Title

Concepts of Morality, Personal Autonomy, and Parental Authority in Multifaceted Social issues: An Examination of Daughters' and Mothers' Reasoning in Religious and Secular Istanbul, Turkey

Author

Acar, Melike

Publication Date

2011

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Concepts of Morality, Personal Autonomy, and Parental Authority in Multifaceted Social Issues: An Examination of Daughters' and Mothers' Reasoning in Religious and Secular Istanbul, Turkey

By

Melike Acar

A dissertation submitted impartial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

In

Education

In the Graduate Division

Of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge :

Professor Elliot Turiel, Chair
Professor Susan Holloway
Asssociate Professor Kaiping Peng

Fall 2011

Abstract

Concepts of Morality, Personal Autonomy, and Parental Authority in Multifaceted Social issues: An Examination of Daughters' and Mothers' Reasoning in Religious and Secular Istanbul, Turkey

By

Melike Acar

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

University of California, Berkeley

Elliot Turiel, Chair

This study examined religious and secular women's reasoning about personal autonomy, maternal authority, and moral concepts in family decision making situations in urban Turkey. 68 daughters and 34 mothers were individually interviewed about decision-making autonomy in general issues (e.g., clothes, house chores, friends, career, healthcare). In addition, they were asked to evaluate socially controversial versions of the issue (e.g., wearing the headscarf) occurring as a conflict in a hypothetical daughter-mother dyad. Participants regardless of their family status and religious background assigned more decision-making autonomy when evaluating general issues. Analysis of controversial issues as hypothetical conflicts indicated that daughters and mothers do not hold unitary social judgments about social world that were always consistent with the norms of their community and family status. Religious background and family status differences were observed in evaluations of some conflict stories but not in others. Women reasoned about conflict situations differently as a function of whether they evaluated the choices as moral, conventional, personal, prudential, or religious matter.

Dedicated to my father with love

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

I cannot thank my advisor, Elliot Turiel, enough for his mentoring through the graduate school. As a scholar and as a friend he has contributed my intellectual and personal development in numerous ways. This is a debt that I can only repay one day by extending his work to my own students. I am also grateful to Susan Holloway for her continuous support during my graduate studies. Many thanks for her insightful perspective, which helped enhancing my own grasp of many issues.

Many thanks to my dearest friends Emine Fişek, Nilgün Bayraktar, and Ayşe Ercümen for keeping me sane, to Jessica Weiss Cummins for being such a good study partner and a perfect editor, to Yasemin Demir for her help in reliability coding, to Kristen Bottema (and to my little lovely friend Cisca) for reading my chapters through. I am particularly indebt to my friend İsmail Onur Filiz for his statistical consultancy and for being patient with my iterative questions. I am also thankful to the members of the seminar directed by Elliot Turiel. Over years Alona Roded, Matt Gingo, and Min Chen became real friends who provided me with the right kind of intellectual and emotional support. Many thanks to Kathryn Day and Marie Lee for their helpful comments on my drafts. Finally, I would like to thank Phyllis Handan Jeffrey for her engagement with my project, for listening me bubbling about my data and Turkey over coffee and beer, and correcting my English whenever it is necessary.

This research could not have been accomplished without women who participated. I owe thanks to them as well to the school counselors in both schools who shared their office and help me recruit my participants. Most of the writing and revision of this work was done in Yali's Café of Berkeley. I would also like to thank its personnel for their welcoming attitude, delicious coffee and pastry supplies.

I owe the most special gratitude to my parents Mücella and İsmet Acar for their belief in my capabilities: Deep-felt thanks for everything! My brother has always been another steady support during the tough times and a critical reader of my work. Thank you, Hulusi Murat Acar, for sharing many precious ideas and biter sense of humor.

Concepts of morality, personal autonomy, and authority in multifaceted social issues: An examination of daughters' and mothers' reasoning in religious and secular contexts in Istanbul, Turkey

Few would disagree with the statement that our everyday lives are complex and multifaceted. Some of the time there is harmony, cooperation, helping, and sharing. Some of the time there is conflict, disagreement, and unfair treatment. How do people think about fairness, personal autonomy, and authority when these concepts are in conflict with each other or with other components of everyday life? Do cultural and religious backgrounds play a role in people's understanding of the social conflicts? Do daughters and mothers have a different perspective? By investigating these questions this study seeks to deepen our understanding of concepts of personal autonomy, parental authority, and social roles among women in Turkish urban contexts.

Most social scientific research on the concepts of morality, autonomy, and authority has followed one of two distinct lines of argument. The first has tended to focus on culture as the main source of variations in moral codes and selves. Many studies in cultural psychology (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 2010; Miller, 2005; Shweder, Mahapatra, & Park, 2003) have focused on cultural differences in roles, duties, and personal freedoms based on an individualism-collectivism framework. According to this perspective, social-moral development and other psychological processes are rooted in culture. In contrast, a second line of research has focused on specific aspects of social interactions in specific social contexts to explain variations in social development and reasoning. For example, research on social development in Benin, West Africa (Conry-Murray, 2009), Mysore, India (Neff, 2001), and a Druze-Arab community in Israel (Wainryb & Turiel, 1994), examined concepts of personal entitlements, freedoms, rights, duties, and interdependence in different types of social arrangements. These studies provided evidence that women in non-Western contexts are concerned with fairness and personal entitlements as well as with power differences in hierarchical arrangements.

The relationship between religion and morality is another controversial area in social science. One sociological tradition has appropriated religion as an important source from which many people derived their concepts of right and wrong about everyday reality. As a social system, religion bound people into communities (Durkheim, 1965) and has therefore been hypothesized to be an important explanatory variable for differences in social and moral reasoning. Social and cultural psychologists (e. g., Graham & Haidt, 2010; Haidt & Graham, 2007; Shweder, Mahapatra, & Park, 2003) have argued that moral beliefs and behaviors cannot be separated from religious practices; hence religion formed a moral community and a moral meaning making system. Other research findings, however, have indicated that people from different religious backgrounds evaluate the moral rules of their religion by referring to justice and welfare concepts and perceive them as unalterable and generalizable, whereas they evaluate other religious rules in terms of normativity within their own religion (Nucci, 1986; Nucci & Turiel, 1993). Religious beliefs, traditions and practices are implicit or explicit parts of people's everyday life that, to a certain extent, influence people's expectations and judgments. In that sense, religious communities as well as secular ones can provide a rich context to examine concepts like obligations, roles, and duties, as well as personal autonomy and fairness.

This study was intended to extend previous research on how Turkish adolescent and adult women reason about fairness, personal rights, and legitimacy of authority as they reflect on broader social conflicts appearing within the daughter-mother dyad. It aims to deepen our understanding of how social-cultural contexts, religious commitments, and roles in the family can be coordinated with moral and personal concepts in the evaluation and justification of socially controversial issues in Turkey. Previous research with children and adults in Western and non-Western contexts (Turiel, 1983, 2002) has indicated that people in different settings develop concepts of justice, welfare, and rights, which constitute the domain of morality. According to cross-cultural research in the domain theory of social and moral development, people around the world evaluate straightforward moral issues such as stealing or harming somebody without a reason as universally wrong even in the absence of social rules and authority. These studies have also indicated that people in diverse societies distinguish straightforward moral issues from social-conventional and personal issues. However, many everyday situations are multifaceted and have moral, social-conventional, personal, and prudential components. Another area of research in the social domain approach has explored how individuals coordinate their judgments in multifaceted situations in which people have conflicting goals (Killen, 1990; Turiel, 1989; Turiel, Hildebrandt, Wainryb, & Salzstein1991; Smetana, 1983). There is limited research in non-Western contexts on how people coordinate their reasoning across different social issues.

The present dissertation addresses how adolescent and adult women evaluated women's personal choices in relation to social norms and authority dictates in daughter-mother interactions and how these judgments are associated with their religious backgrounds. More specifically, it examines whether and how moral, personal, and conventional concepts were coordinated by religious and secular daughters and mothers when reasoning about multifaceted social issues in urban Turkey. In addition, reasoning was examined in religious and secular daughter-mother dyads in the light of two conflicting features: personal choice against maternal authority and social norms. Its objective was to ascertain if young adult women who endorse decision making autonomy will also disapprove maternal authority and social norms and under what conditions they do so.

Participants made judgments about choices of daughters and mothers in five areas generally stated: Clothes, house chores, friendship, career, and health care. Participants were also presented with hypothetical stories pertaining to these areas of choices, but in socially charged ways in the Turkish urban context (e.g., daughter wanting an acting career or no career; mother wanting a career or not wanting to have a career; wearing or not wearing the headscarf). The stories depicted disagreements between daughters and mothers regarding to their prospective choices. In some stories a mother objects the daughter's choice in other stories a daughter objects to the mother's choice.

Review of related literature

Cultural approaches to morality, personal autonomy, and authority

A widely shared position among cultural psychologists[1] is that the distinction between moral, social-conventional and personal domains reflects Western individualistic

[1] This school of thought is an interdisciplinary endeavor of anthropology, psychology and linguistics to understand cultural roots of psychological functioning. Historically, it has

conceptualizations of the human psyche and that this conceptualization is not valid for individuals in non-Western collectivist societies. Cultural psychologists propose that morality and views of the self are culturally grounded. Many comparisons have been made based on the dichotomy between individualism and collectivism or independence and interdependence to explain cultural variations in social reasoning and behavior (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1990; Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 2003). Researchers characterized these cultures as mutually exclusive, homogeneous, and timeless. They use culture to explain social behavior in different social contexts, proposing that individualism and collectivism, as prevailing cultural orientations, characterize people's psychologies, their self-concepts and their relationships with each other. Members of collectivist societies (read as non-Western) are said to subordinate their autonomy to authority and to the needs of their group (Miller, 2005; Markus & Kitayama, 2010; Triandis, 1990). They hold a sociocentric (Shweder & Bourn, 1984) or an interdependent (Markus & Kitayama, 2010) self-concept. In contrast, an egocentric or independent self-concept is found in individualistic Western cultures. Collectivism is also manifested in individuals' moral reasoning. In collectivist cultures morality comprises duty, community, and divinity orientations, whereas in individualistic cultures, the moral system revolves around personal freedom and rights (Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 2003).

Cultural psychologists tend to depict everyday family relationships in non-Western societies as harmonious. According to these analyses, collective elements of social life and responsibilities do not allow the development of a sense of personal entitlement and choice among children and adolescents. Concepts of personal entitlements are seen as dependent on culture because the self benefits from being a member of a cultural community and suffers from its social disapproval (Miller, 2005). The relationship between people who have subordinate and dominant positions in the social hierarchy is described as *asymmetrical reciprocity* (Shweder et al., 2003) where dominant persons are responsible for protecting and satisfying the needs of their subordinates. For example, wives should be obedient to their husbands, while husbands should be sensitive and responsive to the needs and desires of their wives. It has been suggested that parents in individualistic cultures emphasize autonomy and personal freedom in their child rearing practices, whereas parents in collectivistic cultures emphasize interdependence, duties, and shared activities. These respective conceptions of morality, self, and society are transmitted by the *local guardians of the moral order* through cultural practices (Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 2003).

Several cultural psychologists proposed that conflict resolutions within families reflect cultural patterns, with higher rates of compliance to parental authority in collectivist settings and a predominance of self-assertion and negotiation strategies in individualistic settings (Miller, 2005; Phinney, Kim-Jo, Ossorio, & Vilhjalmdottir, 2005). Social interactions in collectivist cultures revolve around strict adherence to duties, obligations, and maintenance of social order and conventions (Hofstede, 1990; Markus & Lin, 1999; Triandis, 1990). Even the most nuanced cultural analyses (Kagitcibasi,

---

been influenced from the "Culture and Personality" school. The central tenet of earlier works was cultural conditioning and acquisition of culturally appropriate norms to predict "good" behavior for a particular culture.

2007; Miller, 2005; Miller & Bersoff, 1995) argue that people in non-Western societies are motivated to sustain interdependence and harmony and to avoid interpersonal conflict. Although these theorists acknowledge the difficulty of making cultural generalizations, they have not studied within culture differences systematically[2].

Religion, Morality, and Personal Agency

Another commonly shared proposition is that the morality of religious conservatives encompasses more than concepts of justice, welfare, and rights of persons. This proposition is grounded in Durkheim's theory of society and religion. According to Durkheim (1912/2008), religion is a system of practices and ideas that connects members of society, shapes their morality and creates a collective consciousness. It claims authority and structure over the entire life of its believers. Similarly, Graham and Haidt (2010) define morality as "interlocking systems of values, practices, institutions, and evolved psychological mechanisms that work to suppress selfishness and make social life possible". Religious people are said to be more prone to authoritarianism, more willing to accept inequality, and more resistant to change. They have fewer conflicts with authority figures of their society and emphasize cooperation and self-sacrifice for the greater good of their own group (Haidt & Graham, 2007; Graham & Haidt, 2010). They argued further that the type of moral reasoning that is limited to concerns of welfare and fairness is only observed among secular liberals and not amongst religious conservatives. Conservative Americans who are religious and on the right side of the political spectrum have more moral concerns than do secular, more liberal people, including respect to authority, in-group preference, purity, and sanctity. Haidt and Graham (2007) suggested that when these other components of morality are in conflict with justice and welfare religious people subordinate the principles of justice and welfare to the principles of unconditional group loyalty, respect of parental authority, and avoidance of personal interests (pp. 101-102). A similar line of research in social psychology suggested that religious people were more likely to approve traditional gender roles which assigned women only domestic responsibilities such as home making and child rearing (Fiske, 1992; Jensen, 2006; Glick, Lamerias, & Castro, 2002)

Furthermore, adherence to the Islamic religion has become an important research topic in social science in the past two decades. There is a growing body of research in psychology, sociology, education, morality, and immigration that has focused on the role of religion in differences between cultures and the global crisis in international relations (Etzioni, 2008). One prevailing argument has been that conflicts in the new world order will not be between social classes, but between civilizations. In this conceptualization, religion is the core of civilization that shapes values, norms, institutions, and modes of thinking (Huntington, 1993). In this perspective, civilizations (Islamic or Western) are conceptualized as timeless and homogeneous and used interchangeably with culture. The

---

[2] Some contemporary cultural psychologists (see Gjerde, 2004 for review) incorporated the dynamic nature of cultures, power differences within cultures and the bi-directional influences between individuals and cultures. Despite the nuances in their definitions of culture and emphasis on the interactions between individuals and culture, they have remained united on the proposition that culturally distinctive research is required in a *multicultural* world. They continue to neglect studying developmental processes by which individuals resist and disagree with cultural norms and practices.

terms civilization and culture both refer to an "overall way of life of people" and involve "norms, values, and modes of thinking". Within-civilization differences have been ignored, but differences between civilizations have been highlighted. Based on the World Values Survey findings the positions of societies can be determined on two dimensions termed "secular-rational" vs. "traditional" and "survival" vs. "self-expression" (Inglehart & Baker, 2000). Traditional values at the one pole include the importance of God in one's life and the importance of obedience and religious faith in child rearing rather than independence and determination. The second dimension includes values of physical and economical security, individual happiness, and interpersonal trust. Similar to the propositions of cultural psychology, social scientists who study societies from the thesis of differences between civilizations also have a relativistic formulation of morality. They argue that religious communities can be understood only from an internal perspective and cannot be evaluated using rational analytic tools, because morality has no rational ground on which everyone can agree.

Another popular research area is the cultivation of Islamic morality and traditions (Göle, 1996; Çınar, 2005) as a type of resistance to the Western secular social order. Islam entails submission of the human to God. According to this perspective, accepting Islam is an act of submission and a surrender of agency. All of the commandments in the Quran are considered immutable and obligatory. Religious instructions include showing respect to authority figures, particularly to parents, obeying rules and commandments, and fulfilling the duties of one's own position in the society. In this respect, moral cultivation means self-discipline and submitting the self to the supreme authority of God. There is a growing body of ethnographic research that studies committed Muslims in the Middle East and explores Muslim women's conflicts with secular state authorities, Islamic orthodoxy, parental authority, and male kin (e.g., Göle , 1996; Mahmood, 2005). In these studies, Muslim women are portrayed as pious, always following moral aims and dedicating themselves to the *Da'wah*[3]. The overarching theme is how consciously committed Muslim women prioritize Islam as the supreme guideline in all domains of life and resist secularism, equality, and individualism by reviving Islamic morality and traditions. In these studies, Islam through its traditions, ethics, and piety is presented as being in opposition to the liberal-secular Western world. Again, the diverse motivations and experiences of different Muslims and complexities, ambiguities, and conflicts of their everyday life experiences are lost under the religion argument. Within-person and between-person differences are mostly reduced to expressions of religious, cultural, and geographical variations.

Taken together, cultural, communitarian, and civilization perspectives have each concluded that differences in moral reasoning and perceptions of autonomy and authority are the outcomes of cultural orientations, religious belief systems and family socialization practices. They treat cultural traits as fixed and assume that these are shared by all members of a group. Even if they acknowledge the problem of generalities in the name of culture they have not systematically studied diversity within cultures. A significant question is whether within-group and within individual variations in reasoning exist in relation to different conceptual systems of social experience. The next section presents

[3] Islamic equivalence of missionary, as one invites people to the faith and Islamic life and fights against the infidels of the West.

alternative approaches that challenge conceptualizations viewing culture and religion as the main sources that shape social and moral development.

Diversities within cultures and social interactions

A number of contemporary cultural anthropologists and political philosophers (Abu-Lughod, 1993; Wikan, 2002; Okin, 1999; Nussbaum, 2000) who have been focused on cultural differences among human beings have been struck by conflicts and different perspectives that exist within cultures, and have challenged the monolithic timeless definition of culture as shared, integrated patterns, meanings, and symbols transmitted across generations (Benedict, 1934; Geertz, 1974). There is significant ethnographic evidence that supports a lack of shared patterns of culture and highlights individuals' conflicting perspectives on structural inequalities and unfair gender practices. For example, Abu-Lughod's (1989) ethnographic work in Egypt depicts the complexity of the lives of Bedouin women. She wrote "against culture" by challenging the problematic connotations of culture: homogeneity, coherence, and timelessness. Her ethnographic data illustrated that both females and males within the traditional Muslim-Arab community in Egypt were confronted with choices: they struggled with others, made conflicting statements, argued, had contradictory points of view on the same event, underwent ups and downs in various relationships, and changed their circumstances and desires. In her conceptualization, cultures are historical constructs created and sustained in the context of collaborations, power clashes, disagreements and contested meaning among individuals. Women and children as well as men in the contested geographies like Egypt have the capacity to realize their own interests against the weight of customs and traditions of their society. Conflicts in everyday life may result in Egyptian women acting in a variety of different ways and expressing resistance and subversion. For example, these women were not entirely adapted to the cultural norms of their society and did not approve of unfair gender practices. Their relations with their male relatives and their larger community entailed continuous interactions, careful judgments, and compromises between harmony and conflict (Abu-Lughod, 1993). In accord with these findings, Wikan's (2002) book *Generous Betrayals* demonstrates the conflict between human rights and cultural tolerance in the welfare state of Norway. She shed light on the immigrant women's and children's experiences and revealed how generalizations in the name of culture reduced the external perception of immigrants to a culturally coherent collectivity whose values, norms, and practices are different from liberal Norwegians. Wikan clearly articulated that individuals regardless of their cultural background have the capacity to exercise autonomy, to make choices and to reason about influences of family members and social institutions. Young women's psychological and legal struggles with their own families and state authorities revealed the multifaceted and complex nature of social life. To summarize, the current anthropological works (e.g., Abu-Lughod, 2002) disputed the assumptions that Muslim practices and traditions are handed down from generation to generation and passively adopted by women. With a strong emphasis on agency it has been argued that women from non-Western cultures exercise autonomy and are not willing to accept inequality and authority particularly in the family context and do fight for their rights as citizens in the public sphere.

The perspective of the political philosophers (Okin, 1999; Nussbaum, 1995, 2000), addressed structural inequalities between men and women, e.g. in areas such as longevity, health status, educational opportunities, employment, and political rights. Nussbaum

contested the concept of cultural relativism, which overlooks the unjust treatment of women. She challenged cross-cultural differences in norms by highlighting the universality of human worth. She believes that treating cultures as homogeneous without attending to internal diversity and conflict is an error. The core idea behind her *Capabilities Approach* (Nussbaum, 2000) is that human beings are dignified free beings who can shape their lives in cooperation and reciprocity with others, rather than being passively shaped or pushed around by the world. Her examination of unequal gender practices in India illustrates how women cope when they are deprived of basic capabilities. She observes that women protested against unfair practices if they believed that their resistance and subversion would produce a change for a better direction.

In line with Nussbaum's defense of universal values to raise human capabilities all over the world, Okin argued that unjust practices that oppress and control women should not be defended in the name of culture. Okin (1989) opposed the public vs. private dichotomy where the latter is associated with family, governed by affection, care, and personal rules. According to Okin, families are "political institutions" to which the standard of justice needs to be applied. By raising the question "How can we raise just citizens in an unjust family?", she drew attention to the nature of the family environment. Because the family is the first context for social development, it should be regulated with moral principles so that family members must not be insensitive to violations of individual rights. In a just society, the structures and practices of families must give women the same opportunities as men to develop their capacities, to participate in political power, to influence social choices and to be economically secure (Okin, 1989).

In summary, ethnographic studies in anthropology have indicated inequalities between men and women, people who have dominant positions and subordinate positions in different cultures. Parallel to these findings, political philosophers' conceptualizations of rights and social justice addressed the notion that cultures cannot be analyzed without recognition of the hierarchy in social systems, social interactions and gender relationships.

Similarly, the social developmental psychologists Wainryb and Turiel (1994) have argued that human relationships are multifaceted in hierarchically arranged societies. Self-oriented and other-oriented goals are essential foundations of social development and coordinated as people think about the nature of relationships. To test these propositions, Wainryb and Turiel (1994) studied dominance, subordination and concepts of personal entitlement in two different communities in Israel. In these studies, participants were presented with hypothetical scenarios that portrayed conflicts between male and female members of the family. An example of a conflict was: "A wife wants to get a job because she thinks it would be more interesting than being at home all day, while her husband objects to it because he thinks she has enough to do at home." The reversed-role condition was also posed: "A husband wants to change his job for another one which would be more interesting but requires longer hours, while his wife objects to it because she wants him to spend more time at home" (Wainryb & Turiel, 1994, p.1706).

Evidence from this study indicated that male and female participants attribute more power to male members of their community than female members, asserting that wives and daughters should not engage in an activity to which a husband or father disagrees. However, husbands and fathers should do what they want and pay no attention to the objections of their wives and daughters. These findings are consistent with the

hierarchical structure of the society in which female activities are restricted by norms and male members. It is clear that personal agency and autonomy were attributed to male members. Furthermore, Druze women's responses indicated that they did not accept unfair practices without questioning. Their reasoning for the endorsement of male authority was indicative of pragmatic concerns. Women were aware the unjust nature of the social norms that privileged men's position and authority, but they were also concerned with the negative consequences of resistance, which might put them into a more vulnerable position. The following quotation illustrates that women are aware of that cultural practices are to the advantage of their male counterparts: "A man's life is simple. He works, he comes back home, and he has no other responsibilities. I work too and I have kids and a home. He knows that when he comes back, everything will be ready for him. That's such a pleasure. When I came back home I have more work to do at home. So, who do you think deserves to get out a little and enjoy life?" (Turiel, 2002, p. 249).

Similarly, Neff's research in India (2001) indicates that Indian participants do not have a general tendency to subordinate personal goals to interpersonal concerns. Autonomy was emphasized more often for males as required by the hierarchical organization of the society. However, in considering situation-specific aspects of the hypothetical stories, Indian participants endorsed female autonomy and challenged the hierarchical gender norms. Conry-Murray (2009) found also that adolescent and adult participants in a traditional society, in Benin, West Africa, evaluated hierarchical gender norms as alterable social conventions. However, participants also were concerned with punishment and coercion endorsed by authority. In addition, the majority attributed decision-making authority for conventional reasons but evaluated the practice as unfair, giving moral reasons.

The question of whether religious adolescents and adults maintain a unitary view of morality and religious rules has also been studied from the perspective of developmental psychology (Nucci, 1982; Nucci & Turiel, 1993; Turiel, Hildebrandt, Wainryb, & Salzstein, 1991). Straightforward moral acts (e.g., stealing, harm) were judged as independent of religious authority, and unalterable. At the same time non-prototypical issues (e.g., homosexuality, abortion, pornography, and premarital sex) were judged contingent on religious authority and specific to a particular religious group. Justifications about the wrongness of the straightforward moral acts included reasons of justice, rights, and welfare, but did not include reasons of group loyalty or religious ideology. Findings revealed that adolescents evaluated non-prototypical moral issues more negatively than adults. Similarly, in a series of studies Helwig (1995, 1997, 2006) examined children's, adolescents' and adults' conceptualization of rights, freedom of speech and religion. These findings indicated that adolescents supported freedom of speech and religion as universal human rights. However, adolescents did not always endorse civil liberties in conflict with other moral concerns, such as inequality (e.g., a speech advocating the exclusion of people of poverty from political participation), physical harm (e.g., a speech advocating violence) or psychological harm (e.g., a public speech with racial slurs).

In summary, research reviewed in this section has challenged the idea that structures of reasoning are culturally or religiously determined and suggests variability in thinking and evaluations. People from different cultures develop a multifaceted

orientation towards the world that includes concerns with fairness, personal desires and needs, and interpersonal connectedness. People think and interpret their social world so that some social norms are questioned and rejected whereas others are accepted. For this reason, research with Islamists and secular women in Turkey could be useful in extending the investigation of moral, social, and personal concepts. The present study aims to provide evidence from different urban contexts of Turkey focusing on how the boundaries between personal entitlements, religious beliefs, social conventions and morality are drawn in different communities and how this social order is renegotiated within daughter-mother dyads. The next section reviews the literature on adolescent-parent relations since this research is about how religious and secular daughter-mother dyads navigate the concepts of morality, autonomy and authority in their families and communities.

Adolescent-parent relations in Western and non-Western contexts

According to many developmental psychological perspectives, adolescence is a period in which a child becomes a self-governing autonomous person; moderate resistance to parental authority is developmentally normative and functional for adolescent development (Erikson, 1963; Piaget, 1932; Smetana, 1995; Steinberg, 1996). Thus, conflict is viewed as a natural component of parent-child relationships during the course of development (Shantz & Hartup, 1992). Research has suggested that conflict over everyday life issues is intrinsic to human development, complementary to harmony and cooperation rather than negative and destructive. Further, it has been found that the rate of conflict decreases significantly in late adolescence and that many conflicts are resolved through mutual compromise and negotiation (Collins, & Laursen, 1992; Youniss & Smoller, 1985; Smetana, Yau, & Hanson, 1991).

Research suggests that adolescent-parent relationships are not a direct outcome of cultural orientations. Rather, they are multifaceted; conflicts between adolescents and parents shift across personal and conventional domains and according to the developmental needs of the adolescents (Smetana, 1995; Turiel, 2005). Both adolescents and parents draw domain distinctions in their judgments about daily life issues. Parents and adolescents enter into conflicts in which adolescents try to resist parental control over their personal issues both overtly and covertly. Parents are primarily concerned with maintaining and enforcing familial and cultural norms. In contrast, adolescents appeal to the norms of the peer culture and claim more personal freedom and choice (Smetana, 2005). Studies in general have shown that both adolescents and parents affirm legitimate parental authority over moral and conventional issues. Both adolescents and parents have reported less conflict over moral and social conventional issues and judge that adolescents have an obligation to conform to parents' moral and conventional rules even if they disagree with them (Smetana, 1989; 2005). Furthermore, it has been found that disclosure and non-disclosure are connected to activity domains. Adolescents think that they are less obligated to disclose personal activities than moral and prudential activities (Smetana, Metzger, Gettman, & Campione-Barr, 2006). In a study of adolescent deception in relationships with parents and peers, Perkins and Turiel (2007) found that adolescents perceive lying to parents to be acceptable if doing so prevents injustice and harm to others or protects their personal domain. In parallel, other research findings have shown that children and adolescents did not accept parental authority in every situation; they rejected parental directives if the authority was in conflict with moral norms, and

they evaluated the legitimacy of authority based on the authority's knowledge and capability (Kim & Turiel, 1993; Laupa, Turiel, & Cowan, 1995).

Furthermore, Smetana and her colleagues (Smetana, 1989, 1995; Smetana, Daddis, & Chuang, 2003; Smetana, Braeges, & Yau, 1991), in their examinations of hypothetical and actual adolescent-parent conflicts, found that adolescents consider certain issues to be under their personal jurisdiction, while their parents view the same issues to be subject to parental authority. Smetana (1988, 1995) categorized types of conflict between adolescents and parents as: academic achievement, dating, choice of friends, house chores, choice of music, TV programs, movies, money, and dress or hairstyle. Smetana found that adolescents and parents accept the legitimacy of parental control in the regulation of moral, prudential, and conventional domains. However, results did point to a substantial discrepancy between adolescents' and parents' judgments over the legitimacy of parental authority in the regulation of adolescents' personal issues. Adolescents tended to reject the legitimacy of parental authority over personal issues and claimed more autonomy than their parents allow. Research has indicated that, during conflicts, adolescents viewed many risk behaviors such drinking, smoking, use of "soft" drugs, when to have sex and driving as issues under their personal jurisdiction. In contrast, almost all parents viewed these issues as prudential and as beyond adolescents' legitimate authority and developmental competence to decide (Smetana, 2002, 2005). Moreover, parents increasingly viewed decisions about choice of friends, appearance, TV programs, music and video games as within adolescents' personal control as adolescents grew older.

In sum, two findings of Smetana's research program have been demonstrated to be robust: First, both adolescents and parents made domain distinctions in their judgments about daily life disputes. Issues pertaining to other's welfare, fairness, or rights were treated more seriously. Thus, there was less conflict between adolescents and parents over moral issues. Adolescents and parents usually agreed about decisions that bore on issues of justice, welfare, and harm. Second, not all events or situations could be clearly distinguished as moral, conventional, and personal. Many events and situations in the sphere of the family, called multifaceted or mixed domain events (reviewed in Smetana, 1983) entailed overlapping concerns with morality, social conventions, pragmatics, and personal issues. For example, cleaning one's room, when to start dating, and hanging out with friends whom one's parents dislike, were considered multifaceted issues. The meaning of conflicts over multifaceted everyday issues was examined in a series of studies (Smetana, 1989; 1995; Smetana & Anquith, 1994; Smetana, Daddis, & Chuang, 2003) obtaining adolescents' and parents' evaluations and justifications. Results of these studies indicated both adolescents and parents agreed that parents treated multifaceted issues as more contingent on parental authority, giving conventional, prudential, and psychological reasons. Adolescents perceived these issues to be under personal jurisdiction based on personal concerns.

An important question is the extent to which these patterns of adolescent-parent relations found in Western societies can be found in non-Western contexts or in immigrant families with non-Western ethnic backgrounds (Darling, Cumsille, & Martinez, 2007; Fuligni, 1998; Miller, 2005). Although it has been argued that the demand for autonomy, the negation pf parental authority, and conflicts between adolescents and their parents are specific to Western cultures (Kagitcibasi, 1996; Markus

& Lin, 1999; Miller, 2005), studies of judgments about adolescent-parent relations in Japan (Hasebe, Nucci, & Nucci, 2004), Brazil (Milnitsky-Sapiro, Turiel & Nucci, 2006) and China (Yau & Smetana, 2003) have shown that non-Western adolescents also assert their autonomy and disagree with their parents.

Research findings have revealed consistently that adolescents claim autonomy earlier than their parents are willing to grant it (Smetana, Campione-Barr, & Metzger, 2006). This assertion of autonomy, particularly over personal issues, has been one of the major reasons for adolescent-parent conflict across ethnicities, social classes, and nations (Fuligni, 1998; Helwig, 2006; Smetana, Daddis, & Chuang, 2003; Yau & Smetana, 2003). Findings in this new emerging body of cross-cultural research also have also suggested that conceptions of personal jurisdictions and choices can be found across cultures (e.g., Milnistky-Sapiro, Turiel, & Nucci, 2006; Yau & Smetana, 2003). There is broad evidence of the personal domain in diverse settings, along with cultural variations in boundaries established around personal choices. Individuals across cultures develop different orientations in diverse social conditions and relationships. Thus, although children's and adolescents' social development is influenced significantly by family interactions, they construct evaluations that entail conflicts between moral, conventional, and personal concepts. Although adolescents usually accept that their parents can regulate the family as a social organization, in some circumstances they do not give priority to parental authority, but instead assert their own autonomy. One of the purposes of this study is to determine how multifaceted issues are evaluated by daughters and mothers as they occur in the family context. In other words, the present study examines whether and how being a daughter or mother affects one's reasoning and how one's role within the family interacts with one's religious affiliation.

Theoretical Framework of the Study and Research Questions

The program of research referred to as social domain theory (Turiel, 1983, 2002), has documented that social knowledge and reasoning develop within conceptually different domains of thought through qualitatively different social interactions. "Domain" refers to subsystems of mind that organize knowledge and allow us to understand the complex nature of the social world. Research conducted over the last three decades in the United States and in other cultural settings has indicated that children form domains of social knowledge: moral, social-conventional, and personal. Issues in the moral domain involve harmful consequences toward others. Issues are categorized as "moral" if they are impersonal, generalizable, obligatory, and independent from authority dictates. Assessments of criterion determination includes questions of whether an action would be wrong in the absence of a rule, if the act would be all right if permitted by an authority figure, and if the act would be all right if there is general agreement on its acceptability. Research findings consistently show that moral transgressions, such as hitting and stealing, are evaluated by the existence of rules, authority permission, or acceptance by society. In contrast, social conventional issues are evaluated as context-dependent, and the wrongness of acts is judged as contingent upon punishment, authority dictates, and social sanctions. The criteria for conventions include rule contingency, contextualism, relativism, hierarchy, and authority jurisdiction. The personal domain includes preferences and choices (e.g., choice of clothes, friends) that are considered to be outside the jurisdiction of social conventions and morality (Nucci & Weber, 1995; Nucci, 1996).

Research on the personal domain has provided evidence for some form of conceptions of personal jurisdiction and choice in diverse cultures (Milnitsky-Sapiro, Turiel, & Nucci, 2006; Turiel & Wainryb, 1998; Yau & Smetana, 2003).

An important premise of social domain theory is that many every day events are multifaceted and contain components of more than one domain. A series of studies (Killen, 1990; Smetana, 1983; Turiel, 1983; Turiel, Hildebrant,Wainryb, & Salzstein, 1991; Wainryb, 1991) has shown that individuals evaluate multifaceted life events by categorizing conflicting components into different domains. These studies point to the issue of domain coordination as well as the complex assessment of various components of everyday situations as primary sources of diversity in social-moral reasoning. For example, most people agree that killing, stealing, and harming are morally wrong. However, consistencies and inconsistencies are found both within and between individuals when evaluating issues that include two conflicting moral components, such as harm and fairness (Killen, 1990). Furthermore, human reasoning is variable with respect to the evaluation of socially and politically charged issues, such as abortion, homosexuality, and pornography (Smetana, 1983; Turiel, Hildebrant,Wainryb, & Salzstein, 1991). Findings have revealed that people either subordinate concerns in one domain to another, coordinate elements of more than one domain, or experience conflict or confusion in coordinating domains. Research from domains of social development has shown that individuals do not take a unitary orientation to the social environment. Decision-making in everyday life includes moral judgments, including harm, rights, and fairness, and societal concepts, such as those concerning cultural institutions, authority, customs, and social conventions.

Social developmental approaches to morality and self have been criticized for their neglect of the influence of the social-cultural context on development. To examine the coordination of personal, social-conventional and moral concepts in non-western cultures research (Conry-Murray, 2009; Neff, 2001; Wainryb and Turiel, 1994) examined judgment and justifications about decision-making authority in family contexts. Some research compared different social classes, ethnicities, and regions in non-Western settings. However, no research has studied historically conflicted groups within the same ethnicity and culture. Furthermore, no research has been conducted in a non-Western context with the members of the same family. The present research also sought to examine whether and how moral, personal, and conventional concepts are coordinated in a family context when reasoning about socially controversial issues in urban Turkey. To achieve this goal, daughters and mothers from religious and secular backgrounds were interviewed. To determine whether daughters and mothers from the different backgrounds endorsed the legitimacy of personal choices participants were asked who they think should make the decision about each of the issues mentioned above: clothes, house chores, friendship, career, and health care. For each issue participants asked to judge who should decide when it is a daughter or mother choosing. It was expected that religious females would be less likely to endorse personal choices for adolescent and adult females.

Participants were also asked to make judgments about daughter's and mothers' decisions regarding controversial issues within the five areas with daughters or mothers making a choice. The decisions were about (1) choosing to wear or not to wear the headscarf; (2) request that males in the family should do or should not help; (3) choosing

to be friend or not to be a friend with a non-Muslim; (4) choosing to have a career or not to have a career; (5) choosing to obtain or avoid health care from a male physician. Those choices involve conventional components such as gender roles, maternal authority, and traditions; moral components related justice, welfare and rights; and components related to the personal choice and autonomy. Ten hypothetical stories involving disagreements between daughter and mother were used for each area of decision. Half of the stories involved a daughter choosing one or the other course of action (e.g., to wear or not to wear the headscarf) and the mother is objecting to the choice. Therefore, in one condition the adolescent daughter protagonist made a decision consistent with the norms of the participant's community (e.g., wearing the headscarf for religious and not to wear the headscarf and not to wear a head scarf for secular), which was opposed by the mother. In the second condition, it was the reverse in that the decision was inconsistent with the community norm (e.g., wearing the headscarf for the secular and not wearing the headscarf for religious). The other half of the stories had the same features, but with mothers choosing an activity and a daughter objecting to the choice.

This study was designed to unpack young and adult Turkish women's reasoning about decision-making autonomy within the family context by allowing them to express their arguments and counterarguments while evaluating daughters and mothers in opposite stories. Table 1 presents the acts in the five areas that are consistent and inconsistent with each of the community norms.

Table 1

Conflict stories across five areas

Areas of decisions	Consistent with religious	Consistent with secular
Clothes	Wearing the headscarf	Not wearing the headscarf
House chores	Boys should not help	Boys should help
Friend	Not to choose a non-Muslim friend	Choosing a non-Muslim friend
Career	Not having a career:	Having a career:
	Daughter chooses not to go the college	Daughter chooses acting as her career.
	Mother chooses not to work	Mother has a full-time job
Health care	Avoiding health care from a male doctor	Obtaining health care from a male doctor

In summary, throughout this study I sought to investigate whether there are content, religious background, and family status differences in the following:

1. Daughters' and mothers' judgments about decision-making autonomy in general questions
2. Daughters' and mothers' judgments of the choices that are context-specific and politically controversial among secular and religious Turkish citizens in contemporary Turkey
    a. From the perspective of the protagonist (daughter/mother)
    b. From the perspective the mother/daughter who disagrees with the protagonist
    c. From the perspective of the protagonist who persists in her choice
3. Daughters' and mothers' ideal conflict resolution strategies

Chapter 2
Setting

This chapter aims to give a brief historical background of the existing tensions between religious and secular groups and to discuss the use of the terms religious and secular in Turkey over recent years. It also describes the research setting, particularly the two high schools from which the participants of this study were recruited.

Defining the religious and secular women in contemporary Istanbul

Conflict between religious and secular communities has been an area of lively debate in Turkey. While the conflict has long historical roots, it has become more polarized between the religious and secular arenas of society since 2002, when a center-right party with Islamic roots[4] entered the government. To best understand the conflict it is necessary to examine the historical development of secularization[5] in Turkey. During the late Ottoman period, some reforms such as a secularized judicial system and legal rights for non-Muslim minorities were introduced to strengthen the state administration.

---

[4] In the 2002 elections it received 34% of the votes. In the 2007 elections the party received 47% of the votes; whereas the republican secularist party received 25% of the votes. In the most recent election in June 2011, the AKP (Justice and Development Party) won the 50 % of the votes and legitimated its central position as socially conservative and economically neo-liberal party. (For deeper analysis of social and economic transformations of the Islamist Party supporters see Tugal, 2009)

[5] It is important to note that Turkish Republican secularism (called *laicism* in Turkey) is different from Anglo-Saxon versions, which means a real separation of state from religion. However, the implication of secularism in Turkey means strong state control over religion through the Directory of Religious Affairs, so that it does not become an obstacle for modernization. In that state version of the religion, all different interpretations of Islam were suppressed and Sunni interpretation became salient in the whole education system. In that sense Turkish state has no neutrality and equal distance toward different believers including non-Muslim minorities and non-believers (Kadioglu, 2010).

Under the new Turkish Republic the Islamic legal code was abolished and replaced by the Swiss Civic Code, which eliminated the practice of polygamy, sex differentiated inheritance law, and the wearing of veils and headscarves in public. During the foundational years (1920-1935) of the Republic, religion was confined to the private realm and all Islamist symbols were eliminated from public institutions. All education was made secular and placed under the control of the Ministry of Education. However, the abolishment of religious orders and laws were accompanied by the establishment of the *Directory of Religious Affairs*, a state institution responsible for all mosques and religious personnel. During the single party years (1935-1949) religion was forbidden altogether in school. After the transition to a multi-party democracy the first public religious schools, called *Imam-Hatip,* were established in 1951 by the secular state under the control of the Ministry of Education. The aim of these schools was to train imams (prayer leaders) and Hatips (preachers). Until 1976, female students were not allowed to study in these schools since they could not function as imams or preachers, according to Islam. But in 2004 the students of these schools were predominantly female (TESEV, 2004). Further, the number of Imam-Hatip graduates exceeded the number of religious functionaries needed to work in mosques (Akpinar, 2007). Both male and female graduates can attend four-year-universities and work in non-religious sectors. The place of Imam-Hatip schools in the Turkish education system, the opportunities given to its graduates, and the perspectives of its graduates on gender issues, remain controversial. A recent study (TESEV, 2004) indicated a significant gender difference in views of women's working lives; 84% of female students attending Imam-Hatip Schools agreed that women should have a profession, whereas only 19% of their male counterparts agreed that women should have a profession. In addition, 83% of male students agreed that women belong at home. Although female students maintained more liberal opinions about women's participation in the work force, only 58% of them thought that women could travel independently. Furthermore, majority of the female students stated that they would never have chosen another high school because of the freedom to cover their heads in Imam-Hatip schools.

In the main stream media secular women were portrayed as the opposites of the religious women in every domain of life. Since the early Republic years, women were portrayed as the bearers of Westernization and carriers of secularization. The Turkish modernization project aimed to achieve its ultimate goal, ascending to Western civilization through both education and increasing women's visibility in the public sphere. Women were given suffrage rights and equal access to education. The almost equal status of women to men has consistently been praised as one of the initial successes of the Turkish modernization project. At the time of the first election in 1935, only 4.5% of the members of the Turkish National Assembly were female, which was higher than the percentage of women maintaining deputy positions in any of the Western democratic countries except Finland. The republican regime honored and respected those exemplary, distinguished, elite women, who were educated, had professions, and practiced their professions without ignoring their traditional duties both as supporting and obedient wives and as good mothers (Tekeli, 1986). Despite the work of these extraordinary women during this era, the husband remained the head of the family by law and the wife needed to obtain the husband's permission to seek a job outside the home. The legal status of the husband remained unchanged until the beginning of the 21st century. At the

time of writing, even in today's modern cities, women with careers outside the home still maintain traditional subservient roles inside the home. In many families, when a couple returns home after work, it is the woman who prepares the dinner, washes the dishes, and takes care of the children. (Ozyegin, 2001). The idea of sharing the "second shift" is not welcomed even by educated urban men. The solution of many professional urban women for dealing with the overwhelming working hours both inside and outside the house is to hire uneducated women from the rural parts of Turkey as domestic workers (Ozyegin, 2001). Most female university graduates have the support of their class in their professional lives, and because of the 'elitist' role ascribed to them, have been very well treated in most jobs. Due to this positive treatment, many of these women remain unaware that they perform a privileged segment, and thus make it difficult for them to see that their gender is one of the most oppressed of their society. When asked by newspapers to make an evaluation of the situation of women in Turkey, most of the professional women endorsed the notion that "*In [their] society, women are in a better position, more respected, and get more equal treatment than women in Western societies"* (Tekeli, 1986, p.192).

In contemporary Turkey, the term secularist refers to a segment of the Turkish public that adheres to the early Republican secularist principles, which demand that Islam should not influence the state and its worldly affairs. According to these principles, religion belongs to the private sphere. Many secular people have suggested that Turkey has stopped moving forward and has even regressed after political Islam came to power in 2002. Increasing religiosity and veiling are considered to be backwards transformations by secularists (Navaro-Yashin, 2002; Ozyurek, 2006). Imam-Hatip schools are evaluated by the secularists as a threat to the secular system by which religious youth become radicalized into the Islamist Movement. In secular circles, the Imam-Hatip Schools have always been perceived as propaganda tools to mobilize religious people with the promise of educating their children "as moral examples". Furthermore, there has been resistance to Imam-Hatip schools among secular people because these schools are considered to be institutions where students are inculcated with religious ideas in an authoritarian way (Akpinar, 2007).

Secularists of recent Turkey, on the other hand, conceptualize their culture as modern on the axis of gender equality. The Islamic style headscarf—*Türban*— is considered to be a political symbol of patriarchal control over women rather than religious expression or a personal choice. Their criticism of Islamist conservatives is not only confined to the issue of women wearing headscarves, which is perceived as a symbol of female oppression by secularists, but also directed to the Islamic lifestyle. Their increased skepticism is associated with the ruling party's censorship of non-religious art and music, prohibition of alcoholic beverages in some areas, and promotion of sex segregation and conservative family values, such as female modesty and invisibility. Recent research (Toprak, 2009) has indicated that women with headscarves tended to endorse the segregation of sexes and did not advocate women working outside the home. Furthermore, social pressure has been exerted by Islamists to conform their view of Muslim behavior. These pressures include disapproving gazes at women with miniskirts or pants and boycotting grocery stores selling alcoholic beverages. Women without headscarves argue that they feel threatened in communities in which the majority of women have adopted Islamic clothing and lifestyles.

The differences between secular and religious people in Turkey have also been studied from the social capital perspective. Most sociological research has documented that the urban poor support Islamism (see Tugal, 2009; Toprak, 2009 for review). The term *Islamist* is widely used to refer to people who identify themselves with Islamic traditions, tastes and life styles to differentiate themselves from secularists. It also refers to political actions and interventions undertaken in the name of Islam. Islamists are not homogeneous in their Islamic identities, as they are influenced by different religious orders and authorities and do not share the same political agenda when positioning themselves within the political structure. Some of them do actively participate in political struggle, while others dedicate themselves to Islamic community development and the expansion of the Islamic faith. Despite their diversity, they tend to agree that religious schooling is a necessity for the youth to acquire religious literacy and become socially competent citizens. Religious people who embrace Imam-Hatip schools as their own argue that "morality" in other public and private schools is loose (Akpinar, 2006; Pak, 2004; Tuğal, 2006). In this context, Imam-Hatip high schools are the only acceptable options for those Islamist families who would never send an adolescent girl to school without a headscarf. Such families believe that the headscarf is a religious necessity for a woman to maintain her purity and modesty. By sending their daughters to the Imam-Hatip schools they immerse their children in an Islamic environment in which their youngsters can interact with other children from an Islamist background. The secular neighborhoods and schools are disapproved of by Islamists for their loose morality, impious life style, and alcohol consumption. Islamist social and family life emphasizes sex segregation and hierarchical relationships. Islamist adolescents attending Imam-Hatip schools are portrayed as obedient and having harmonious family relationships. Although Islamist women demand their right to access public education with headscarves, most of them do not support the employment of women after their education. The view that the primary responsibility of women is to maintain familial happiness and train the children is widely shared among Islamists (Arat, 2010). Furthermore, low-SES urban populations supporting Islamism have been classified as having the *total interdependence* family model, where the autonomy of the child is not desired and obedience-oriented child rearing practices are common (Kagitcibasi, 2007).

It is also important to distinguish the overarching term *Muslim* from *Islamist.* The term Muslim refers to people who identify themselves as followers of Islam regardless of their political views. In the Turkish context, there are secular Muslims who accept that religion belongs to the private sphere and do not believe religious politics and symbols are appropriate in the public sphere. Women's visibility in public and the inequality between men and women continues still to be the primary debate between secularists and Islamists. In this context, social scientific research focuses on this tension by using different frameworks and methodologies. Since 1990, women with headscarves have become the subject of many ethnographical studies (e.g., Gole, 1996). When using survey data from university students, social psychologists tend to treat religious and secular backgrounds as external independent variables to predict attitudes and behaviors (Hortacsu, 2000; Sevim, 2006; Tasdemir & Sakalli-Ugurlu, 2010). Studies by these researchers consistently find that religious people are more likely to positively evaluate women who embrace traditional gender roles and justify gender hierarchies.

In the 2010 Human Development Report (HDR, 2010), Turkey was ranked 83rd among the nations, reporting improved economic indicators. However, according to the same report, its economic growth did not translate into increased gender equality. Women are discriminated against in the realms of health, education, and work. The Gender Inequality Index indicated that only 9.1% of the Turkish Parliament is female. Only 27% of the female population had a high school education or more; 26% of women were participating in the labor force. The report further concluded that a lack of education among women, the limited visibility of women in public spheres, women's low participation in the work force, and the mistreatment of minorities continued to be problematic issues in present day Turkey. To summarize, social scientific research from a number of disciplines has suggested that cultural differences between Islamists and secularists in contemporary Turkey is mapped on the question of gender, particularly on women's choices and lifestyles. School preferences and women's dress signify political and religious views. The two schools chosen as sites for this research reflected the recent dichotomy between Islamists and secularists as perceived by the public and presented in recent academic works. They provide an excellent research setting to examine the concepts of morality, autonomy and authority in daughters and mothers and how these concepts are coordinated in the context of family and community.

Research Settings

Participants were selected from two different schools located in two demographically distinct neighborhoods in Istanbul. School 1 was a public religious vocational high school with a strong emphasis on Sunni-Islam teaching, along with positive sciences like physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics. It was categorized as an *Anatolian Imam-Hatip* (Prayer-Preacher) high school. It was located in a low-SES urban neighborhood with a population mainly of rural origins, Muslim lifestyle and Islamic dress. The medium of instruction was Turkish. Arabic and English were taught as foreign languages. Religious subjects, regarded as vocational courses, were Islamic law, Islamic history, Koran, Islamic theology, the prophetic traditions, and Islamic customs. The main objective of school was to train religious service providers and prayers (imams) for mosques. Its graduates could continue their higher education at Divinity Colleges or take the National University Entrance Exam and study whatever specialty they like. It was a mixed gender high school and drew its students from the top five percent according to the results of the national high school entrance exam. Eighty percent of School 1's students were female even though women cannot serve as religious leaders, according to Islam. Female students wore the Islamic style headscarf and long skirts as their school uniform. The interactions between boys and girls are limited and strictly controlled by teachers. In classrooms, boys and girls never sat next to each other. (However teachers and families had begun to be concerned about boys and girls using text messages and social media to communicate). Graduates of School 1 chose to study Theology, Law, and Public Administration in urban and provincial universities.

School 2 was a private high school located in an upper-middle class urban neighborhood in Istanbul. The medium of instruction was both English and Turkish. It was one of the few schools in Turkey that adjusted its curriculum to the Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Diploma Programmes. It was also accredited

by the New York State Association of Independent Schools and was a member of G20[6] schools. According to the Turkish National Education Ministry's classification, School 2 is a *foreign college.* In the Turkish context, *college* means private high school. Foreign colleges have had a long history in Turkey dating back to the Ottoman era and have maintained a reputation of educating the secular elites. School 2 was established in the second half of the 19th century by American missionaries devoted to education. Since the foundation of the Republic, School 2 has provided a strictly secular education. It has become semi-autonomous in the design of its own secular curriculum under the control of the Turkish Ministry of Education. General graduation requirements for students in School 2 include five years of English Language and literature, four years of Turkish language and literature, and at least two years of mathematics, science, history, geography, Turkish history, philosophy, and arts. Based on the National High School Entrance Exam results, School A accepts students from the first percentile. Approximately 35-40% of its graduates are accepted to liberal art colleges and universities in the United States and the UK each year. The rest of its graduates mostly continue their higher education at prestigious private and public universities in Turkey. School 2 has mixed-education classes with equal numbers of female and male students.

Chapter 3: Method

Participants

This study included 102 female participants, 68 daughters and 34 mothers. Daughters and mothers were from the same family. Thirty-six daughters (M = 16. 7 years, SD = .79, range 16-18 years) and 18 mothers (M = 39.3 years, SD = 4.2, range 34-55 years) were from the religious Imam-Hatip High School. All participants from the religious school wore a headscarf. Thirty-two daughters (M = 16.6, SD= .55, range 16-18) and 16 mothers (M = 44.5, SD = 3.85, range 39-52) were from the secular private college. There was a significant demographic difference between religious and secular participants (Table 1). The mean number of children within the religious participants' households (M = 3.06, SD =. 86) and the secular participants' households (M = 1.72, SD = .51) were also significantly different, t (65) = -7.43, p = .00 (two-tailed), d = .10

Table 2

Participants' demographics

	Religious Families	*Secular Families*
Mean number of children	3.06 (.86)	1.72 (.51)
Mothers' mean age	39.3 (4.2)	44.5 (3.85)
Fathers' mean age	42.8 (5.2)	48.03 (4.8)
Mother's education (4-year-college)	0%	84%
Father's education (4-year-college and above)	25%	90%

Parentheses indicate standard deviations.

[6] G20 is an independent school association of secondary schools initiated by St. Andrew College (South Africa) and Wellington College (UK) in 2006 to accredit their academic excellence and innovation.

None of the religious mothers had a college degree. 44% of the religious mothers (N = 16) were elementary school graduates, 22% (N = 8) were middle school graduates, 25% (N = 9) were high school graduates, and 8% of them did not receive any formal education. The majority of the religious mothers (94%, N = 14) were housewives, while 6% of them (N = 2) were blue-color workers. However, 84% of the secular mothers (N = 27) had a four-year college degree or more, while 13% (N = 4) were high school graduates. Only 3% (N = 1) of the secular mothers had no more than an elementary school education. Only 25% of secular mothers (N = 8) were housewives. Seventy-five percent (N = 24) were white-collar workers and professionals (mostly teachers and doctors). Similar to the mothers' educational backgrounds, religious fathers had less education than secular fathers; 25% of religious fathers (N = 9) had a college degree, 31% were high school graduates (N =11), and 44% had a middle school diploma or less (N = 16). In contrast, 90% of the secular fathers (N = 29) had a college degree or greater. Fifty percent of religious fathers (N = 36) had blue-collar jobs (e.g., artisans, drivers, mechanics) and 17% were owners (N =6) of small-scale businesses. On the other hand, 78% of secular fathers (N = 25) had white-collar positions and 16% were self-employed (N =5).

Procedure

The researcher introduced the study to all tenth and eleventh graders in both schools during their homeroom hours. Female students who were interested in participating were interviewed individually in their free hours or during their lunch breaks on school grounds. The participation rate was approximately 40% in each classroom. Interested participants' mothers were contacted first through e-mail or by phone. If they agreed to participate, the interviews were arranged at their convenience. Mothers' participation rate was 50%. All religious mothers were interviewed at their home.[7] Additional precautions were adopted with religious participants; the researcher dressed modestly in dark clothing and did not wear make-up in order to present as more similar in appearance to these participants. Furthermore, the researcher spent time with female students at the guidance and psychological counseling service of the school cafeteria, and yard of the religious school to increase their comfort level. Interviews with secular mothers occurred at different places, including their offices, work cafeterias, and at the schools of their daughters.[8] The participants responded to questions in a semi-structured interview format for about 30-45 minutes. All interviews were conducted in Turkish, electronically recorded and transcribed for analysis. The interviewer was a native Turkish-speaking woman. Participants were given a box of chocolate for compensation.

Design and Assessment

First participants were asked who they think should make decisions about a) clothes, (b) house chores (c) friendship (d) career, and (e) health care.

---

[7] In neighborhoods such as Gungoren, Bagcilar, Bahcelievler, Kucukcekmece, and Basaksehir, which are governed by Islamist municipalities

[8] In neighborhoods such as Ulus, Arnavutkoy, Nisantasi, Suadiye, Atakoy, and Adalar, which are governed by republican secular municipalities

Then they were presented with a series of conflict situations in adolescent daughter – mother dyads about socially controversial issues within the above mentioned five areas: In Format 1 daughter protagonists were portrayed as choosing and desiring an activity opposed by her mother. Conflicts involved the five areas were presented in two conditions. In the first condition, the protagonist daughter was presented as making a decision that was consistent with the social norms of the participants' community but opposed by the protagonist's mother. In the reverse condition, the protagonist daughter makes a decision inconsistent with the social norms of the participants' community. For example, the adolescent female protagonist does not choose to wear a headscarf because she thinks women should not have to wear it, but her mother opposed this choice by voicing her opinion that women should wear a headscarf. Then, another protagonist daughter was portrayed as choosing to wear a headscarf because she felt that women ought to wear it, conflicting with her mother's opinion that women should have not wear a headscarf.

In Format 2, the mother protagonists were portrayed as choosing and desiring an activity that was opposed by her daughters. For example, the protagonist mother did not want to wear a headscarf because she thinks women should not have to wear it, but her adolescent daughter opposed this decision by voicing her opinion that women should wear a headscarf. Then, another protagonist mother was portrayed as being willing to wear a headscarf because she felt that women ought to wear it, conflicting with her daughter's opinion that women should have not wear a headscarf. Like Format 1 all stories are presented in normative and reverse conditions.

Each participant was presented with ten stories (5 areas of conflict x 2 types of conditions [consistent with participant's community, inconsistent with the participant's community]) (See Appendix A). After being presented with each story, participants were asked to evaluate four questions:

1) Do you think what the protagonist decides in this situation is ok or not ok? Why?

2) Do you think it is OK or not OK that her mother /daughter objects? Why?

3) Do you think it is OK or not that daughter/mother persists? Why?

4) What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?

Coding and Reliability

Four coding systems were developed based on previous research (Conry-Murray, 2009; Davidson, Turiel, & Black, 1983; Nucci & Smetana, 1996; Milnitsky-Sapiro, Turiel, & Nucci, 2006; Wainryb & Turiel, 1994) and modified using 33% of the interviews. First, the responses to the query "Who should decide?" were coded as *the person/both (joint)/the other person* should decide. "*The person should decide* responses were coded as 1, *joint* responses as 2, and *the other person* as 3. The second coding system was for participants' evaluations of the permissibility of the protagonists' decision, permissibility of the objection by the other, and perseverance of the protagonist for pursuing her decision were coded on an *OK/maybe/ not OK* scale. The third coding system was for coding participants' justifications. Fifteen justification categories were developed based on the interview protocols. Up to three justifications for each question were allowed. For statistical analysis, justification categories were collapsed into five categories. The moral category included responses related to justice, rights, concerns

related to welfare of the other, equality and reciprocity between family members. The religious category includes responses related to God's words and religious rules. The social-conventional category included responses that referred to social norms, hierarchy, and role related competences. Responses referring to the individual's personal autonomy, choices, desires, needs, and priorities were grouped as personal. Responses concerning the safety of the self and pragmatics of the act were grouped as prudential (See Appendix B). Each justification category was applied either to positive (OK), negative (not OK), or mixed (maybe) responses to evaluation questions. The fourth coding system ordered participants' ideal resolution strategies. The same justification categories were used to analyze why and how this resolution was ideal (Appendix B).

The interviews were transcribed in Turkish and coded by the author. For inter-rater agreement, 16% of the interviews were coded by another native Turkish speaker. The inter-judge agreements based on Cohen's kappa were as follows: in the coding for evaluations, $\kappa = .86$, in the coding for justifications, $\kappa = .77$, and in the coding for conflict resolution $\kappa = .77$.

Statistical Procedure

The statistical analyses focused on comparisons of judgments and justifications of who should decide, protagonist's decision, the other person's objection, protagonist's persistence, and the ideal conflict resolution for each story with normative and reverse versions between daughters and mothers from religious and secular backgrounds. Log-linear analyses were conducted on responses. The aim of this statistical analysis was to find the main effects of religious background and family status and all interactions as participants evaluated distinct hypothetical daughter-mother conflicts entailing normative and reverse contents from both daughters' and mothers' points-of-view (Serlin & Seaman, 2010). Within-subject component of the data aimed to further explore the consistency and inconsistency of evaluations and justifications. However, the nature of the measurement did not allow for making any statistical comparisons between Format 1 (daughter as the agent of the conflict) and Format 2 (mother as the agent of the conflict). Similarities and differences between Format 1 and Format 2 in response patterns will be discussed.

Chapter 4: Results

Evaluations. Chi-square analyses were performed to determine if participants' evaluations to each question were significantly different by story. Format 1, in which the daughter protagonists were portrayed as the decision-maker and Format 2, in which the protagonist mothers were portrayed as the decision-maker, measured different concepts in two different groups of participants, across format analyses were conducted separately. As shown in Table 2 and Table 3, there were significant main effects of the content of the story on participants' evaluations of each question across in Format 1 and Format 2.

Table 3
Chi-square analysis of story effects on evaluation questions (Format 1= daughter as the agent)

	$\chi 2$	Df	P
Who should decide?	52.07	8	.00
Is it ok that the daughter decides x^1?	30.39	8	.00
Is it ok that the daughter decide y^2?	65.32	8	.00
Is it ok that her mother objects to the daughter's decision about x^1?	39.87	8	.00
Is it ok that her mother objects to the daughter's decision about y^2?	65.34	8	.00
Is it ok that the daughter persists on x^1?	27.76	8	.00
Is it ok that the daughter persists on y^2?	92.51	8	.00
Ideal resolution for x^1	56.16	12	.00
Ideal resolution for y^2	54.33	12	.00

[1] A decision/ choice/ request that is assumed to be consistent with norms of the secular community

[2] A decision/ choice/ request that is assumed to be consistent with norms of the religious community

Table 4
Chi-square analysis of story effects on evaluation questions (Format 2= mother as the agent)

	$\chi 2$	df	p
Who should decide?	68.31	8	.00
Is it ok that the mother decides x^1?	31.74	8	.00
Is it ok that the mother decides y^2 ?	77.53	8	.00
Is it ok that her daughter objects to her mother's decision about x^1?	41.43	8	.00
Is it ok that her daughter objects to her mother's decision about y^2?	49.96	8	.00
Is it ok that the mother persists on x^1 ?	26.15	8	.00
Is it ok that the mother persists on y^2 ?	117.98	8	.00
Ideal resolution x^1	55.91	12	.00
Ideal resolution y^2	51.57	12	.00

[1] A decision/ choice/ request that is assumed to be consistent with norms of the secular community
[2] A decision/ choice/ request that is assumed to be consistent with norms of the religious community.

In order to determine the effects of participants' family status, religious background and two versions of the story, and because all of the variables were categorical, Log-linear Analysis (also known as multi-way frequency analysis) was used. As in analysis of variance (ANOVA), Log-linear Analysis includes a grand mean, main effect, and interaction terms that are consistent with the specified hypothesis (Serlin & Seaman, 2010). The first step in a log-linear analysis is to test all possible main effects and interactions. Second, a stepwise hierarchical procedure is used to systematically test other models to find the contribution of each independent variable and interactions. This procedure involves subtraction of the chi-square value ($\chi 2$) obtained under the saturated model from the chi-square value obtained under the reduced model. The final model includes only the remaining variables that contribute significantly to the model. In this study, this procedure is repeated for each story with two versions in order to determine the main effect of participants' family status (daughter vs. mother), religious background (religious school vs. secular school) and interactions on their evaluations and justifications. In other words, Log-linear procedures allowed for analyses between group differences as well as within group changes. However, the nature of measurement does not allow for the statistical comparison between the two formats, hence the agent of the stories changed from daughter to mother with some overlap of the content of the stories.

Evaluations of who should decide. Table 5 and Table 6 represent the percentages of participants for each "who should decide" question for Format 1 and Format 2 respectively. With regard to the "who should decide about what an adolescent daughter should do in terms of house chores" question the majority of the participants thought that it should be a joint decision or the mother's decision. The follow-up chi-square analysis showed a main effect for family status, with daughters more likely than mothers to say

that mothers and daughters should make the decision together, $\chi 2$ (2) = 11.68, p < .001. There was a significant main effect of religious background on participants' evaluations of the question "who should decide about an adolescent daughter's friend", $\chi 2$ (2) = 13.41, p < .001, with religious participants more likely to respond that it should be a joint decision or the mother should decide. No significant differences were found in participants' evaluations of who should decide about an adolescent daughter's clothes, career, and health. With regard to "who should decide about an adolescent daughter's clothes" question, daughters were more likely to say that it should be the daughter's decision than mothers and mothers were more likely to say it should be a joint decision. However, the difference was not statistically significant. With regard to "who should decide about an adolescent daughter's career" the majority of the participants thought that it should be the daughter's decision. Finally, with regard to the who should decide about an adolescent daughter's health, most of the participants indicated that it should be a joint decision or the mother's decision (See Table 5).

The follow-up chi-square analysis of the mother as agent version (See Table 6) showed a main effect for religious background, with religious daughters (67%) and religious mothers (75%) more likely to say that mothers should make the decision about the house chores, $\chi 2$ (2) = 11.03, p <. 001, than secular daughters (20%) and secular mothers (38%). There were a main effect of religious background and family status in participants' evaluations of " who should decide about a mother's health" question. Secular participants were more likely to think the daughter should make the decision about the mother's health, $\chi 2$ (2) =7.70, p < 05. Furthermore, regardless of religious background daughters were more likely to think that it should be a joint decision, $\chi 2$ (2)= 6.67, p < .05. The follow-up chi square analyses revealed no significant association between participants' background, family status and their evaluations of the question " who should decide" about the mother's clothes, friends, and career. Most of the participants evaluated the questions "who should decide about a mother's clothes", "who should decide about a mother's friend", and "who should decide about a mother's health" as the mother should decide.

Table 5
Evaluations of "who should decide about a daughter's ….?"

	Secular Daughters			*Secular Mothers*			*Religious Daughters*			*Religious Mothers*		
	D	J	M	D	J	M	D	J	M	D	J	M
Clothing	53	41	6	38	62	---	50	28	6	22	44	33
House chores *	0	69	32	0	22	78	22	56	22	0	22	78
Friend *	76	24	0	50	50	0	44	33	22	22	33	44
Career	70	18	12	70	20	10	72	28	12	56	22	22
Health	35	47	18	10	50	40	33	44	22	11	22	67

D= daughter, J= joint, M= mother

* Percentages significantly different p <. 001

Table 6
Evaluations of "who should decide about a mother's…. "

	Secular Daughters			*Secular Mothers*			*Religious Daughters*			*Religious Mothers*		
	M	J	D	M	J	D	M	J	D	M	J	D
Clothing	73	20	7	63	37	0	44	44	11	63	37	0
House chores *	20	73	7	38	50	12	67	---	33	75	25	---
Friend	53	47	0	62	38	0	67	28	6	50	50	0
Career	73	27	0	75	25	0	39	53	11	50	38	12
Health*	20	47	33	25	13	62	39	50	11	75	12	13

* Percentages significantly different p <. 001

As discussed in the methods section, after the general question of who should decide was asked, participants were also asked to evaluate the socially charged version of the same issue as it occurred in the daughter-mother dyad. Table 7 and Table 8 show participants' evaluations of hypothetical conflict stories by questions in Format 1 and in Format 2 respectively.

Evaluations of hypothetical conflicts

1.Evaluations of the protagonists' decisions. Chi square analyses revealed a main effect of conflict story and conditions (refer to Table 2 and Table 3 for statistical results). As the question "is it ok that the protagonist" decides was repeated across stories, further analyses within each story were conducted to explore the associations between evaluations, participants' religious background, and family status. Table 7 and Table 8 present participants' positive evaluations of the protagonists' decisions, the other person's objection, and the protagonists' persistence across five stories and two conditions in each format.

The follow-up chi-square analysis for the headscarf conflict for Format 1 revealed a significant main effect of religious background. As shown in Table 7 secular participants (100%) evaluated the daughter's choice not to wear the headscarf positively without variance, $\chi 2$ (2) = 29.13, p <.001. Similarly, religious participants evaluated the daughter's choice to wear the headscarf positively without variance, $\chi 2$ (2) = 37.73, p < .001. The resulting model for the friendship conflict story indicated a significant main effect of religious background for the legitimacy of the daughter's decision to choose a non-Muslim friend $\chi 2$ (2) = 8.57, p < .001. Religious daughters (78%) and religious mothers (56%) evaluated less positively the daughter's choice of a non-Muslim friend than secular daughters (100%) and secular mothers (100%). However, there was no significant main effect of religious background and family status on participants' evaluations of the protagonist daughter's choice of not befriending a non-Muslim friend. Most of the participants evaluated this decision as not ok (See Table 7). With regard to the career conflict, the responses to whether it is ok that an adolescent daughter decides to choose acting as her career showed a main effect of family status, $\chi 2$ (2) = 8.31, p <. 02. Regardless of religious background (secular daughters 77% ; religious daughters 83%) daughters were more likely to say choosing acting as career was all right than their

mothers. No other significant religious background and family status differences were found in the evaluations' of daughter's choices of not attending college ,obtaining healthcare, and avoiding obtaining healthcare stories . Most of the participants evaluated the protagonist daughter's choice of not attending the college, and avoiding obtaining health care negatively, whereas most of the participants evaluated the protagonist daughter who chooses to obtain health care positively.

The follow-up chi-square analyses for the "mother as agent" stories indicated a main effect for religious background in evaluations of two conditions of the headscarf conflict. Secular participants (100%) evaluated the mother's choice of not wearing the headscarf positively without variance, $\chi 2$ (2) = 35.15, $p < .001$ and religious participants evaluated the mother's choice of wearing the headscarf positively without variance, $\chi 2$ (2) = 24.87, $p < .001$ (See Table 8). Similarly, further analysis showed a significant main effect for religious background in evaluations of the mother's choice of a non-Muslim friend, with secular women evaluated the choice more positively than the religious women, $\chi 2$ (2) = 11,52, $p < 001$. There was no significant background and family status differences in participants' evaluations of the protagonist mother's choice of not befriending a non-Muslim, with that most of the participants tended to evaluate the mother's decision negatively. Furthermore, there were no significant association among participants' background, family status and their evaluations of the protagonist mother's choice of having a full-time job and having non-career. The majority of the participants tended to evaluate these choices as positively. Similarly, no group differences were found in participants' evaluations of the protagonist mothers' health related choices. Most of the participants evaluated the mother who chooses to obtain health care from a male doctor positively and the mother who avoids obtaining health care from a male doctor negatively.

2. Evaluations of objections. Separate analyses within each story explored the association among participants' religious background and family status and their evaluations. With regard to the "whether it is OK that the mother objects that her daughter chooses not to the wear the headscarf?" question there was no significant association between participants' religious background, family status, and their responses. Regardless of their religious background, daughters and mothers evaluated the mother's objection less positively. The follow-up analysis for the friendship conflict story indicated a significant main effect of religious background for the legitimacy of the mother's objection to the daughter's choice of a non-Muslim friend $\chi 2$ (2) = 16.28, $p < .001$, with religious daughters (50%) and mothers (50%) were more likely to evaluate the mother's objection positively than secular daughters and mothers (See Table 7). No other significant group differences were found in participants' evaluations of the mother's objection to the protagonist daughter's choice not to befriend a non-Muslim, request that boys should not help to house chores, choice not to attend college, and to avoid obtaining health care from a male doctor. As displayed in Table 7 most of the participants tended to evaluate mothers' objection to the daughters' choices positively in these situations. Finally, most of the participants evaluated the mother's objection to the daughter's request that boys should help, her choice of acting as a career and obtaining health care from a male doctor negatively.

With regard to the daughter's objection to the mothers' choice not to wear and wear the headscarf participants' evaluations differed significantly by religious group. As shown in Table 8 secular participants evaluated the daughter's objection to her mother who chooses to wear the headscarf positively $\chi 2$ (2) = 35.15, $p < .001$, whereas religious participants evaluated the daughter's objection to her mother who does not choose to wear the headscarf positively, $\chi 2$ (2) = 25.20, $p < .001$. Similarly, there was a significant association between the participants' religious background and their responses to the daughters' objection to the mother's choice of a non-Muslim friend, $\chi 2$ (2) = 18.40, $p < .001$, with religious participants were more likely to evaluate the daughter's objection to her mother's choice positively than their secular counterparts (see Table 8). No significant association between participants' religious background, family status, and evaluations of the daughter's objection to her mother's request that boys should not help, choice not to befriend a non-Muslim, choice not to work, and avoid obtaining health care from a male doctor. Most of the participants tended to evaluate the daughter's objection to her mother's decisions positively. However, the daughter's objection to the mother's request that boys should help, was evaluated negatively by most of the participants. Similarly, participants tended to evaluate the daughter's objection to her mother's choice of a non-Muslim friend, having full-time job, and obtaining health care from a male doctor negatively.

3. Evaluations of the protagonists' persistence. There was a main effect of story in evaluations of the protagonists' persistence in their choices in both formats. Further $\chi 2$ analyses revealed significant associations between participants' religious background and their evaluations of the daughter's persistence in not wearing the headscarf, $\chi 2$ (2)= 22. 2, $p<.001$, with all secular participants evaluating the daughter's persistence in not wearing the headscarf positively when compared to religious daughters (56%) and mothers (44%). Parallel to this finding, all religious mothers (100%) and 94% of religious daughters evaluated the protagonist's persistence in wearing the headscarf positively when compared to secular daughters (56%) and secular mothers (44%), $\chi 2(2)= 24.09$, $p<.001$. A main effect of religious background was found for participants' evaluations of the protagonist daughter's persistence in her choice of a non-Muslim friend, $\chi 2(2)= 24.09$, $p <.001$. Secular daughters (88%) and mothers (100%) were more likely to evaluate the protagonist daughter's persistence in this issue positively than the religious participants. Parallel to this finding, secular participants tended to evaluate the protagonist daughter's persistence in not befriending a non-Muslim peer less positively than religious participants, $\chi 2$ (2) = 11.55, $p < .001$. Furthermore, a main effect of religious background was found on participants' evaluations of the persistence of the protagonist daughter in her choice of acting career, $\chi 2$ (2) = 7.29, $p < .05$, with religious school participants evaluating the protagonist's persistence more negatively than secular participants. No significant differences were found in participants' evaluations of the protagonist daughter's persistence in choices about house chore and healthcare. As presented in Table 7 most of the participants tended to evaluate daughter's persistence positively in situations where she requests that boys should help and chooses to obtain healthcare from a male doctor. Similarly, most participants tended to evaluate the daughter's persistence in her request that boys should not help, not attending college and avoiding obtaining healthcare negatively.

Similar religious background differences were found in participants' evaluations of the protagonist mother's persistence in her choice not to wear the headscarf $\chi 2$ (2)= 20.65, p <. 001 and wear the headscarf $\chi 2$ (2) = 20.35, p = .00 (refer to the Table 8 for the percentages). There was also an interaction between religious background and family status when participants evaluated the persistence of the protagonist mother's choice on avoiding obtaining healthcare from a male doctor $\chi 2$ (2) = 7.84, p= .02, that is, secular mothers (50%) were more likely to evaluate it positively when compared to the other groups. There were no other significant group differences in participants' evaluations of the mothers' persistence in house chores, friendship and career stories. Most of the participants evaluated the protagonist mother's persistence in her request that boys should help, choice of a non-Muslim friend, to have a full-time job, not to work and to obtain health care from a male doctor positively. However, they tended to evaluate the mother's persistence in her request that boys should not help and her choice not to befriend a non-Muslim friend negatively

Table 7

Positive evaluations (percentages) of the protagonist's daughter decision, her mothers' objection and the daughter's persistence across five conflict stories with two conditions in Format 1 (daughter as agent)

	Is it ok that the daughter decides ....?				*Is it ok that that her mother objects?*				*Is it ok that the daughter persists ....?*			
	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM
Not to wear the headscarf	100	100	33	56	6	10	33	33	100	100	56	44
Wear the headscarf	31	10	100	100	75	90	11	0	56	20	94	100
Boys should help	88	100	67	89	0	22	6	22	75	78	44	89
Boys shouldn't help	0	0	22	11	81	100	78	89	7	11	6	22
Choosing a non-Muslim friend	100	100	78	56	6	0	50	50	88	100	50	60
Not to befriend a non-Muslim friend	6	0	17	40	94	100	83	90	13	0	50	50
Acting as college major	77	50	83	33	35	40	39	56	70	70	61	33
Not attending to college	12	0	6	11	94	100	90	78	6	10	17	11
Obtaining health-care	100	100	100	100	13	14	17	10	100	100	94	90
Avoiding obtaining health care	38	57	50	60	100	100	89	100	6	57	39	20

Table 8
Positive evaluations (percentages) of the protagonist mother's decision, her daughter' objection and the mother's persistence across five conflict stories with two conditions in Format 2 (mother as agent)

	Is it ok that the mother decides…?				Is it ok that that her daughter objects?				Is it ok that the mother persists ….?			
	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM
Not to wear the headscarf	100	100	33	12	13	12	72	75	100	100	56	38
Wear the headscarf	47	38	100	100	87	75	17	38	60	38	100	100
Boys should help	93	100	67	88	0	0	17	0	79	88	72	62
Boys shouldn't help	0	0	11	0	86	100	72	50	7	0	0	0
Choosing a non-Muslim friend	100	100	72	62	7	12	61	38	100	88	67	62
Not befriending a non-Muslim friend	7	12	44	38	93	100	83	75	13	12	50	38
Having a full-time job	93	100	65	75	7	12	35	25	87	75	41	50
Staying home	33	62	71	88	73	75	88	50	67	88	81	75
Obtaining health-care	100	100	100	100	7	25	17	0	100	100	100	100
Avoiding obtaining health-care	27	50	22	0	100	100	100	100	22	50	22	22

5. Participants' ideal conflict resolutions. Conflict resolutions differed significantly across five stories with two conditions in Format 1 and Format 2 (See Table 2 and Table 3 respectively). The log-linear analysis indicated a main effect of religious background in participants' ideal resolution responses about the headscarf conflict in Format 1. Secular women endorsed the protagonist daughter's opinion if she chooses not to wear the headscarf $\chi 2$ (3) = 17.53, p =.00, whereas religious women endorsed the protagonist daughter's opinion if she chooses to wear a headscarf, $\chi 2$ (3) = 29.21, p < 001. The follow-up chi-square analysis of the daughter as agent version (Format 1) indicated a significant main effect of religious background for conflict resolutions of "boys should help" $\chi 2$ (3) = 23.53, p < .001 and "boys should not help" $\chi 2$ (3) = 33.51 p < .001, with religious participants more likely to endorse a "middle way" as the ideal resolution. However, secular participants were more likely to endorse the daughter's opinion if the protagonist daughter requested that boys should. Participants' responses with regard to the friendship story, where the protagonist daughter decided not to befriend a non-Muslim differed by their religious backgrounds. Secular participants were more likely to endorse the mother's opinion as the ideal resolution whereas religious mothers (78%) tended to endorse the daughter's opinion , $\chi 2$ (3) = 7.82, p = .05, in this situation. The chi-square test for the choice of acting as career story showed a significant interaction

between religious background and family status, $\chi 2$ (3) = 8.34, p= .03 with religious mothers (67%) more likely to offer that "mother's opinion should prevail" as the ideal resolution (See Table 9) than the other groups. However, most participants were more likely to offer that "mother's opinion prevail" if the daughters in the stories chose not to attend college and avoids obtaining healthcare. No significant group differences were found in participants' ideal conflict resolutions in choosing a non-Muslim friend and obtaining healthcare stories. Most of the participants tended to endorse "daughter's opinion" in these situations.

In summary, secular participants were more likely to endorse the mother's authority in situations where the protagonist daughter chooses to wear the headscarf, request that boys should not help, chooses not to befriend a non-Muslim peer, not to go the college, and avoid health care from a male doctor. However, secular participants were more likely to endorse the daughter's opinion where the protagonist daughter was portrayed as not wearing the headscarf, requesting that boys should help, choosing a non-Muslim friend, choosing acting as her career, and obtaining health care form a male physician. No significant differences were found between secular mothers' and daughters' ideal resolution strategies.

Religious participants endorsed the mother's authority where the protagonist daughter was portrayed as not wearing the headscarf, not going to the college, and avoiding obtaining health care. However, they endorsed the daughter's opinion in situations where the protagonist daughter chooses to wear the headscarf, have a non-Muslim friend, exclude a non-Muslim friend, and obtain health care. Furthermore, there was a significant difference between religious mothers' and daughters' ideal resolution strategies in the story where the protagonist daughter was depicted as choosing acting as her career: Religious daughters were more likely to endorse the daughter's opinion or to find a middle way whereas religious mothers were more likely to endorse the mothers authority

Table 10 presents the participants' ideal resolution strategies to hypothetical conflicts in Format 2. A significant main effect for religious background was found where the protagonist mothers were portrayed choosing not to wear the headscarf and wear the headscarf. Religious participants were more likely to endorse the daughter's opinion if the protagonist mother chooses not to wear the headscarf $\chi 2$ (3)= 7.19, $p < .05$ than secular participants, whereas secular participants were more likely to endorse the mother's opinion when the protagonist mother decides to wear the headscarf, $\chi 2$ (3)= 17.58, $p < .001$. The follow-up chi-square analysis of the mother as agent version (Format 2) also revealed a main effect of religious background in house chore stories. Secular participants were more likely to endorse mother's opinion if she requests that boys should help house chores, $\chi 2$ (3) = 26.14, $p < .001$, whereas religious women tended to suggest " middle way" as the ideal resolution. Parallel to that, religious daughters and mothers were less likely to offer "daughter's opinion should prevail" that the secular participants as the ideal conflict resolution, $\chi 2(3) = 24.52$, $p < .001$, if the protagonist mother request "boys should not help." There were no significant religious background and family status differences in participants' ideal resolutions for the mother's choice of a non-Muslim friend. Most of the participants tended to offer "the mother's opinion should prevail" in this situation. However, participants' ideal resolution suggestions with regard to the protagonist mother's choice not to befriend of a non-Muslim differed by their

religious backgrounds, $\chi 2$ (3) = 8.08, p <. 05. Secular participants were more likely to endorse the daughter's opinion as the ideal resolution than religious participants. The follow-up chi square analyses for mother's career choice to have a full-time job showed an interaction between religious background and family. Secular women and religious mothers were more likely to endorse mother's opinion, $\chi 2$ (3) = 8.34, p < .05, than religious daughters. In this situation, religious daughters were more likely to say they should find " middle way" or "daughter's opinion should prevail" than any other group. No significant differences were found in participants' ideal conflict resolution strategies for the mother's choice not to work. Most of the participants tended to endorse "the mother's opinion" in this situation. Furthermore, participants were more likely to endorse "mother's opinion" if the mother chooses to obtain healthcare from a male doctor and endorsed " the daughter's opinion" if the mother avoids obtaining health care from a male doctor.

In summary secular participants were more likely to endorse the mother's opinion in each conflict stories where the mother chooses not to wear the headscarf, request that boys should help, to have a non-Muslim friend, to have a career, not to have career, and obtain health care from a male doctor. Secular participants endorse the daughter's opinion in situations where the mothers were portrayed as choosing to wear the headscarf, request that boys should not help, exclude a non-Muslim friend, and avoid obtaining health care from a male doctor.

Religious participants were more likely to endorse the mother's opinion in situations where the mother chooses to wear the headscarf, have a non-Muslim friend, exclude a non-Muslim friend, have a career, not to have a career, and obtain health care from a male doctor. However, they were more likely to endorse the daughter's opinion where the mothers were portrayed as not wearing the headscarf. Finally in both Formats, regardless of who made the request that boys should help, religious participants were significantly more likely to think that "middle way" is the ideal resolution.

Table 9
Ideal conflict resolutions in percentages in Format 1

	Daughter's Opinion				*Mother's opinion*				*Middle way*				*No resolution*			
	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM
Not to wear the headscarf	94	80	39	33	0	10	50	67	0	10	11	0	0	0	0	0
Wear the headscarf	35	10	100	89	41	60	0	0	24	30	0	11	0	0	0	0
Boys should help	76	40	11	0	0	20	17	22	12	40	72	78	12	0	0	0
Boys shouldn't help	24	20	11	44	65	70	0	0	12	10	44	56	0	0	0	0
Choosing a non-Muslim friend	94	100	83	56	6	0	17	33	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0
Not befriending a non-Muslim friend	40	20	50	78	60	80	39	22	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
Choosing acting as college major	59	60	44	33	18	10	11	67	24	30	44	0	0	0	0	0
Not attending to college	6	0	6	11	76	90	78	67	12	10	17	22	0	0	0	0
Obtaining health care	88	80	78	66	6	10	6	11	6	10	17	11	0	0	0	11
Avoiding obtaining health care	12	10	0	0	88	80	89	89	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0

Table 10
Ideal conflict resolutions in percentages in Format 2

	Daughter's opinion				*Mother's opinion*				*Middle way*				*No resolution*			
	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM
Not to wear the headscarf	7	12	56	62	87	88	33	12	7	0	11	25	0	0	0	0
Wear the headscarf	27	13	0	0	53	63	100	100	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boys should help	18	12	7	12	65	75	27	25	6	12	67	62	12	0	0	0
Boys shouldn't help	67	60	6	0	20	0	22	25	7	40	67	62	7	0	6	12
Choosing a non-Muslim friend	7	12	17	25	93	75	78	62	0	12	6	12	0	0	0	0
Not befriending a non-Muslim friend	60	75	33	38	10	25	50	38	0	0	17	25	0	0	0	0
Choosing a full-time job	0	0	24	0	80	88	47	75	20	12	29	25	0	0	0	0
Staying home	33	12	29	12	53	88	59	75	13	0	12	12	0	0	0	0
Obtaining health-care	0	0	0	0	93	100	100	88	7	0	---	12	0	0	0	0
Avoiding obtaining health-care	87	100	83	62	7	0	11	12	7	0	6	38	0	0	0	0

Justifications

Justification categories (See Appendix B) concerning with each evaluation questions had not enough cell frequencies that permit log-linear analyses. One solution for this problem would be to collapse justification categories and use the commonly used categories that permit the log-linear analysis (Perkins & Turiel, 2007). The associations among particular justifications, participants' background, and family status were analyzed by using log-linear analyses for each evaluation question across five issues. .

Justifications of "Who should decide about an adolescent daughter's….?" As shown in Table 11 participants used conventional, religious, personal, moral categories as their justifications for the general question of who should decide about an adolescent daughter's clothes, participation to house chores, friends, career, and health. There was a significant main effect of participants' family status and religious background on the justifications for the evaluations of " who should decide about an adolescent daughter's clothes. Religious mothers were more likely to give conventional (22%) and religious

(44%) justifications, whereas the rest of the participants tended to use personal and conventional justification, $\chi 2$ (2) = 18.13, p < .05. Furthermore, daughters in general were more likely to give personal domain related justifications than their mothers, $\chi 2$ (2)= 5.64, p =.06. With regard to the question of who should decide what an adolescent daughter does in house chi-square tests indicated a main effect of family status. Daughters were more likely to use moral justifications, $\chi 2$ (2) =11.93, p <.001, whereas, most of the mothers used conventional justifications. As presented in the cross-tabulations (See Table 11), participants used four different justifications for the question of who should decide about an adolescent daughter's friend: Personal, moral, conventional, and religious. The follow-up chi square analyses revealed a significant main effect of religious background, $\chi 2$ (3) = 9.46, p <.001 and a marginally significant interaction effect between religious background and family status , $\chi 2$ (3) = 5.53, p = .07 in justification. As shown in the Table 11, secular daughters (76%) were more likely to use personal justifications and religious mothers (78%) were more likely used conventional justifications. Furthermore , secular mothers and religious daughters tended to use more prudential justifications. The most used justification categories for the "who should decide about a daughter's career" question were personal and conventional. No significant differences between groups were found in participants' justifications. Similarly, "who should decide about an adolescent daughter's health?" question was more likely to elicit prudential justifications from all participants.

Justifications of "Who should decide about a mother's…? As displayed in Table 12, most participants tended to use personal choice justifications when evaluating who should decide about a mother's clothes. There were no significant religious background and family status differences. There was, however, a significant main effect of religious background for the same question about house chores, $\chi 2$ (3) = 7.73, p <. 001. Religious participants were more likely to use conventional justification, whereas secular participants were more likely to use moral reasons. As presented in Table 12, most of the religious participants tended to use personal domain justifications when evaluating who should decide about a mother's choice of friends than secular participants, $\chi 2$ (3) =9.73, p <. 001. Furthermore, there was a marginally significant religious background x family statutes interaction $\chi 2$ (3)= 5.05, p = .06 with secular daughters (40%) were more likely to use prudential justifications than the other groups while they evaluated who should decide about a mother's friends. There was no statistically significant association between religious background, family status and justifications of who should decide about a mother's career choice. Although religious daughters (56%) tended use more conventional justifications and less personal justifications (44%) than the other participants, most of the participants tended to use personal justifications for the mother's career choice. Finally, most of the participants used more prudential justifications for the "who should decide about a mother's health" question.

Table 11

Justifications (percentages) for daughters' decision-making autonomy

	Who should decide about a daughter's ……..?																					
	Personal				Conventional				Moral				Prudential				Religious			
	sd	sm	rd	rm	sd	sm	rd	rm	sd	sm	rd	rm	sd	sm	rd	rm	sd	sm	rd	rm
Clothing	59	40	61	33	41	60	33	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	44
House ch	18	0	17	11	29	60	17	67	53	40	67	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Friend	76	50	44	22	12	10	33	78	0	0	0	0	12	40	22	0	0	0	0	0
Career	71	80	89	56	29	20	11	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	18	0	17	11	29	60	17		0	0	0	0	53	40	67	67	0	0	0	11

Table 12
Justifications (percentages) for mother's decision-making autonomy

Who should decide about a mother's .....?	Personal				Conventional				Moral				Prudential				Religious			
	sd	sm	rd	rm	sd	sm	rd	rm	sd	sm	rd	rm	sd	sm	rd	rm	sd	sm	rd	rm
Clothing	73	62	50	62	27	38	44	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
House chores	7	0	0	12	27	38	61	62	67	62	39	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Friend	60	38	61	62	0	38	33	38	0	0	0	0	40	25	6	0	0	0	0	0
Career	73	62	50	50	27	38	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	27	38	39	25	7	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	67	62	61	62	0	0	0	0

Justifications about hypothetical conflict stories

Headscarf story

Justifications for the daughter's choice not to wearing the headscarf. Chi-square analysis indicated a significant main effect of religious background, $\chi 2$ (3) = 33.41, $p < .001$. Religious participants were re likely to refer to God's command and religious rules while evaluating the daughter' decision of not wearing the headscarf, whereas secular participants tended to use moral justifications: freedom of expression and oppression of women. Further justifications of evaluations of the mother's objection $\chi 2$ (3) = 18.50, $p < .001$ and the daughter's persistence $\chi 2$ (3) = 27.71, $p < .001$ showed also a significant main effect of religious background, with religious participants were more likely to justify their evaluations with conventional and religious justifications, whereas their secular counterparts were more likely use moral justifications.

Justifications for the daughter's choice to wear the headscarf showed also a significant main effect of religious background, $\chi 2$ (3) = 37.44, $p < .001$. Religious participants were more likely to justify the protagonist daughter's choice of wearing the headscarf by referring to the God's command and religious rules, whereas secular participants' justifications of the evaluations of the protagonist daughter's decision of wearing the headscarf indicated moral justifications. A main effect of religious background were found in participants' justifications for their evaluations of objection of the mother to the daughter's choice $\chi 2$ (3) =29.77, $p < .001$, with religious participants were more likely to use justifications from the religion category to justify their negative evaluations of the mother's objection. Similarly, religious participants used significantly more religious justifications for their positive evaluations of the daughter's persistence, $\chi 2$ (3) = 22. 71, $p < .001$. Secular participants were more likely to use moral reasons while they evaluate mother's objection positively and daughter's persistence negatively.

Justifications for the mother's choice not to wear the headscarf .When participants evaluated the mother's decision of not to wear the headscarf, a main effect of religious background $\chi 2$ (3) = 38.90, $p < .001$ and family background $\chi 2(3) = 8.87$, $p < .05$ were found. Religious participants were more likely to use religious concerns. Furthermore, secular daughters were more likely use personal domain justification when compared to their mothers. There was also a significant main effect of religious background in participants' justifications while they judged the objection of the daughter to the mother's decision, $\chi 2$ (3) = 24.87, $p <. .001$. Religious participants justified the daughter's objection to her mother's decision by referring to the religious rules, whereas secular participants used moral justifications for their negative evaluations of the daughter's objection. Furthermore, religious participants were significantly more likely to use religious rules while evaluating the persistence of the mother on not wearing the headscarf negatively, whereas secular participants were more likely to use moral justifications while evaluating the mother's persistence positively, $\chi 2$ (3)= 38.90, $p <. 001$

Justifications for " the mother's choice to wear the headscarf" showed also a significant main effect of religious background. Religious participants used religious justifications, whereas secular participants used justifications related to oppression of women and freedom of expression, $\chi 2$ (3) = 28.84, $p < .001$. Main effect of religious background was also found in participants' justifications for their evaluations of the daughter's objection to the mother, $\chi 2$ (3) = 19.14, $p < .001$. As in the previous

conditions, religious participants were more likely to use religious justifications for their negative evaluations of the daughter's objection to her mother's choice of wearing the headscarf ; whereas secular participants were more likely to use moral justifications for their positive evaluations of the same choice. Similarly, religious participants were more likely to refer religious reasons than secular participants while they evaluated the mother's persistence on her choice of wearing the headscarf $\chi 2$ (3) = 30.27, p <.001.

House chore story

Justifications for the daughter's request that "boys should help". As displayed in the cross-tabulations in detail (See Table 14), the conflict stories about house chores elicited moral justifications from all participants. No significant association among participants' background, family status and justifications were found. Most of the participants used the moral and future-related concerns when they evaluated the daughter's request that " boys should help". Similarly, most of the participants disapproved the mother's objection to the request and approved the daughter's persistence in her request that boys should help by using moral and future concerns.

Justifications for the mother's request that " boys should help elicited also moral justification. There were no significant background differences and family status differences in participants' justifications for their evaluations of the mother's request and the daughter's objection. However, there was a significant religious background and family status interaction, $\chi 2$ (2) = 12.19, p < .01 in participants justifications for the evaluations of the mother's persistence in her request. All secular mothers justified the mother's persistence in her decision about "boys should help" as moral, whereas other participants tended to bring conventional justifications.

Justifications for the request that "boys should not help". Whether the request came from a daughter or a mother, it was evaluated negatively with moral justifications. No significant group differences were found. Similarly, the mother's or the daughter's objection to the request were justified with moral justifications. Finally, most of the participants tended moral justifications while judging the persistence of the protagonist.

Friendship story

Justifications for "the daughter's choice of a non-Muslim friend " indicated a main effect of religious background and a main effect of family status. Religious participants' justifications tended to be more related with the religious scripts, whereas secular daughters (63%) and secular mothers (80%) used moral reasons, $\chi 2$ (3)= 16.31, p < .001 in their justifications. Furthermore, religious participants were significantly more likely to use religious justifications while evaluating the mother's objection to her daughter's choice of friend, $\chi 2$ (3) = 21.94, p <. 001, whereas secular participants were more likely to use moral justifications. No background and family status difference were found in participants' justification for their evaluations of the daughter's persistence. Most of the participants used moral and personal justifications.

Justifications for " the daughter's choice not to befriending a non-Muslim peer". There were no significant group differences in participants' justifications of their evaluations of not befriending a non-Muslim peer. Most of the participants tended to justify the wrongness of the act by using moral justifications. Similarly, most of the participants used moral justification while judging the mother's objection to her daughter and the daughter's persistence on not befriending her non-Muslim peer.

Justifications for "the mother's choice of a non-Muslim friend differed by participants' religious background. Secular participants were more likely to use moral justifications while evaluating the mother's choice of a non-Muslim friend than religious participants , $\chi 2$ (3) = 16.80, p < .001. The daughter's objection to her mother's choice of a non-Muslim friend also showed a main effect of religious background, $\chi 2$ (3)= 25.22, p < .001, with religious participants were more likely to use religious justifications for the objections. Furthermore, there was a significant main effect of religious background, $\chi 2$ (3) = 11.52, p <. 001, with religious participants more likely to justify the mother's persistence by referring to religious rules and personal choice.

Justifications for " the mother's choice not to befriending a non-Muslim peer. There were no significant group differences in participants' justifications for the protagonist's mother's choice not to befriend a non-Muslim peer. Most participants evaluated exclusion of a non-Muslim friend wrong by using moral justifications. In this condition, most of the participants tended also used moral justifications while judging the daughter's objection to her mother and mother's persistence.

Career Choice Story

Justifications for the daughter's choice of acting as career. A significant interaction between religious background and family status, $\chi 2$ (3) = 8.60, p <. 001 was found for the acting story. Religious mothers were more likely to use conventional (22%) and religious justifications (44%), whereas the other groups were more likely to use personal choice. A main effect of religious background was found in justifications for the mother's objection to acting $\chi 2$ (3) = 27.93, p <. 001. Religious participants were more likely to use conventional and religious justifications, whereas secular participants were more likely to justify the mother's objection to her daughter's choice of career with future concerns. Furthermore, secular participants were more likely to use personal justifications while they evaluated the daughter's persistence in her choice, whereas religious were tended to use conventional and religious justifications, $\chi 2$ (3) = 5.80 , p = .05

Justifications for "the daughter's choice not to attend college. No significant group differences were found in participants' justification for the daughter's choice about not going to the college, her mother's objection to this choice, and the daughter's persistence. Most of the participants used future concern category in their justifications.

Justifications for the mother's choice to have a full-time job. No significant differences were found in justifications for the evaluation of the mother's choice of having a full-time job. Most participants tended to use personal justifications. Furthermore, no significant background and family status differences were found in participants' justifications for their evaluations of the daughter's objection to the mother's career choice. Most of the participants used conventional justifications while evaluating the daughter's objection. However, the persistence of the mother in her choice to have a full-time job revealed a significant group difference $\chi 2$ (3) = 12.98, p < .001. Secular daughters (93%) and secular mothers (75%) used personal choice, whereas religious women were more likely to emphasize the conventional and religious concerns.

Justifications for the mother's choice not to work. No significant religious background and family status difference found in this situation. Most of the participants, regardless of their religious background and family status, used personal justifications

while evaluating the mother's choice of not working. However, most of the participants justified the daughter's objection to her mother's choice of not working by using future related concerns. Furthermore, most of the participants justified the mother's persistence in not working as her personal choice.

Health Story

Justifications for the daughter's choice to obtain health care from a male doctor. No significant group differences were found in participants justification for their evaluation of the daughter's choice of obtaining health care. All participants justified this choice as prudential. Furthermore, most of the participants used prudential reason while evaluating the mother's objection to the daughter's choice negatively and while evaluating the daughter's persistence positively.

Justifications for the daughter's avoidance of obtaining health care showed a significant main effect of religious background, $\chi 2\ (2) = 13.35$, $p < .001$, with religious participants were more likely to use religious rules while evaluation the daughter's avoidance. However, there were no significant differences in their justifications while they judged the mother's objection and the daughter's persistence. Most of the participants tended to use prudential justifications in these situations.

Justifications for the mother's choice to obtain health care from a male doctor indicated no background and family status differences in this condition. Most of the participants tended to use prudential justifications.

Justifications for " the mother's avoidance of obtaining health care from a male doctor" were significantly different by participants' religious background, $\chi 2\ (2) = 18.96$, $p < .001$. Religious participants were more likely to justify the decision within the jurisdiction of personal choice and religion, whereas secular participants were more likely use prudential and personal choice justifications. No significant differences were found in participants' justifications for the daughter's objections and the mother's persistence on the decision. Most of the participants tended use prudential reasons for their evaluations.

Table 13
Justifications (percentages) of headscarf conflict in percentages by each question

	Daughter as agent				Mother as agent			
	SD*	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM
Is it ok that X chooses not to wear the headscarf?								
Moral	64	60	22	11	20	75	0	0
Personal	35	40	28	44	80	25	39	12
Religious	0	0	50	44	0	0	61	88
Is it ok that X chooses to wear headscarf?								
Moral	71	60	0	0	47	75	17	0
Personal	12	40	44	11	40	25	33	25
Religious	18	0	56	89	13	0	50	75
Is it ok that the other objects to not wear the headscarf?								
Moral	48	40	11	11	40	87	0	0
Personal	29	40	17	11	47	75	0	0
Religious	24	20	72	78	13	12	100	100
Is it ok that the other objects to the choice to wear the headscarf?								
Moral	65	90	33	22	67	62	6	0
Personal	24	10	0	0	27	25	17	0
Conventional	12	0	33	12	7	12	56	75
Religious	0	0	33	56	0	0	22	25
Is it ok that x persists in not to wear headscarf								
Moral	58	60	17	0	33	75	6	0
Personal	41	40	56	56	67	25	56	50
Religious	0	0	28	44	0	0	39	50
*Is it ok that x persists in to wear headscar*f								
Conventional	12	30	6	0	20	25	0	0
Moral	47	40	11	0	20	25	17	0
Personal	24	30	28	22	60	50	39	12
Religious	18	0	56	78	0	0	44	88

* SD: Secular Daughters, SM: Secular Mothers, RD: Religious Daughters, RM: Religious Mothers

Table 14
Justifications (percentages) of house chore story in percentages

House Chores	Daughter as agent				Mother as agent			
	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM
Is it ok that x requests that boys should help								
Conventional	18	10	39	11	7	0	28	12
Future orientation	12	0	6	33	20	12	17	38
Moral	71	90	56	56	73	88	56	50
Is it ok that x requests that boys should not help								
Conventional	18	20	28	33	27	12	44	38
Future orientation	6	0	11	11	0	12	0	0
Moral	76	80	56	56	73	75	56	62
Is it ok that the other objects that boys should help								
Conventional	41	30	22	44	33	25	33	62
Future orientation	0	20	11	22	20	12	11	0
Moral	59	50	67	33	47	62	56	38
Is it ok that the other objects that boys should not help								
Conventional	18	0	33	11	33	0	28	50
Future orientation	0	10	22	22	20	25	0	0
Moral	82	90	44	67	47	75	72	50
Is it ok that x persists that boys should help								
Conventional	29	30	56	33	33	0	33	50
Future orientation	18	0	0	0	13	0	6	25
Moral	53	70	44	67	47	100	61	25
Is it ok that x persists that boys should not help								
Conventional	35	50	67	33	20	38	17	38
Future orientation	0	10	6	11	13	12	6	0
Moral	65	40	28	56	67	50	78	62

Table 15
Justifications (percentages) of friendship story in percentages

	Daughter as agent				Mother as agent			
	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM
Is it ok that x chooses a non-Muslim friend								
Conventional	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moral	65	80	44	33	73	62	39	38
Personal	29	10	39	11	27	38	22	12
Religious	0	0	17	56	0	0	39	50
Is it ok that x befriends a non-Muslim friend?								
Conventional	18	10	0	0	7	15	0	10
Moral	54	60	72	56	67	60	60	60
Personal	24	30	17	33	27	25	10	12
Religious	0	0	11	11	0	0	25	25
Is it ok that the other objects that x's choice of a non-Muslim friend?								
Conventional	41	10	17	22	20	25	11	0
Moral	53	80	39	33	80	38	17	25
Personal	6	10	0	0	0	25	6	0
Religious	0	0	44	44	0	12	67	75
Is it ok that the other objects that x befriends of a non-Muslim?								
Conventional	18	0	0	0	13	38	6	0
Moral	82	90	94	89	87	62	78	50
Personal	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Religious	0	0	6	11	0	0	17	50
Is it ok that x persists on her choice of a non-Muslim friend								
Conventional	12	10	28	0	0	12	22	12
Moral	59	80	28	44	73	25	17	25
Personal	29	10	17	0	27	50	33	38
Religious	0	0	28	56	0	12	28	25
Is it ok that x persists on befriending of a non-Muslim?								
Conventional	24	30	17	11	13	38	6	0
Moral	18	50	17	33	87	62	78	60
Personal	59	20	44	33	0	0	0	0
Religious	0	0	22	22	0	0	17	40

Table 16

Justifications (percentages) in career choice story

	Daughter as agent				Mother as agent			
	SD	*SM*	*RD*	*RM*	*SD*	*SM*	*RD*	*RM*
Is it ok that x chooses a career[1]?								
Conventional	29	80	6	22	20	25	33	25
Personal	71	20	89	33	80	75	61	75
Religious	0	0	6	44	0	0	0	0
Is it ok that x does not choose a career[2]?								
Conventional	24	0	6	11	7	0	17	0
Future orientation	47	100	78	78	27	25	11	0
Personal	29	0	17	11	67	75	72	100
Is it ok that the other objects that x's choice a career[1]?								
Conventional	24	30	72	22	73	75	94	88
Personal	24	30	22	33	20	12	6	12
Prudential	53	40	0	0	7	12	0	0
Religious	0	0	6	44	0	0	0	0
Is it ok that the other objects that x doesn't choose a career[2]?								
Conventional	18	10	6	22	20	38	39	50
Future orientation	76	90	89	56	73	50	56	12
Personal	6	0	6	22	7	12	6	38
Is it ok that x persists on her choice of career?[1]								
Choosing a career								
Conventional	24	10	33	44	7	25	33	50
Personal	76	90	67	33	93	75	67	50
Religious	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0
Is ok that x persists on her choice of not having a career[2]?								
Conventional	18	80	17	78	0	12	22	25
Future orientation	41	20	56	22	20	0	0	0
Personal	41	0	28	0	80	88	78	75

[1] The choice was acting in the daughter as agent format, whereas the choice was a full-time job in the mother agent format

[2] The choice was not attending to college in the daughter as agent format, whereas the choice was staying home in the mother agent format

Table 17
Justifications (percentages) for health story in percentages

Health	Daughter as agent				Mother as agent			
	SD	SM	RD	RM	SD	SM	RD	RM
Is it ok that x obtains health-care from a male doctor?								
Prudential	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Is it ok that x avoids obtaining health-care?								
Conventional	24	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
Prudential	59	70	50	44	60	62	56	37
Personal	6	20	44	44	33	38	0	38
Religious	12	10	6	11	0	0	44	25
Is it ok that the other objects that x obtains health-care?								
Conventional	0	20	22	0	47	12	6	0
Prudential	88	80	72	89	47	75	72	88
Religious	12	0	6	11	7	12	22	22
Is it ok that the other objects that x avoids obtaining health-care?								
Conventional	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prudential	94	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Is it ok that x persists on obtaining health-care?								
Conventional	0	20	11	11	0	0	0	0
Prudential	100	80	89	89	100	100	100	88
Religious	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Is it ok that x persists on avoiding obtaining health-care?								
Conventional	6	0	6	0	7	25	0	0
Prudential	88	90	89	78	80	75	83	75
Personal	6	10	0	22	13	0	17	25
Religious	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0

Table 18: Summary of results

Research Question	Results
1.Do the content of the general question make a difference din daughters'and mothers' judgments about decision-making autonomy?	Confirmed. Main effect of the content of the question was found on each who should decide question. Further analyses showed some group differences in some questions (see Table 19)
2.Do participiants' evaluations of the choices that are context-specific and politically controversial among secular and religious Turkish citizens in contemporary Turkey differ? a.When they evaluate it from the perspective of the protagonist (daughter/mother)? b. When they evaluate it from the perspective the mother/daughter who disagrees with the protagonist?	Confirmed. Main effect of conflict story was found on each question.
3. Do their ideal conflict resolutions differ across hypothetical stories?	Confirmed.

Table 19: Within story results summaries

Clothing-Headscarf	Daughter as agent	Mother as agent
Who should decide	Family status difference: Daughters: Daughter's decision with personal justifications Mothers: Joint decision with conventional and religious justifications	No group difference Mothers should decide with moral justifications.
Not willing to wear headscarf	Religious background difference: Secular (+), w/moral Religious (-), w/religious, personal	Religious background difference: Secular (+), w/moral Religious (-), w/ religious, personal
Willing to wear the headscarf	Secular (-) Religious (+)	Secular (-) Religious (+)
Ideal resolution		
Not willing to wear	Religious: Mother's opinion	Religious: Daughter's opinion
Willing to wear	Religious: Daughter's opinion	Religious: mother's opinion

House chore	Daughter as agent	Mother as agent
Who should decide?	Family status difference Daughters: joint with moral justifications Mothers: mothers with conventional justifications	Religious background difference: Secular: Joint with moral justifications Religious: mothers with conventional justifications
Boys should help	No difference, all (+) w/ moral	No difference, all (+) w/moral
Boys should not help	No difference, all (-) w/moral	No difference, all (-) w/moral
Ideal conflict resolutions	Religious background difference:	Religious background difference:
Boys should help	Secular: Daughter's opinion should prevail Religious: They should find a middle way.	Secular: Mother's opinion should prevail. Religious: They should find a middle way
Boys should not help	Secular: Mother's opinion should prevail Religious: They should find a middle way	Secular: Daughter's opinion should prevail. Religious: They should find a middle way

Friendship	Daughter as agent	Mother as agent
Who should decide the choice of friends?	Family status x religious background interaction: Secular daughters: Daughter's decision w/personal justifications Other groups: joint decision w/conventional and prudential justifications	No group difference. Mother's decision w/ personal justifications.
Choosing a non-Muslim friend	Secular: (+) with moral justifications Religious: less (+) w/ moral and religious justifications.	Secular: (+) w/moral. Religious: less (+) with moral and religious justifications.
Exclusion of a non-Muslim friend	No group difference: (-), w/ moral	No group difference (-), w/moral
Ideal resolution		
Choosing a non-Muslim friend	Daughter's opinion prevail	Mother's opinion prevail
Exclusion of a non-Muslim friend	Secular: mother's opinion Religious mothers: daughter's opinion Religious daughters mother's opinion or middle way.	Religious mothers: mother's opinion Religious daughters mother's opinion or middle way

Career	Daughter as agent	Mother as agent
Who should decide?	No group difference-- Daughter's decision, w/ personal justifications	Mother's decision, w/personal justifications. Religious daughter: more likely to say joint w/ conventional reasons
Choice consistent with secular norms [1]	Family status difference: Daughters support acting	No difference- the mother's opinion should prevail.
Choice consistent with religious norms [2]	No group difference. Everybody disapproves the daughter's decision who doesn't want to go the college.	Secular women were less supportive.
ideal resolution	Daughter's opinion should prevail except religious mothers	Secular said clearly mother's opinion, religious are ambivalent
Choice consistent with secular norms [1]		
Choice consistent with religious norms [2]	Mothers' opinion should prevail—no difference	No group difference. Mother's opinion; that her life.

Health	Daughter	mother
Who should decide?	Mixed -Together or the other person Personal, conventional, prudential justifications	Religious mothers more likely to say mothers Secular mothers more likely to say other members of the family
Obtaining health care from a male doctor	No difference, all (+)	No difference, (+)
Avoiding health care from a male doctor	No group difference, (-)	No group difference, (-)
Ideal resolution	No group difference for both conditions. The protagonist daughter should obtain healthcare .	No group difference for both conditions The protagonist mother should obtain healthcare

(+) Choice was evaluated positively

(-) Choice was evaluated negatively

1 Choosing acting for daughters; choosing a full-time career for mothers

2 Choosing not attending college for daughters; choosing to have a no career for mothers

Chapter 5: Discussion

The major goal of this study was to examine how adolescent and adult women from secular and religious backgrounds reason about fairness, personal choices, social-conventions, and legitimacy of parental authority in the Turkish urban family context. Findings of this study revealed that young and adult women in Turkey do not make unitary forms of social judgments since they made various distinctions in their judgments by taking the agent of the choices (daughter or mother) and the content of the choices (clothes, house chore, friendship, career, health) into account. This was found in response to general questions, as well as with regard to the controversial issues.

Decision making autonomy of daughters and mothers

One set of findings, coming from responses to the general question of who should decide about an adolescent daughter's choices, indicated that religious backgrounds and family status could be the basis of either commonalities or differences depending on the content of the question. In general, religious mothers tended to endorse less personal autonomy for their adolescent daughters than religious daughters and secular participants. For the most part daughters and mothers judged that career choices should be made by the daughter and mainly justified the decision on the basis of personal desires, choices, and expectations. With regard to health, most daughters and mothers accepted that mothers could intervene in the daughter's choice and based that on prudential reasons.

By contrast, there were variations in evaluations of choices regarding clothes, house chores, and friends. Daughters of both religious backgrounds were more likely to endorse the daughters' choices of clothes on the grounds of personal choice. However, mothers judged that the daughter's decision should be made jointly or by the mother, with conventional or religious justifications. As expected, religious mothers more frequently emphasized religious dictates whereas secular mothers more frequently cited social conventional norms of their community. As past research has also shown (Navaro-Yashin, 2002; Ozyurek, 2006) mothers regardless of their religious background were more concerned with how an adolescent daughter's public appearance is perceived by their immediate community in the Turkish urban context.

Similarly, the general question of who should decide about what an adolescent daughter should do in terms of house chores elicited significantly different judgments and justifications in daughters and mothers. Daughters were more likely to respond that daughters and mothers should make this decision together for moral reasons, raising concerns about fairness and justice. However, mothers judged that the decision should be made by mothers, basing it on conventional reasons. They mentioned role-related competence of mothers and assigned the responsibility to mothers. Furthermore, the results demonstrated that secular and religious daughters differed with regard to choice of friends, as did secular and religious mothers. Religious daughters and mothers endorsed less decision-making autonomy for daughters in their choice of friends than did secular daughters and secular mothers. Religious participants were more likely to say that the choice of an adolescent daughter's friend should be either a joint decision or the mother's decision with conventional and prudential concerns. For the religious participants, whether the daughter's friend is acceptable in the community or whether the friend has bad habits (e.g., smoking, spending too much time on streets and shopping malls [in Turkish gezenti], and not observing religious rules well enough) played an important role why they think the friend should be approved by the mother. In other words, for religious

participants a shared belief in the legitimacy of the friend's habits was a concern. However, secular participants were more likely to evaluate choice of friend as a personal issue and attributed more decision-making power to daughters.

Decision making autonomy of mothers

With regard to the "who should decide about a mother's choices" question, participants' responses did not differ by family status and religious background in some areas but differed by religious background in other areas. More specifically, the results indicated that regardless of religious background and family status most of the participants thought that a mother should be able to decide for herself in areas of clothing, friends, and career. Their reasoning revolved around concerns with individual choice, taste, desire and needs. However, religious background was associated with participants' responses to the questions of who should decide about what a mother should in terms of house chores and about her own health. Religious participants claimed more authority for mothers in the areas of household chores and health-related decisions than secular participants. Secular women thought that what a mother should do in terms of household chores must be a joint decision in order to make the division of labor fair for her and for the other members of the family. However, religious women said that the mother should decide about the division of household chores since it is the mother's responsibility and area of expertise. A surprising finding of this study was that most of the secular mothers asserted less personal control over their own health and justified it with conventional reasons (e.g., I always put the needs of the family members over my needs, I am to busy whether everything is all right in my family [in Turkish sacimi supurge ediyorum, kendime vakit kalmiyor]. This could be explained by the fact that the majority of the secular mothers interviewed for this study have full-time jobs, and therefore had less time to devote to health issues and instead referred to the other family members' expertise in medicine. In line with the previous research findings in non-Western contexts (Wainryb & Turiel, 1994; Conry-Murray, 2009), the present findings about the "who should decide" question indicate that adolescent and adult women endorsed personal entitlement and thought themselves as the ultimate decision making authority on certain issues. This tendency was more evident when participants judged the "who should decide what should a mother do" than when they judged " who should decide what an adolescent daughter should do?" The generic questions of who should decide about a mother's choice on a specific issue tended to elicit more autonomous responses by all participants, whereas who should decide about daughter's decision tended to elicit more autonomous responses by daughters, and more joint decision making with the other person. Similar findings were found in judgments about rights (Helwig, 1995) when the question is asked in general terms without having any conflicting component.

Reasoning about controversial issues

A second goal of this study was to investigate participants' judgments about daughters' and mothers' decisions regarding controversial issues within the five areas where daughters or mothers were portrayed as making one choice or the other. The results demonstrated that participants made distinctive judgments and justifications while evaluating a disagreement between a daughter and a mother. There were differences and commonalities in judgments and justifications associated with participants' religious background and family status. First, I discuss whether participants endorse personal choice or maternal authority in their evaluations of the controversial choices, persistence,

and ideal resolutions in the hypothetical stories. Then, I discuss justifications provided on the controversial issues.

Whose choice, whose authority?

Findings coming from the evaluations of choices, objection to the choices and persistence in choices indicated differences across hypothetical stories. Participants made different judgments when a daughter or a mother chose an activity and when the activity is consistent or not consistent with the norms of their community. The findings demonstrated that participants subordinate maternal authority to the social norms of their community when they evaluated the choice of wearing the headscarf and a non-Muslim friend. Regardless of the choice made by the daughter or the mother they evaluated the protagonist's choice with the same pattern. All religious women approved the choice of wearing the headscarf by referring to the obligatory nature of the religious rule. In this context, regardless of their family status religious women rejected objections to wearing the headscarf and appropriated the daughter's challenge to maternal authority. More specifically, both religious daughters and mothers approved the hypothetical daughter who objected to her mother. However, secular women, regardless of their family status, evaluated the protagonist's decision of wearing the headscarf negatively and approved objections.

Whether the daughter or mother chooses a career or not was evaluated differently by mothers and daughters. Although they judged the general question of who should decide to be a personal issue, the protagonist daughter's career choice of acting was disapproved by religious mothers for religious and conventional reasons and by secular mothers for conventional and future concerns. In contrast, daughters regardless of their religious background approved the choice of acting career by referring to the protagonist daughter's personal desires and expectations. In this case, most of the participants did not disapprove of the mother's objection to the daughter's career choice.

Almost all participants disapproved of the daughter's choice of not going college by raising their concerns for the daughter's future and the need for education. On the other hand, the mothers' choices of career were judged overwhelmingly positive by the majority of the participants. Consistent with the responses to the general question who should decide most of the participants approved the protagonist mother's choice to have a full-time job and not to have a career.

Regardless of their religious background and family status participants judged the choice of befriending a non-Muslim, the request that boys should help with house chores and not help, and the choice to obtain or to avoid obtaining health care with the similar patterns. In these situations, whether the daughter or mother made the decision or whether the decision is consistent with the presumed community norms did not have a significant effect. Daughters and mothers negatively judged the choice of befriending a non-Muslim, the request that boys should not help house chores, and avoiding obtaining health care from a male physician. Although a cultural/ religious component was embedded in the story (i.e. obtaining health care from a male doctor; avoiding health care from a male doctor) participants prioritized the protagonist health in their evaluations. In general, the findings of this study suggested that participants evaluated the general question of who should decide differently than the socially charged issues occurring as disagreements between daughters and mothers.

The results of this study indicated further that participants made distinctions in their judgments about the daughter's persistence on her decision in relation to the objection of her mother. Mostly, justifications for the maternal objection to the daughters did not vary across story context and versions. Participants judged maternal objection to daughters' decision on the basis of a woman's natural role as the mother, independent of their evaluations of the mothers' objection. For example, when participants were asked to give justifications for whether or not it is acceptable for a maternal authority to be against her daughter's proposition that boys should do household chores, they based it on what they believe the mother knows and thinks about division of household chores in addition to concerns related with welfare and justice. This result was similar to findings of a study (Laupa, Turiel, & Cowan, 1995) in which children evaluate the legitimacy of authority in relation to the authority's power to make rules for their children's best interest. Among the religious participants, the majority approved the daughter's persistence on her choice on befriending a non-Muslim friend even if her mother objects. Although in first place they disapproved of the daughter's choice of befriending a non-Muslim with moral reasons, such as a concern with harming the friend's feelings, they changed their initial judgments while evaluating the persistence by citing that choice of friend is a personal matter. Similarly, both group of mothers disapproved of the daughter's choice of an acting career in the first place by citing conventional and future related concerns. However, secular mothers changed their judgment by taking into account that the persistence could reflect a real personal desire. However, religious mothers did not change their attitude of opposition to an acting career and cited religious and conventional concerns. However, the daughter's persistence against her mother's will did not play an important role in changing participants' perspectives in their responses to stories concerning wearing the headscarf, not wearing the headscarf, requesting that boys should help, requesting that boys should not help, not attending college, obtaining healthcare or avoiding healthcare. Religious and secular participants approved or disapproved the daughter's choices based on personal, moral, prudential, religious and conventional criteria independent of the maternal authority.

The findings on the mother's persistence in her choices in relation to her daughter's objections revealed that participants were less likely to change their initial judgments in this area. In other words, whether religious and secular participants approved or disapproved the mother's decision, they did not change their initial judgment by taking the daughter's objection into account. For example, religious participants approved the mother's choice of wearing the headscarf and secular participants' approved the mother's choice of not wearing the headscarf even if the daughters objected. Furthermore, both religious and secular participants judged the request that boys should help positively with welfare and fairness concerns and they did not change their judgments in accordance to the daughter's objection. Similar patterns were found in judgments of the mother's persistence in the matters of not befriending a non-Muslim friend, having a full-time career, choosing not to work, and obtaining and avoiding health care from a male doctor. An interesting finding was that religious participants disapproved of the mother's choice of a non-Muslim friend by reasoning that the differences in religion would impede their friendship and approved the daughter's objection for the same reason. However, they approved the mother's persistence in

keeping her non-Muslim friend by referring the personal component of the friendship and moral component of the exclusion.

The findings on the mother's persistence in her choices in relation to her daughter's objections revealed that participants were less likely to change their initial judgments in this area. In other words, if religious and secular participants approved or disapproved the mother's decision based on a criterion, they did not change their initial judgment by taking the daughter's objection into account. For example, religious participants approved the mother's choice of wearing the headscarf and secular participants' approved the mother's choice of not wearing the headscarf even if the daughters objected. Furthermore, both religious and secular participants judged the request that boys should help positively with welfare and fairness concerns and they did not changed their judgments in accordance to the daughter's objection. Similar patterns were found in judgments of the mother's persistence in the matters of not befriending a non-Muslim friend, having a full-time career, choosing not to work, and obtaining and avoiding health care from a male doctor. An interesting finding was that religious participants disapproved the mother's choice of non-Muslim friend by referring to reasoning that the differences in religion would impede their friendship and approved the daughter's objection for the same reason. However, they approved the mother's persistence in keeping her non-Muslim friend by referring the personal component of the friendship and moral component of the exclusion. Further research is required to unpack the dynamics of in-group and out-group interactions.

A third goal of this study was to examine whether participants differ in their ideal conflict strategies for the above-mentioned hypothetical stories. The results show that ideal conflict resolutions were mostly found to be consistent with the participants' judgments of protagonists' choices in hypothetical stories. Secular participants suggested that the daughter's opinion should prevail if the daughter chose not to wear the headscarf, requested that boys should help, have a non-Muslim friend, have acting career, and obtain health-care even if mothers objected to these choices. However, religious participants were more likely to endorse the mother's opinion or a compromise position as the ideal resolution when the daughter's choices were in conflict with her mother. In the context of not wearing the headscarf, not attending college, and avoiding obtaining health care, they clearly endorsed the mother's opinion. With regard to the daughter's request that boys should help and boys should not help they offered a compromise position as the ideal conflict solution. Religious daughters and mothers were in disagreement in their conflict resolution strategies about the daughter's choice of an acting career. Consistent with their previous evaluations of the hypothetical story, religious mothers were more likely to say that the mother's opinion should prevail.

Results demonstrated that religious and secular participants were in agreement in their conflict resolutions and asserted that "the mother's opinion should prevail" if the mother made choices to have a non-Muslim friend, to avoid having a career, and to obtain health care. However, both groups endorsed the daughter's opinion only if the mother avoided obtaining health care. However, participants framed the mother's choices in the areas of wearing or not wearing the headscarf and befriending or not befriending a non-Muslim in terms of the norms of their social community. Interestingly,

secular participants and religious mothers agreed in their strategies and offered the mother's opinion as ideal for the conflict in which a mother chose a full-time career against her daughter's will. Religious daughters in this situation thought finding a middle way or endorsing the daughter's opinion would be more ideal.

Domains of justification in controversial issues

Religious and social-conventional concerns vs. rights and welfare for headscarf. All religious women approved the choice of wearing the headscarf by referring to the obligatory nature of the religious rule. They also referred to personal choice of following a religious rule. In this context, regardless of their family status religious women rejected objections to wearing the headscarf and appropriated the daughter's challenge to maternal authority. More specifically, both religious daughters and mothers approved of the hypothetical daughter who objected to her mother. However, secular women regardless of their family status evaluated the protagonist's decision of wearing the headscarf as moral being in the moral domain. The moral category constituted responses coded as dealing with oppression of women and freedom of expression. Although there was no significant family status difference, secular mothers were more likely to perceive the headscarf as constituting oppression of women, whereas secular daughters were more likely to evaluate the acts of wearing and not wearing the headscarf as matters of freedom of expression.

As the findings show, secular and religious women hold different opinions about women wearing a headscarf. This is consistent with existing sociological and anthropological studies (Ozyurek, 2006; Navaro-Yashin, 2002) that propose that religious groups seek the right to wear the headscarf by using the discourse of democracy and human rights. Religious women regardless of their family status viewed wearing the headscarf as a religious rule that they have to abide by as believers. However, secular women evaluated the protagonist's decision of wearing the headscarf as a moral issue. The moral category constituted responses coded as matters concerning the oppression of women and freedom of expression. Although there was no significant difference, religious mothers were more likely to perceive the headscarf as the symbol of the oppression of women, whereas secular daughters were more likely to evaluate the acts of wearing and not wearing the headscarf as instances of freedom of expression. Objections to protagonist decisions were also in line with participants' religious backgrounds. Participants from the secular school evaluated the mother's objection to the protagonist decision of not wearing the headscarf negatively, whereas they evaluated the objection to the protagonist decision of wearing the headscarf positively.

One striking result of the headscarf conflict story was religious women's negative evaluation of the mother's objection to the daughter who is not willing to wear the headscarf since they approached the issue from a developmental readiness perspective by highlighting the importance of being patient and not forcing the child to do something if she is not ready. As this quote appears to suggest, religious participants argued that religious training in the family context requires mutual understanding and interaction.

> "….The mother should really be patient with her daughter. Instead of forcing her to wear the headscarf, she should patiently explain to her why it is necessary for a true Muslim woman. The mother should also listen to her daughter. Why is she resisting? Is she under the bad influence of her peers? If she punishes her, the girl would rebel more. She will lose her. This is a process; first I stopped styling my

> hair and wearing tight clothes, then started to wear the headscarf [sonra tamamen tesseturre gectim]….Her mother should be able to change her daughter's opinion with reason. I think the girl would eventually realize that that is not her mother's order, that it is God's order. (religious mother, 36 years old).

In this situation, religious participants suggested that the daughter's opinion should prevail as the ideal resolution. The justifications showed that religious participants based their evaluations on the obligatory nature of the religious rule. They asserted that daughters can also teach the appropriate behavior or correct their mother by giving reference to possible punishments by God.

> " ….The daughter could convey [teblig edebilir] all kinds of religious rules to her mother . This is kind of her responsibility as a Muslim. If the mother wants to be a real Muslim and avoid future punishment, she would listen to her daughter. That is clearly for her benefit." (religious mother, 34 years old).

As seen in these quotes the practice of wearing the headscarf is a religious rule rather than a family rule set by parents. However, participants also argued that guiding children according to their interpretation of the rule was as a legitimate parental socialization role. Similarly, Helwig (1997) found that children and adolescents accepted that parents restrict their young children's practice of a different religion from their own. However, educating family members about the religious rules is not always from mother to daughters. As the results indicated, parents as well as children see themselves as responsible for teaching the necessity of following this rule. Participants did not always envision that the religious rule flows from mothers to daughters. Participants' responses about the headscarf conflict reflect that Turkish women also evaluate wearing the headscarf as a part of religious socialization. However, religious participants did not judge the headscarf issue in moral terms—for instance, by asserting that - every women should do it for the welfare of others, or that it is unfair if one wears it and another does not. Their justifications were mostly focused on their religious assumptions like pleasing God, or avoiding God's punishment. Previous research found that moral rules of religion, by referring to justice and welfare concepts, are perceived as unalterable and generalizable; whereas other religious rules are evaluated in terms of the normative status within their own religion (Nucci & Turiel, 1993).In this context, non-moral religious rules were judged binding on the members of a particular religious community, but not on others. One important question to ask is whether religious women think that the headscarf rule is generalizable to all women who do not deny Islam but do not practice. Recent research (Toprak, 2009) suggested that there is a process of "community pressure" in conservative neighborhoods on the basis of religion and social pressure exerted by Islamists to conform to their view of proper behavior. More research is needed on the legitimacy of conveying religious rules to friends, neighbors and strangers.

Secular daughters and mothers had also a different conceptualization of wearing the headscarf. Although both generations do not approve of the decision, younger women were more flexible in terms of accepting the headscarf as a symbol of freedom of expression. They further argued that the choice of not wearing the headscarf also belongs to freedom of expression. Most of the secular mothers, on the other hand, evaluated

wearing the headscarf as a symbol of women's oppression and judged it as a traditional and ugly appearance in a modern society. In this context, secular mothers' responses mirror increased skepticism about a backward transformation that is replacing the principles of modernity with Islamic norms. For example, some secular mothers pointed to the European Laws and particularly the French court decisions forbidding the headscarf from the school system and interpreted the decision as universal. Other women mentioned the more liberal interpretations of Islam that does not expect women to cover their heads.

> " No, she shouldn't wear the headscarf. I am also a Muslim, but I don't feel the need to show it by covering my head. My faith is between God and me. And who says that women should cover their heads? There are so many different interpretation of this rule. When I see a covered woman on the street, I always want to go and ask her why do you wear this? And I know what would she respond, for the God's sake…But, in my mind she is giving a political message, discriminating against the uncovered women" (Secular mother, 45 years old).

In sum, women's clothing in public spheres is more than a personal choice in Turkey. As responses show, women choose what to wear to express a political stance, social status, and religious beliefs. Future research needs to also focus on how secular women reason about the legitimacy of state regulations over women's bodies.

Personal choice vs. conventional and prudential concerns for career choices. Whether the daughter or mother chooses a career was evaluated differently by daughters and mothers. Although they judged the general question of who should decide to be a personal issue, the protagonist daughter's career choice of acting was disapproved by religious mothers for religious and conventional reasons and by secular mothers for conventional reasons and future concerns. In contrast, daughters regardless of their religious background approved the choice of acting career by referring to the protagonist daughter's personal desires and expectations. During interviews, some of the religious daughters mentioned that they would never choose acting as a career because of religious reasons. However, when evaluating the hypothetical situation, they supported the daughter's decision. They also tended to evaluate the mother's objection negatively substantiated by conventional justifications. Mothers, on the other hand, tended to disapprove of the decision and gave conventional, prudential, and religious reasons. Secular mothers were more concerned with the economic future of the acting career, whereas religious mothers were more concerned with the moral image of the actress in society. On the other hand, almost all participants disapproved the daughter's choice of not going college by raising their concerns for the daughter's future and the need for education. All participants thought that a girl was obligated to attend college. All women judged education as a necessity and as security for the future. Previous research also suggested that evaluations of career related choices were more complex than the choice of music and clothes in the US because of its long-term consequences for the individual (Bregman & Killen, 1999). Furthermore, this result contributed to the body of evidence from different cultures (Milnstsky-Sapiro, Turiel, & Nucci, 2006; Yau & Smetana, 1996), indicating that adolescents sought to negotiate on issues that they consider personal matters and did not obey maternal authority blindly.

On the other hand, a mother's choice of career was judged overwhelmingly as a personal choice by the majority of the participants. However, in the area of mother's career, the results indicated no background or generation differences in relation to the participants' evaluations of a mother's career choice to have a full-time job. All participants, including religious mothers, evaluated the mother's decision positively by referring to her personal choices. However, the evaluations and justifications about the mothers' persistence in the matter of having a full-time job revealed that the religious daughters were more ambivalent about mothers' career choices for conventional reasons. Most of them asserted that working women would neglect their responsibilities as mothers. As this quote revealed, the prioritization of conventional aspects included some psychological concerns for the quality of their interactions:

> "I think the primary responsibility of a woman is to be a mom and nurture her family. I believe there is a woman behind each successful man. This doesn't mean of course women should stop receiving an education. Women need to be acculturated [Kulturlu] in order to raise the next generation. She can attend some adult education classes, but she doesn't have to work and earn her own income if there is no need. Single young women can work, I have nothing against that, but once they get married they have other responsibilities. If you ask me I don't want my mom to work. I just want to see her at home when I am back from school. That makes me happy. If she works she'll come home very tired, she won't have enough time for me" (Religious daughter, 16 years old).

On the other hand, secular daughters were less likely to promote traditional mothering roles when compared to other groups. They preferred a working mother to a stay-home mother by mentioning the economical and psychological benefits of having an independent income. However, they evaluated mother's choice of career within the personal realm and did not prescribe a norm to it. There were no group differences in participants' evaluations of the protagonist mother's persistence of not working; each group gave personal justifications. Furthermore, some secular mothers mentioned that they left their careers after becoming mothers. They also said that the decision was not imposed by their husbands; it was a personal choice as a result of internal conflicts between being a good mother and a successful working woman. The current results about career choices extend findings on the subject of personal entitlement as a concept in non-Western context (Conry-Murray, 2009, Wainryb &Turiel, 1994). These results can also be interpreted in relation to the recent statistics about Turkey, where the labor force participation of women did not even reach 25% and sexists values were propagated by state bureaucracy and educational system For example, Prime Minister Erdogan advised women that they should give birth at least to three children, but there was no mention of child-care in his public speeches (Arat, 2010).

Morality as fairness and justice for house chores and exclusion a non-Muslim friend. The results of this study showed that whether the request that boys should help with house chores or should not and the choice of not befriending a non-Muslim peer were judged as moral issues. In these situations, whether the daughter or mother made the decision or whether the decision is consistent with the presumed community norms did not have a significant effect. Regardless of their religious background and family status, most women in this study evaluated the idea that "boys should also do house

chores" positively. Furthermore, the protagonist who promoted "boys should not help" was evaluated negatively regardless of her family status. Differential treatment in the home context was viewed as an issue of fairness and equality by all participants. This finding was in contrast to previous research about religious women in Turkey (e.g., Hortacsu, 2000; Sevim, 2006; Tasdemir & Sakalli-Ugurlu, 2010) indicating that they were more likely to accept traditional gender roles without question. Lack of a significant difference between daughters' and mothers' judgments about gender equity was also in contrast to cultural models of morality (Shweder et al, 2003), which propose that adherence to traditional gender norms increases with age.

Furthermore, participants also brought stereotypical gender expectations in relation to the division of labor in a family context when they evaluated the objections by mentioning that females have more responsibility for household chores than males. However, similar to previous research findings (Neff, 2001 in India; Conry-Murray, 2009 in Benin West Africa), Turkish women suggested the alterable aspects of gender roles by focusing on the future. However, participants did not agree about when this change should begin. In that respect there was a significant religious background difference in the ideal resolution strategies offered for this conflict. Secular women were more likely to endorse the opinion of the protagonist who is promoting gender equality. Religious women, however, believed the conflicting daughter-mother dyad must find a middle way. Some of the older women did not believe that the men of her generation could change, but they were hopeful about the next generations.

> "No it's not ok…[responding to the question is it ok or not ok that the mother says that boys shouldn't do household chores]. In my husband's family men don't do any chores. My mother-in-law passed away two years ago and my father-in-law and brother-in-law are alone now at their apartment without a woman. You should see the mess they live in… They don't even know how to use the washing machine, how to vacuum the carpet.. I don't want my son to become like them. ..It doesn't matter whether it's a boy or a girl, God created them equally. Both should be able to do household chores. This is my responsibility to teach my sons so that the next generation won't suffer from it" (Religious mother, 42 years old).

> "Well, I can also relate with the mother because she is coming from a different background and she thinks she has a legitimate reason because this is the how men are treated in our society. And she is afraid if she asks for help from her son, the boy might be perceived as "soft" by others. But I don't think it's right; it is not logical" (religious daughter, 17 years old).

In addition to their ideal resolution strategies, 25% of the secular daughters and 22% of the religious daughters gave their perspective about what would happen in the real world. The protagonist daughter's demand for gender equality in household chores is perceived as being in vain because the girl cannot change her brothers without having parental support. The gap between their ideal resolution strategies and projections about real life might reflect men's resistance to sharing house chores. In sum, women evaluated a boy's unwillingness to do house chores as wrong, providing as the basis for this evaluation/demonstrating - concerns with welfare, fairness and reciprocity.

Harming a friend's feelings vs. personal choice for friendship conflict. There was no significant group difference between religious and secular participants in their evaluations of the exclusion of a non-Muslim friend. Both groups evaluated exclusion as negative and gave moral justifications. Although the decision of exclusion was condemned by all participants with moral concerns, religious participants were more likely to reject the other's objection and approve the protagonist choice. Religious participants argued that friendship with a non-Muslim might harm the religious community and were more conflicted with their initial evaluations with moral concerns. However, secular participants judged the same situations more consistently and found exclusion to be less acceptable because it could hurt the non-Muslim friend's feelings.

> " Religion should not play a role in choosing friends. As a mother, I would prefer that my daughter has a non-Muslim friend instead of having an alcoholic friend, but still the mother needs to be more cautious because those people have different customs. …If I would be the mother of this girl, I would restrict her interaction with this friend; I wouldn't say don't be friends, but I wouldn't let her see her every day" (religious mother, 42 years old).

> "There are so many minorities in our country, she should only consider how her friend is as a person, whether she influences her badly……I understand why her mother is worried, she might be afraid that her friend would change her faith…if I have a friend, I will invite her to my home, introduce her to my mother…"(religious girl, 17 years old).

> "Exclusion is wrong, you can't just discriminate against people based on religion. You should greet them, say hi, and ask how they are doing. But friendship is different. Your friends have to feel the same way, you have to think same way, worship the same way. I don't think I would have anything in common with a non-Muslim. But at the same time, if I put myself into the non-Muslim friend's shoes, I think I would be terribly heartbroken" (religious girl, 18 years old).

Previous research (Smetana, 1989) has identified the choice of friendship as a multifaceted issue, which is perceived as personal by adolescents and social-conventional by their parents. Previous research about adolescent-parent relations in some non-Western contexts indicated that low SES parents feel more obligated to control personal issues on the basis of prudential and safety concerns (Lins-Drayer & Nucci, 2004, Yau & Smetana, 2003). Although the quotes also suggest that religious participants expressed more caution on the issue of choosing a non-Muslim friend, they are not uniform in this. The most striking aspect of their justifications in general was the definition of friendship. As their conflict resolution strategies indicated, religious participants were more likely to define friendship issues as personal choice and emphasized psychological comfort and mutual acceptance of each other's identity in their justifications. Although they evaluated exclusion as wrong for moral reasons, they thought that the decision of whether to continue or not continue a friendship with a non-Muslim peer should ultimately be up to the agent. Similarly, 20% of the secular daughters also mentioned that the mother's authority might not be able to convince her daughter to either to keep a friend in real life

if the daughter is religious as described in the hypothetical story. One important proposition of social developmental perspectives (e.g., Piaget, 1932; Turiel, 1983) is that people make inferences based on their social experiences; a lack of religious diversity in their immediate community might play an important role in why religious women are more ambivalent about interfaith interactions despite the fact that they see the moral component. In line with the other research (Akpinar, 2007; TESEV, 2004) about Imam-Hatip School students and their parents, this finding suggests that maternal approval of a friendship is crucial for religious participants.

This finding is consistent with previous results (Killen, Lee-Kim, & et al, 2002; Killen, Kelly, Richardson, Crystal & Ruck, 2008) that suggested that children and adolescents evaluate the exclusion of someone from a friendship on the basis of race alone as unfair— but that they also characterized it as a personal choice. However, secular participants were found to be more accepting of the differences in friend relations. Both daughters and mothers in the secular group evaluated interfaith friendship positively and evaluated the exclusion of a friend based on religion negatively for moral reasons. Further research is required to unpack the dynamics of in-group and out-group interactions.

Prudential reasons for health care conflict. Participants cited prudential justifications when judging the health care choices. Although a cultural/ religious component was embedded in the story (i.e. obtaining health care from a male doctor; avoiding health care from a male doctor) participants prioritized the protagonist health in their evaluations. Participants evaluated health-related issues as more important than other matters, citing prudential personal welfare justifications. Although a cultural/traditional/ religious component was embedded in the hypothetical story, the health of the protagonist was prioritized in all evaluations. Most of the participants agreed that obtaining health care is a prudential issue. In this circumstance, all participants determined that it was appropriate to challenge the maternal authority. This finding extended previous findings that adolescents accepted parental regulation in prudential situations (Perkins & Turiel, 2007; Smetana, 1989). Furthermore, when participants evaluated a traditional mother's decision of not going to the doctor, they ascribed normativity to the situation and said the daughter should bring her to the doctor."

Summary of the findings

In summary, the findings of this study suggested that participants evaluated the general question of who should decide differently by using different criteria than the socially charged issues involving as disagreements between daughters and mothers.

Results across five different conflict stories indicate that participants made nuanced judgments about adolescents' personal choices and maternal authority while taking the content of the conflict into account. There were situations in which adolescents' decisions were evaluated as acceptable and their chosen course of action worthy of being pursued and there were other situations in which the protagonist was advised to change her mind and go along with the maternal authority. Furthermore, daughters' objections to mothers' choices were evaluated positively in some situations and not in other situations. Participants' reasoning revolved around concerns for fairness, rights, social roles, duties, individual choice and autonomy. However, they consistently prioritized one type of concern over the other as they took the perspective of an adolescent daughter and an adult mother. Participants in this study conceptualized daughters and mothers in relational

terms rather than characterizing the relations and social issues by harmony, obedience, and acceptance of norms. They emphasized reciprocal communication and verbal give-and-take in their conflict resolution strategies.

It is a commonly held perspective that each story has two sides. This is evident when participants evaluated the same conflict story from the adolescent daughter's and her mother's perspectives and from being consistent with their communities social norms to being inconsistent. The findings, which demonstrated that daughters and mothers from both social backgrounds made nuanced judgments and justifications contradicted findings from cultural psychology that suggested modes of thinking and decision making are a product of cultural and/or religious orientations (Haidt & Graham, 2007; Jensen, 2006; Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 2003; Miller, 2005) and to the clash of civilization argument (Huntington, 1993). However, this does not mean that social context and religious values do not play a role in women's evaluations and justifications of social issues. For example, consistent religious background differences were found in participants' responses to the headscarf conflict. Religious women accepted the practice without variation because of their strong belief that it is an obligatory and binding for all Muslim women. However, as I discuss in the next section, religious women did not judge the protagonist daughter and mother in the same unitary manner. Another proposition in cultural psychology is that the conceptions of morality, self, and society are transmitted by the *local guardians of the moral order* through cultural practices (Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 2003). Interestingly, the findings of this research suggest that even religious mothers thought the adolescent daughter's objection to the mother's decision is all right. If they evaluated the mother's decision as unfair, they did so because it entails a risk or goes against a religious command. Moreover, this research did not compare and contrast female perspectives to the male perspectives. In contrast to Gilligan's assertions about care-based rather than justice-based moralities in females, the results indicated that female participants' evaluations of social conflicts in a family context involved concerns with justice and rights as well as concerns with welfare of the others and interpersonal considerations. Furthermore, no significant age difference was found in judgments of moral conflict stories. These findings contribute to an emerging body of research from different cultures indicating that adolescents and parents participants expressed support of the idea of negotiation of many personal issues by adolescents and parents, but expressed approval of parental authority if the directives were evaluated as legitimately within parents' socialization role (Lins-Dyer & Nucci, 2005; Milnistsky-Sapiro, Turiel, Nucci, 2006). In all, this study indicate that Turkish daughters and mothers from both backgrounds try to balance their urge for personal autonomy with many other concerns such as fairness, freedom, maternal authority, community and religious norms norms.

Implications for Turkey

The primary purpose of this dissertation was to expand research evidence for the coordination of social judgments about multifaceted social issues in two different social contexts relevant to Turkey. In order to study this question, participants were selected from two schools that represent opposite ends of the spectrum. In general, the findings of this study did not support cultural theories and 'war of civilization' propositions, which tend to depict homogeneity in social reasoning in relation to harmonious social life. The participants did not make unitary forms of judgment with regard to their religious orientation. It is important to note that the factors leading participants to identify secular

and religious and the structuration of in religious communities are issues beyond the scope of this study. However, the findings of this study have implications for the development of personal autonomy in non-Western contexts. The judgments and justifications given by Turkish women indicate that personal autonomy, family regulations and community rules need to be considered from the perspective of individuals.

The result of the present study suggested the importance of social interactions in a so-called polarized society. As discussed earlier, women who participated/women participating in this study evaluated the hypothetical conflicts in daughter-mother dyads by weighing and balancing different components. Conflicts written for this research were about ongoing public debates related to women's choices in contemporary Turkey. The nature of hypothetical conflicts between a daughter and her mother led many participants to tell their personal stories and experiences related to the hypothetical conflict. The most interesting part of the study was when participants evaluated a conflict that is not pertinent to their life. For example, most of the religious women had no experience with a Non-Muslim since they live in a very isolated community, but they were clearly able to put themselves into the shoes of the protagonist. Similarly, for most of the secular participants the women's decision to wear the headscarf was inappropriate. Most of them felt the need to assert that they do not know any women who wore headscarves in their community, but they acknowledged that it is one of the most important problems of religious women, and found it worthwhile to answer the questions from both the daughter's and the mother's perspective. Everyday life is the primary ground of contestations over political issues.

Limitations

One of the major limitations of this study is that it only reflected female participants' perspectives on socially and politically charged issues. Adolescent and adult male perspectives on similar issues are very important for understanding the nature of interpersonal and social conflicts. Previous research has revealed that male perspectives are different on gender equity and personal entitlements in non-Western contexts (Conry-Murray, 2009; Wainryb & Turiel, 1994). In addition, only a few participants mentioned concerns over possible punishment as a justification category. While they evaluated the conflict about household chores, some daughters brought up their concerns with punishment by their bothers but not by their mothers. In that sense, it is also worthwhile to examine young and adult male perspectives on politically charged issues from the developmental perspective in Turkey. Future studies should focus on son-mother and daughter-father dyads.

Second, due to the age range of the participants this study cannot be considered a developmental study. The differences between mothers and late adolescent daughters reflected more the hierarchical differences in the family rather than developmental differences. Inclusion of a younger age group would provide evidence about development of social reasoning and coordination of the conflicting components in multifaceted issues. Finally, the quality of adolescent-parent relationships could play another role in adolescent's and adult's judgment and justifications of hypothetical conflict stories. During the interviews some participants asked about the protagonist dyads' daily interactions and communication style. Future research might include the usual

communication style between the daughter and mother as another study variable. Finally, given the sensitive nature of some conflict stories (e. g., choosing to wear or not to wear the headscarf) being interviewed by a nontraditional Turkish woman educated in the USA might have an effect on participants' evaluations. Yet, by nature of the design the conflict stories allowed participants to be conflicted in their own judgments by evaluating the stories not only from daughter's and mother's perspective but also from the norms of a different community. In addition, numbers of statistical tests conducted in this study reduced the likelihood of getting significant findings by chance.

The aim of this study was to compare and contrast religious and secular women's evaluations and justifications. In light of the findings I conclude that there is no simple prototype of a young and adult women in modern Turkey as the participants of the study did not held unitary judgments about multifaceted conflicts between daughters and mothers. Daughter-mother relationships entail renegotiation of boundaries between authority and autonomy and reflect the tension between the individual and society. There is much to learn about specific contexts within cultures, interactions of domains of thought, and different perspectives about power and roles in the social system.

References

Akpinar, A. (2007). The making of a good citizen and conscious Muslim through public education: The case of Imam-Hatip Schools. In M. Carlson, A. Rabo, & F. Gok (Eds.), *Education in multicultural societies: Turkish and Swedish perspectives*.

Arat, Y. (2010). Religion, politics and gender in Turkey: Implications of a democratic paradox? *Third World Quarterly, 31,* 869-884.

Bregman, G. & Killen, M. (1999). Adolescents and young adults' reasoning about career choice and the role of parental influence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 9,* 253-275.

Conry-Murray, C. (2009). Adolescent and adult reasoning about gender roles and fairness in Benin, West Africa. *Cognitive Development, 24,* 207-219.

Cinar, A. (2005). Modernity, Islam, and secularism in Turkey: Bodies, Places and Time. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press

Darling, N., Cumsille, P., & Martinez, M. L. (2007). Adolescents as active agents in socialization process: Legitimacy of parental authority and obligations to obey as predictors of obedience. *Journal of Adolescence, 30,* 297-311.

Davidson, P., Turiel, E., & Black, A. (1983). The effect of stimulus familiarity on the issue of criteria and justifications in children's social reasoning. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 1,* 49-65.

Durkheim, E. (2008). *The elementary form of religious life*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Original work published in 1912).

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: Norton

Esmer, Y. (2002). Is there an Islamic civilization? *Comparative Sociology, 1*, 265-298

Etzioni, A. (2008). Will the right Islam stand up? *Sociological Forum,* 23, 174-178.

Fuligni, A. J. (1998). Authority, autonomy, and parent-adolescent conflict and cohesion: A study of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, Filipino and European Backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 782-792.

Huntington, S. (1993). The clash of civilizations. *Foreign Affairs, 75,* 28-34.

Inglehart, R. & Baker, W.E. (2000). Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of the traditional values. *American Sociological Review,* 65, 19-51.

Gjerde, P. F (2004). Culture, power, and experience: toward a person-centered cultural psychology. *Human Development, 47,* 138-157.

Gole, N. (2002). Islam in public: New visibilities and new imaginaries. *Public Culture, 14,* 173-190.

Graham, J. & Haidt (2010). Beyond beliefs: Religions bind individuals into moral communities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14,* 140-150.

Hasebe, Y., Nucci, L., & Nucci, M. (2004). Parental control of the personal domain and adolescents symptoms of psychopathology: A cross-national study in the US and Japan. *Child Development, 75,* 815-828.

Haidt, J. & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals might not recognize. *Social Justice Research, 20,* 98-116.

Human Development Report, (2010). The real wealth of nations: Pathways to human development. Published for the United Nations Development Programme.

Helwig, C. (1995). Adolescents' and young adults' conceptions of civil liberties: Freedom of speech and religion. *Child Development,* 66, 152-166.

Helwig, C. (1997). The role of agent and social context in judgments of freedom of speech and religion. *Child Development,* 68, 484-495.

Helwig, C. (2006). The development of personal autonomy throughout cultures. *Cognitive Development, 21,* 458-473.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Sage, Beverly Hills: California

Hortacsu, N. (2000). Intergroup relations in a changing political context: The case of veiled and unveiled university students in Turkey. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30,* 733-744.

Jensen, A. (2006). Liberal and conservative conceptions of family: A cultural-developmental study. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 16,* 253-269.

Kadioglu, A. (2010). The pathologies of Turkish republican laicism. *Philosophy and Social Criticism, 36,* 489-504.

Kagitcibasi, C. (2007). Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Killen, M. (1990). Children's evaluations of morality in the concept of peer, teacher-child, and familial relations. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 151,* 395-410.

Killen, M., Lee-Kim, J, McGlothlin, H., & Stangor, C (2002). How children and adolescents evaluate gender and racial exclusion.

Killen, M., Kelly, M., Richardson, C., Crystal, D., & Ruck, M. (2010). European American childrens' and adolescents' evaluations of interracial exclusion. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 13,* 283-300.

Laupa, M., Turiel, E., & Cowan, P. (1995). Obedience to authority in children and adults. In M. Killen & D. Hart (Eds.), Morality in every day life. Cambridge University Press.

Mahmood, S. (2005). Politics of piety: The Islamic revival and the feminist subject. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.

Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves: A cycle of mutual constitutions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 420-430.

Markus, H. & Lin, L. (1999). Conflictsways: Cultural diversity in the meaning and practice of conflict. In D. Prentice & D. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 302-333). New York: Rusell Sage Foundation.

Miller, J. G. (2005). Is community compatible with autonomy? Cultural ideals versus empirical realities. In W. Edelstein & G. Nunner-Winkler (Eds.), *Morality in context*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.

Miller, J. G. & Bersoff, M. (1995). Development in the context of everyday family relationships: Culture, morality, and adaptation. In M. Killen & D. Hart (Eds.), *Morality in everyday life: Developmental perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milnitsky-Sapiro, C., Turiel, E., & Nucci, L. (2006). Brazilian adolescents' conceptions of autonomy and parental authority. *Cognitive Development, 21,* 317-331.

Navaro-Yashin, Y. (2002). Faces of the state: Secularism and public life in Turkey. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Neff, K. (2001). Judgments of personal autonomy and interpersonal responsibility in the context of Indian spousal relationships: An examination of young's people's reasoning in Mysore, India. *British Journal of Developmental* Psychology*, 19,* 233-257.

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

Nucci, L. & Turiel E. (1993). God's words, religious rules, and their relation to Christian and Jewish children's concept of morality. *Child Development*, 64, 1475-1491

Ozyurek, E. (2006). *Nostalgia for the modern: State secularism and everyday politics in Turkey*. Duke University Press.

Pak, S.Y. (2004). Cultural politics and vocational religious education: The case of Turkey. *Comparative Education*, 40, 3, 321-341.

Perkins, S. A., & Turiel, E. (2007). To lie or not to lie: To whom under what circumstances. *Child Development, 78,* 609-621.

Phinney, J.S., Kim-Jo, Osorio, T., & Viljamsdotter, P. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in adolescent- parent disagreements: Ethnic and developmental factors. *Journal of Adolescence*.

Piaget, J. (1932/1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. New York: Free Press.

Serlin, R. C. & Seaman, M. A. (2010). Log-linear analysis. In G. R. Hancock & R. O. Mueller (Eds.), The reviewers' guide to quantitative methods in the social sciences. New York: Routledge.

Sevim, S. (2006). Religious tendency and gender roles: Predictors of attitude towards women's work roles. *Social Behavior and Personality, 34,* 77-86.

Shantz, C. U. & Hartup, W. W. (1992). Conflict and development: An introduction. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shweder, R. A., Much, N. C., Mahapatra, M., & Park, L. (2003). The "big three"of (autonomy, community, and divinity) morality and the "big three" explanations of suffering. *Why do men barbeque?: Recipes for cultural psychology*. Harvard University Press Cambridge, MA.

Smetana, J. (1983). Social-cognitive development: Domain distinction and coordination. *Developmental Review, 3,* 131-147.

Smetana, J. (1995). Context, conflict, and constrain in adolescent-parent authority relationships. In M. Killen & D. Hart (Eds.), *Morality in everyday life: Developmental perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smetana, J. & Anquith, P. (1994). Adolescents' and parents' conception of parental authority and personal autonomy. *Child Development, 65,* 1147-1162.

Smetana, J., Braeges, J., & Yau, J. (1991). Doing what you say, saying what you do: Adolescent-parent conflict in interviews and interactions. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 6,* 276-295.

Smetana, J., Campione-Barr, N. & Metzger, A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annual Rev. Psychology, 57,* 255-284

Smetana, J., Daddis, C., & Chuang, S. (2003). "Clean your room!": A longitiduninal investigation of adolescent-parent conflict and conflict resolution in middle class African-American families. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 18,* 631-650.

Smetana, J., Yau, J., & Hanson, S. (1991). Conflict resolution in families with adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 1,* 189-206.

Smetana, J., Metzger, A., Gettman, D., & Campione-Barr, N. (2006). Disclosure and secrecy in parent-adolescent relationships. *Child Development, 77,* 201-217.

Tasdemir, N. & Sakalli-Ugurlu, N. (2010). The relationship between ambivalent sexism and religiosity among Turkish university students. *Sex Roles,* 62, 420-426.

TESEV. (2004). Imam-Hatip Schools: Legends and Realities, Istanbul: Turkish Economic and Social Science Foundation Publications

Toprak, B. (2009). *Turkiye'de Farklı Olmak: Din ve Muhafazakarlik Ekseninde Otekilestirilenler* [Being Different in Turkey: Othering on the Basis of Religion and Conservatism], Istanbul: Metis, 2009.

Tugal, C. (2009). Passive revolution: Absorbing the Islamic challenge to capitalism. Stanford, Ca: Stanford University Press.

Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E. (1989). Domain-specific social judgments and domain ambiguities. *Merill-Palmer Quarterly, 35,* 89-114.

Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict*. Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E. (2005). Many faces of parenting. *New Directions for Child Development, 108,* 79-89.

Turiel, E. & Wainryb C. (1998). Concepts of freedoms and rights in a traditional, hierarchically-organized society. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 16,* 375-395.

Turiel, E., Hildebrandt, C., Wainryb, C., & Salzstein, H. D. (1991). Judging social issues: Difficulties, inconsistencies, and consistencies. *Monographs of the Society for Child Development, 56, 2*, pp. i-116.

Triandis, H.C. (1990) Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. IN J. Berman (Ed)., *Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1989: Cross-cultural perspectives (Vol. 37, pp. 41-133)*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Wainryb, C. & Turiel, E. (1994). Dominance, subordination, and concepts of personal entitlements in cultural contexts. *Child Development, 65*, 1701-1722.

Wikan, U. (2002). Generous Betrayal: Politics of culture in the new Europe. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Yau, J. & Smetana, J. (1996). Adolescent-parent conflict among Chinese adolescents in Hong-Kong. *Child Development, 67,* 1262-1275.

Yau, J. & Smetana, J. (2003). Adolescent-parent conflict in Hong-Kong and Shenzhen: A comparison of youth in two cultural context. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27,* 201-211.

Youniss, J. & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Appendix A: Interview Protocols

Clothing	Protocol 1: Daughter as agent	Protocol 2: Mother as agent
	1. Who should decide about an adolescent daughter clothes? Why?	1. Who should decide about a mother's clothes? Why?
Consistent with secular norms	Leyla, a high school senior, does not choose to wear the headscarf because she thinks women should not have to wear it. Her mother objects her daughter's choice because she believes that women have to wear the headscarf.	Alev Hanim, a mother of a high school senior, does not choose to wear the headscarf because she thinks women should not have to wear it. Her daughter objects her mother's choice because she believes that women have to wear the headscarf.
	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Leyla does not choose to wear the headscarf? Why 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Leyla persists? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Alev Hanim does not choose to wear the headscarf? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Alev Hanim persists? Why? 5. What is tour ideal resolution for this conflict? Why
Consistent with religious norms	Burcu, a high school senior, chooses to wear the headscarf because she thinks women should have to wear it. Her mother objects her daughter's choice because she believes that women should not have to wear the headscarf.	Aynur Hanim, a mother of a high school senior, chooses to wear the headscarf because she thinks women should have to wear it. Her daughter objects her mother's choice because she believes that women should not have to wear the headscarf.
	1.Is it ok that Burcu wants this? Why? 2. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not that Burcu persists? Why? 4. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	1.Is it ok that Aynur Hanim wants this? Why? 2. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not that Aynur Hanim persists? Why? 4. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?

House Chores	Protocol 1: Daughter as agent	Protocol 2: Mother as agent
	1. Who should decide about what should an adolescent daughter do in terms of house chores? Why?	1. Who should decide about what should a mother do in terms of house chores?? Why?
Consistent with secular norms	Yasemin is a high school senior. She request that her brothers (similar age) should also help house chores. Her mother objects her daughter's request because she thinks boys should not help.	Yildiz Hanim is the mother of a daughter and two boys (similar age). She request that her sons should also help house chores. Her daughter objects her mother's request because she thinks boys should not help.
	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Yasemin does request this? Why 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Yasemin persists? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Yildiz Hanim request that boys should help too ? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Yildiz Hanim persists? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?
Consistent with religious norms	Emine is a high school senior. She request that her brothers (similar age) should not help house chores. Her mother objects her daughter's request because she thinks boys should help.	Rana Hanim is the mother of a daughter and two boys (similar age). She request her sons should not help house chores. Her daughter objects her mothers's request because she thinks boys should help.
	1.Is it ok that Emine does request that her brothers should not help? Why? 2. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not that Emine persists? Why? 4. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	1.Is it ok that Rana Hanim requests that her sons should not help? Why? 2. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not that Rana Hanim persists? Why? 4. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?

Friend	Protocol 1: Daughter as agent	Protocol 2: Mother as agent
	1. Who should decide about an adolescent daughter's friend? Why?	1. Who should decide about a mother's friend? Why?
Consistent with secular norms	Serra is a high school senior and friend with Melissa who is a non-Muslim. They are really getting along and enjoying spending time together. Serra's mother objects this friendship because she believes a Muslim girl should not have a non-Muslim friend. But, Serra wants to keep Melissa as her friend.	Nermin Hanim is the mother of a high school senior and friend with Ethel Hanim who is a non-Muslim. They are really getting along and enjoying spending time together. Nermin Hanim's daughter objects this friendship because she believes a Muslim woman should not have a non-Muslim friend. But, Nermin Hanim wants to keep Ethel as her friend.
	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Serra chooses a non-Muslim friend? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Serra persists on her choice? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Nermin Hanim chooses a non-Muslim friend? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Nermin Hanim persists on her choice? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?
Consistent with religious norms	Hande is a high school senior and friend with Selin, who is a non-Muslim, but Hande doesn't know that. They are really getting along and enjoying spending time together. One day Selin told Hande that she is a Non-Muslim. Hande decides not to be friend with Selin because she believes that a Muslim girl should not have a non-Muslim friend. Hande's mother objects this because she believes a Muslim girl could not have a non-Muslim friend.	Sevgi Hanim is a friend with Seyla Hanim, who is a non-Muslim, but Sevgi Hanim doesn't know that. They are really getting along and enjoying spending time together. One day Seyla Hanim told Sevgi Hanim that she is a Non-Muslim. Sevgi Hanim decides not to be friend with the non-Muslim woman because she believes that a Muslim woman should not have a non-Muslim friend. Sevgi Hanim's daughter objects this because she believes a Muslim woman could not have a non-Muslim friend.
	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Hande does not befriend a non-Muslim peer? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Sevgi Hanim does not befriend to have a non-Muslim friend? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Sevgi

	Hande persists? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	Hanim persists? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?

Career Choice	Protocol 1: Daughter as agent	Protocol 2: Mother as agent
	1. Who should decide about what should an adolescent daughter's career? Why?	1. Who should decide about what should a mother's career? Why?
Consistent with secular norms	Fatma is a high school senior. She wants to study acting at college and decides to apply acting schools. She believes women should pursue any career. Her mother objects her daughter's decision because she thinks a young woman cannot chose every career.	Nergiz Hanim is the mother of a high school senior. She wants to have a full-time career and decides to apply jobs. She believes that women should have to work. Her daughter objects her mother's decision because she thinks a married woman should not have a full-time job.
	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Fatma chooses acting at college? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Fatma persists on her choice? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Nergiz Hanim chooses to have a full-time job t? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Nergiz Hanim persists on her choice? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?
Consistent with religious norms	Ayse is a high school senior. She does not want to attend because she thinks women should not have to study. Her mother objects her daughter's decision because she thinks women should have to study.	Meryem Hanim is the mother of a high school senior. Although she has a college degree she does not want to work because she thinks women should not have to work. Her daughter objects her mother's because she thinks women should have to work.
	1.Is it ok that Ayse chooses not to attend college? Why? 2. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not that Ayse persists on her choice? Why? 4. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	1.Is it ok that Meryem Hanim chooses not want to work? 2. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not that Meryem Hanim persists on her choice? Why? 4. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?

Health	Protocol 1: Daughter as agent	Protocol 2: Mother as agent
	1. Who should decide about an adolescent daughter's health? Why?	1. Who should decide about a mother's health? Why?
Consistent with secular norms	Merve was not feeling ok and complaining about acute abdominal pains during her periods. She wants to see a gynecologist in the hospital immediately and be examined by a doctor. However, her mother believes that females should be examined only by female doctors. She said that Merve should wait until she makes an appointment with a female doctor. But, Merve insists to see a doctor immediately.	Nergiz Hanim was not feeling ok and complaining about acute abdominal pains during her periods. She wants to see a gynecologist in the hospital immediately and be examined by a doctor. However, her mother believes that females should be examined only by female doctors. She said that Merve should wait until she makes an appointment with a female doctor. But, Merve insists to see a doctor immediately.
	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Merve wants to go the doctor? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Merve persists? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	2. Do you think that it is ok/not ok that Nergiz Hanim wants to go the doctor? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 4.Do you think it is ok or not that Nergiz Hanim persists? Why? 5. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?
Consistent with religious norms	Seda was not feeling ok and complaining about abdominal pains during her period, but she doesn't want to go the hospital to see a gynecologist. She thinks that female patients should be examined only by female doctors. Her mother is worried about her daughter's health and says she should go to the hospital and see a doctor immediately. But Seda wants to wait.	Betul Hanim was not feeling ok and complaining about acute abdominal pains during her periods. But s doesn't want to see a gynecologist in the hospital immediately and be examined by a male doctor. However, her daughter does not believe that female patients should be examined only by female doctors. She said that her mother that she should go to the hospital. But, Betul Hanim wants to wait.
	1.Is it ok that Seda does not want to go the doctor? Why? 2. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her mother objects? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not that Seda persists? Why?	1.Is it ok that Betul Hanim does not want to go the doctor? Why? 2. Do you think it is ok or not ok that her daughter objects? Why? 3. Do you think it is ok or not that Betul Hanim persists? Why?

	4. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?	4. What is your ideal resolution for this conflict? Why?

Appendix B: Coding Schemes

1. Who should decide about this issue?

Responses	Example
(1) Autonomous	The person should make the decision
(2) Mixed	Joint decision
(3) Nonautonomous	Other person, family…

Justification categories for who should decide question

Domains	Category	Examples
Personal	1.Personal choice	The person know her priorities, needs, desires It's her business
	2.Personal right	It's her personal right, no one should intervene
Psychological	3.Perspectivism	She must also think how the others feels, thinks
	4.Interpersonal, psychological dispositions	Reference to psychological development, affective bonds
Conventional	5.Hierarchy/authority	She has to obey because she is the daughter
	6. Custom/tradition/norm	She can't decide because that is the way it is in our community
	7.Role-related competence	Everyone is an expert of their domain of responsibility
Moral	8. Equality/ justice/ fairness /welfare	Each person in the family has an equal saying

Coding schemes for hypothetical conflict stories

Coding for evaluation questions: Is it ok that x chooses to do the issue? Is it ok that her mother/ daughter objects? Is it ok that x persists in her choice?

(1) Yes, ok
(2) Maybe, it depends
(3) No, not ok

Justification categories

Domain	Criteria	Example
1. Moral	1. Fairness; justice; equality 2. Harm/ welfare of the other. 3. Rights	(Haram-kul hakki) "Allah kadinla erkegi esit yaratmis, her kosulda esittir). It's not ethical, we don't have the right, it's unfair. (Kadinla erkek esittir; insan haklari, din ve vicdan ozgurlugu, kadin haklari)
2. Religious	4. Religious orders/ religious sanctions/ punishments	Sunnet, tarikata bagli kurallar
3.Social-Conventional	5. Respect to maternal authority with reference to the culture and traditions or role related competence	Annenin yillara dayanan tecrubesi var. Oyle yetismis, oyle gormus. "Agac yasken egilir" Armut dibine duser"
	6. Social customs/traditions/ norms in community/ negative consequences for social order/ community pressure/ gender norms	Bu konuda cocugu egitmek ailenin gorevidir. Cevremiz ne der? Konu komsu ne der? Bizim toplumda bu isler boyle yuruyor. Kemiklesmis gelenekleri degistirmek zor
	7. Harmony in family/ Appeal to togetherness of the family; Negative social consequences for the person and affective interpersonal relations	(Ailenin huzuru, birligi beraberligi her seyin ustundedir)
4.Personal	8. Personal autonomy: Autonomy seeking, individuation, identity exploration, self-sufficiency	Kendi ayaklari uzerinde durmali, kendi kendi kararini kendi verebilmeli.
	9. Personal preferences/ choices	Bu onun kisisel alanidir, kisisel tercihidir, Dogru ya da yanlis sonuclarina da kendi katlanmalidir,

		baskasi karismamali
5. Prudential	10. Caution to danger and risks; Intervention to one's ability to govern one's own welfare under certain circumstances especially as caution to danger and risk	Saglik her seyin basi. Bir insanin kendi vucudu ama acil bir durumda mudahale edilebilir.
6.Pragmatics	11. Future orientation/ Best interest 12. Greater good	Gelecegini dusunmeli. Kendi menfati icin en mantikli olan bu. Kendini garantiye almali Birlikte yasamayi kolaylastirir, bundan herkes karli cikar.

Coding categories for the ideal resolution strategies

1. Mother's opinion should prevail	The subordinate should go along with the authority. The authority should persuade the subordinate. The authority should punish/ use force.
2. Daughter's opinion should prevail	The authority should go along with the subordinate. The subordinate should persuade the authority. The subordinate should resist/disobey the authority.
3. Middle way	They should negotiate, compromise and find a middle way.r
4. No resolution	There is nothing they can do in this situation. There is no resolution for this conflict.