1981). Bu şemalar, kadınsılık ve erkeksilik özelliklerine atfedilen farklı özelliklerden oluşup insanların tutumlarını, eğilimlerini ve davranışlarını etkiler. Cinsiyete dayalı toplumsal normların etkisiyle, kadın ve erkek farklı sosyalleşme süreçleri yaşar ve yaşamını bu kurallara göre şekillendirir. Daha ayrıntılı açıklayacak olursak, bulguların hem kız çocukları hem de annelerin duygusal ifade üstünlüğünü desteklemesi, doğumdan itibaren maruz kaldığımız farklı toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri ile ilişkili olması çok mümkündür. Çünkü, toplumsal cinsiyet normlarına göre duygusallık -duygusal özellikler taşıma- kadınsılık şemasına atfedilen bir özelliktir (Işık-Baş ve ark., baskıda). Bir erkeğin duygusal özelliklere sahip olması toplumsal cinsiyet normlarıyla tutarsız bir davranış olarak kabul edilir ve bu tarz tutarsızlıklara toplumun toleransı daha azdır.

Hipotez ettiğimizin tersine, çocuğun cinsiyeti ve ebeveyn türünün etkileşiminin aile bireylerinin anı aktarımındaki duygusal ifade kullanımları üzerine etkisi anlamlı bulunamamıştır. Çocuğun cinsiyetinin kuvvetli temel etkisine dayanarak, anne-baba-kız ve anne-baba-oğlan üçlülerinin duygusal ifade dağılımlarının birbirlerinden oldukça farklı olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Bir başka deyişle, çocuğun cinsiyetinin güçlü temel etkisi, olası başka faktörlerin açığa çıkmasını engellemiş olabilir. Ayrıca, araştırma deseninin bir gereği olarak, etkileşim etkisinin anlamlı çıkabilmesi, örneklem sayısının daha yüksek olmasıyla mümkün olabilir. Gelecek çalışmalar, bu bulguları, daha geniş bir örneklemle tekrarlamalıdır. Diğer yandan, mevcut çalışmanın duygusal ifade farklılıklarına ilişkin bulgularının, kümülatif ve olumsuz duygusal anı konuşmaları için geçerli olup olumlu duygusal anı için anlamlı bulunamaması, olumsuz olayların hayati değeri ile açıklanabilir. Literatür, olumsuz duygusal olaylarla ilgili ebeveyn-çocuk konuşmalarının daha kapsamlı olduğunu ve olumlu olaylarla ilgili konuşmalarla karşılaştırıldığında, daha çok duygusal ve zihinsel referanslar içerdiğini desteklemiştir (Finkush ve ark., 2008; Ackil ve ark., 2003). Bir diğer deyişle, olumsuz olaylar çocukların psikolojik sağlığı üzerinde daha

etkili olabileceğinden, ebeveynler çocuklarına yardım etme konusunda daha fazla endişe etmiş ve buna uygun olarak daha fazla duygusal tartışmaya yer vermiş olabilirler.

Çalışmanın ikinci amacı olan aile bireylerinin üçlü anı konuşmalarının genel kompozisyonuna yaptıkları bireysel katkıyı keşfetmek için, deney deseni ve yapılan analizler duygusal anı özellikleri incelenirken yapılanlarla birebir aynı olup sadece bağımlı değişkenler toplam satır sayısı ve toplam kelime sayısı olarak değiştirilmiştir.

Çalışmanın bulguları hem olumlu hem olumsuz anılarda hem de her ikisinin kombinasyonunda aile bireyi türünün, toplam satır sayısı ve toplam kelime sayısının üzerindeki temel etkisinin anlamlı olduğunu göstermiştir. Ancak çocuğun cinsiyetinin temel etkisi ve ikisinin etkileşiminin bu değişkenler üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi bulunamamıştır. Çocuğun cinsiyetinden bağımsız olarak, aile bireylerinin üçlü anı konuşmalarının genel kompozisyonuna yaptıkları bireysel katkıyı daha ayrıntılı inceleyecek olursak, annelerin sahip olduğu toplam konuşma sırası ile toplam kelime sayısı babalarınkinden anlamlı olarak fazladır. Çocukların ise, toplam kelime kullanımında anne-baba-çocuk sıralamasında en geride kalırken, konuşma sırası bakımından hem babalarından (anlamlı biçimde) hem de annelerinden (ortalama olarak) önde oldukları saptanmıştır.

Çalışmanın aile anı aktarım sistemindeki genel kompozisyona dayalı bulgularını ele alırsak, aile bireyi türünün temel etkisinin anlamlı olması ve annelerin konuşma hacmi bakımından üstün olması literatür tarafından desteklenmektedir. Fivush ve arkadaşları (2000) anne-çocuk ve baba-çocuk ikili anı konuşmaları karşılaştıran çalışmalarında, annelerin babalardan daha çok kelime kullandığını bulurken; Stoneman ve Brody de üçlü aile etkileşimini karşılaştırdıkları çalışmada benzer sonuçlar bulmuştur (1981). Bu konuşmalarda çocukların, konuşma hacmi bakımından en geride kalması ise onların bulundukları gelişimsel sürece bağlı olarak sahip oldukları sınırlı dilsel kapasitelerinin doğal bir sonucudur (Bauer ve ark., 2007). Konuşma sırası ile ilgili bulgular açısından ise, çocukların aile bireyleri sıralamasında en önde yer alması, dilsel sınırlamalara rağmen çocukların aile içi anı

aktarım sisteminde aktif rol aldığının ve konuşmayı karşılıklı hale getirerek ebeveyn-çocuk etkileşimine dönüştürdüğünün bir göstergesidir (Kent-Walsh, Binger, & Hasham, 2010). Duygusal içeriğin yanı sıra dilbilimsel çalışmaların yoğun olarak incelediği konuşma sırası ve hacmi ile ilgili olarak çalışmanın bulguları, aile içi anı aktarım sistemi literatürüne de önemli katkı sağlamıştır.

Çalışmanın en önemli bulgularından biri olan, çocuğun cinsiyetinin temel etkisinin, genel konuşma kompozisyonu üzerine farklılıklara değil, sadece duygusal ifade farklılıklarına yol açması da derine yerleşmiş toplumsal cinsiyet normları ve etkilerinin bir sonucudur. Çocuğun cinsiyetine bağlı olarak konuşma sırası ve kelime sayısı bakımından farklılaşmayan konuşmaların, yalnızca duygusal ifade açısından farklılaşmakta olduğu ve toplumsal cinsiyet şemalarına uygun olarak, kız çocuğuna sahip ailelerin, oğlu olan ailelere oranla, duygusal konuşmalara ve tartışmalara daha çok yer verdiği bir kez daha desteklenmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, bildiğimiz kadarıyla bu çalışma hem çocuğun cinsiyetinin hem de aile üyelerinin türünün, anne, baba ve çocuğu üçlü olarak inceleyerek ortak duygusal anı aktarım sistemi üzerindeki temel etkilerini gösteren ilk çalışma olmuştur. Toplam ve farklı duygusal kelimeler açısından çok benzer bulgular ortaya konması da çalışmanın literatüre olan katkısını güçlendirmiştir. Buna ek olarak, çocuğun cinsiyetinin anlamlı temel etkisi sadece ailelerin duygusal bellek özellikleri için bulunmuş olup anne-babanın derine yerleşmiş toplumsal cinsiyet şemalarını desteklemektedir. Bulgularımız, annelerin bu üçlü anı aktarımı sırasında kullanılan duygusal kelime, farklı duygusal kelime ve toplam kelime sayısı açısından miktarca en fazla katkı sağladığı gözlemlenirken; konuşmaları karşılıklı bir etkileşim haline getirerek konuşma sırası açısından en fazla katkı sağlayanların ise çocuklar ve anneler olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Son olarak, önceki literatüre ait bulgular Türk aile sistemi içerisinde incelenerek tekrarlanmış, aynı zamanda üçlü (anne-baba-çocuk) konuşma ortamında, ailenin tüm dinamik etkileşimleri incelenerek uluslararası literatüre de önemli bir katkıda bulunulmuştur. Genel geçerliğinin artması için mevcut çalışmanın bulgularının daha geniş ve farklı kültürel ortamlarda tekrarlanması faydalı olacaktır.

Appendix F: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Bürümlü
Adı : Elif
Bölümü : Psikoloji

TEZİN ADI : Family Conversations about Emotional Shared Past Events: The Triadic Examination of Mothers', Fathers' and Children's Memory Characteristics

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☒ Doktora ☐

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

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: