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This study examined diversity in the socialization goals (SGs) of Palestinian mothers from different educational and socioeconomic backgrounds. It specifically looked at their cultural model using the Family Change model to analyze elements of collectivism and individualism in their attitudes and goals for the future. Purposeful-convenience sampling was used to recruit twelve urban Arab mothers of first grade children from two types of socioeconomic backgrounds (SES). Each mother was interviewed about her goals and asked to describe her child. The interviews were analyzed thematically, and coding was guided by that used by other studies on SGs. One main finding was that mothers with higher education had more goals related to self-maximization, particularly in relation to choosing a career, thriving and being highly successful in that. Mothers with less educational attainment had education as a goal, also valuing employment with an emphasis on stability of income and comfort. Both groups of mothers reported goals related to decency including “avoiding illicit behaviors”, having “morals” and “treating others well”. Collectivism and individualism were both present in the goals and descriptors of Palestinian mothers with some differences across maternal education and SES.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Culture and socioeconomic status both affect parental practices and desired outcomes for children. Cross-cultural research has shown that parent-child interactions are significantly shaped by the environmental context, which includes the larger culture (Harkness & Super, 2002, 2006, 2012) and socioeconomic background of the family (Hoff, Laursen & Tardif, 2002). This is because parental socialization goals and ethnotheories are themselves shaped by culture and change with changing socioeconomic demands, dominant economic models, opportunities and constraints. Ecological theories looking at how development differs across groups view families, neighborhoods and schools as rich microenvironments that prepare children to be competent cultural members of their societies. Parents greatly contribute to transmitting culture, especially in the early years, directly through socialization and indirectly through what activities/aspects of development are prioritized and how daily life is structured.

From a cultural psychology perspective, culture is internalized and largely contributes to behaviors, perception, cognition and interpersonal relationships (See Greenfield, Keller, Fuligni & Maynard [2003] for a review). Across the globe, research unveiled multiple developmental trajectories or "cultural models": “organized sets of ideas shared by members of a cultural group” (Harkness & Super, 2006, p. 62). The most common categorization is collectivism/interdependence/relatedness on one hand and individualism/independence/autonomy on the other. The former is generally used to describe countries of non-European heritage (Africa, Asia, Latin America) and the later countries with a European heritage (Europe, U.S., Australia and Canada). The former cultural model prioritizes obedience and group harmony, whereas the later prefers individualism and autonomy. While there is much research to support this dichotomy, some studies challenge it by finding evidence of the two as coexisting
orthogonally to each other. This study examined the Family Change Model which proposes a third qualitatively distinct cultural model named autonomous-related which combines aspects of collectivism and individualism (Kagitçibasi, 1996, 2005). According to the theory, this cultural prototype can be found amongst affluent families in traditionally collectivist societies and poorer families in individualist societies. The current study focused on the cultural models and socialization goals of mothers from diverse socio-economic backgrounds living in a collectivist society. Specifically, I looked at the intersection of class and culture by examining the parenting of urban Middle-Eastern Arab mothers from Palestine who have various occupations and levels of education.

Paper Outline

I will first discuss differences in parenting goals across independent and interdependent cultural models; focusing on research related to parenting in Arab countries or among Arab minority groups in the U.S. and elsewhere. I will follow this up with studies that challenge dichotomizing cultural models by ethnicity/country by including research on parenting and socioeconomic backgrounds. I will then present the Family Change Model (Kagitçibasi, 1996, 2005) as a theory that can possibly untangle some of the contradictions and issues related to SES, culture and parenting. Finally, I will discuss aspects of the local Palestinian context relevant to this study followed by the research design and hypotheses.

Parental Ethnotheories Across Collectivist and Individualist Cultures

Cultures are commonly defined by two opposite models, where each one prioritizes and favors diverse types of social, cognitive, emotional and behavioral characteristics. The interdependent/collectivist (C) model values strong emotional connectedness, high social harmony, obedience to group rules and co-dependency amongst group members. The
independent/individualistic model (I) places high value on autonomy, self-reliance, achieving maximum self-potential (self-maximization) and individual freedom. The two cultural models give rise to diverse types of selves: In the later, the “self” has high autonomy and is less reliant on others both materially and psychologically. Individuals with this type of self are less considering of group expectations when making decisions and so have more leverage to act freely. The interdependent self has in a way the opposite characteristics: lower autonomy, higher dependency on relationships with others and more regard to group obligations, norms and expectations. In modern times, the family (nuclear and extended) contributes significantly to socializing children into their respective cultural models. This becomes evident when looking at differences in the parenting of collectivist-individualistic cultures.

Ecological developmental theories propose that cultural schemas are embodied in every aspect of children’s environment, sending consistent culturally-bounded information on behaviors, relationships and feelings. According to Harkness and Super (2002, 2006, 2012), acculturation takes place through three aspects of the “Developmental Niche” (their name for a child’s environment (See Figure 1 in Appendix B): the setting (physical context in which they grow up), customs of care (traditional practices of child-care transmitted across generations) and caretaker psychology. Caretaker psychology includes parental “ethnotheories” which are the focus of this study:

Parental ethnotheories are cultural models that parents hold regarding children, families, and themselves as parents…Like other cultural models related to the self; parental ethnotheories are often implicit, taken-for-granted ideas about the "natural" or "right" way to think or act, and they have strong motivational properties for parents. (Harkness & Super, 2006, p. 62)
While all aspects of the Developmental Niche interact together, another ecological theory (Weisner, 2002) suggests a more linear relationship in which parental cultural models influence their ethno-theories, which consequently influence their socialization goals (personal and interpersonal traits that parents want their children to acquire on the long run). These, in turn, influence their parenting practices and how they organize activities, which then socializes children in culturally appropriate and expected way. Because the cultural models have different meaning/expectations for what successful socialization is, socialization goals in the two contexts will be different. Research largely supports this assertion. In a series of studies comparing socialization goals of Euro-American (considered to have individualistic model) and Latin American mothers (Mainland Puerto Rican and migrants from South America; considered to have a collectivist model) findings consistently indicated five broad types of desirable traits across various variables: self-maximization, self-control, lovingness, decency and proper demeanor (Harwood, 1992; Harwood, Schoelmerich, Ventura-Cook, Schulze & Wilson, 1996; Harwood, Leyendecker, Carlson, Asencio & Miller, 2002; Leyendecker, Harwood, Lamb & Schölermerich, 2002). Two were identified as relevant to individualism and collectivism: Euro-American mothers’ goals often were related to self-maximization which included independence, self-confidence and accomplishing one’s full potential whether intellectually or practically. Latin-American and Puerto Rican mothers prioritized Proper Demeanor which included respect, cooperation with others and fulfillment of interpersonal/familial obligations. Both groups valued lovingness, decency and self-control, but the value of the latter was group-dependent: for Euro-Americans, self-control was desired because it allowed self-actualization, while for Latina/Puerto Rican mothers its significance was linked to social image and behavior within interpersonal relationships. Similar patterns were found when comparing Brazilian and Norwegian maternal
socialization goals; the most common priorities for Brazilian mothers included studiousness, good education and good character. Norwegian mothers most commonly prioritized self-confidence, followed by independence and finally being a nice/kind person (Lordelo, Roethle & Mochizuki, 2012).

Studies looking at individualism and collectivism in socialization goals found comparable results across cultures. Huijbregts, Tavecchio, Leseman and Hoffenaar (2009) interviewed Dutch, Dutch Caribbean and Dutch Mediterranean care-givers in daycare centers in the Netherlands about their socialization beliefs and practices. While all caregivers valued “togetherness” and “sociability”, there were significant differences about independence. Dutch caregivers were more likely to mention independence and less likely to mention obedience as compared to caregivers with other ethnic backgrounds. In addition, individualistic traits (grouped as independence, self-confidence, cognitive development and learning-individualistic perspective) constituted a significant factor able to correctly predict care giver ethnicity for 55% of the Caribbean Dutch, 65% of the Dutch and 95.2% of Mediterranean caregivers. Similarly, Mone, Benga, and Susa (2014) found that maternal cultural models predicted socialization goals in a Romanian sample: a collectivist model predicted relational socialization goals (loyalty, reciprocity and solidarity) that aim to socialize the child into harmonious relationships with the family, which explained 32% of variance. More so, an individualistic cultural model predicted individualistic goals like promoting self-confidence and self-reliance, which predicted 16% of variance. This study and others on cultural models and socialization goals will be explored further in the introduction when looking at intracultural differences and effects of socio-economic background.
Although the current study focuses on Arab parents, there is little research on ethnotheories amongst this population. Studies suggest that parents from the Arab World\(^1\) have a collectivist model as evident in parenting styles characterized by high control and expectations of unquestioned obedience. Like other groups considered to hold a collectivist model (Asian-American [Chao, 2000], Latin-American [Fuller & Garcia Coll, 2010] and African-American [Hill, 2006]), Egyptian Canadian and Egyptian fathers (Rudy & Grusec, 2001, 2006) embraced an Authoritative parenting style. Like patterns found in these groups, “harsh” parenting was not associated with negative psychological and academic outcomes common to Euro-American children/adolescents growing up around this way of parenting (Rudy & Grusec, 2001, 2006; Chao, 2000), further supporting the collectivist model hypothesis. Joseph’s (1993) ethnographic observations on “connectivity” amongst families in the Lebanese capital strongly resonate with a collectivist cultural model:

> By connectivity I mean relationships in which a person's boundaries are relatively fluid so that persons feel part of significant others. Persons in Camp Trad did not experience themselves as bounded, separate, or autonomous. They answered for each other, anticipated each other's needs, expected their needs to be anticipated by significant others and often shapes their likes and dislikes in accordance with the likes and dislikes of others. (p. 452)

---

\(^1\) Arab World refers to a region encompassing parts of the Middle East (West Asia) and Africa (mostly North) and includes 22 Arab-speaking countries. While sharing an Arab identity (majorly Islamic), there is religious, linguistic and cultural diversity across sub-regions and countries brought about by their unique socio-historical and political conditions and indigenous customs and traditions.
If we are to assume that Arab cultures have a collectivist model, then we can expect their socialization goals to be like the ones discussed earlier in relation to this cultural model. While this is a reasonable assumption, it is not sufficient to predict Arab socialization goals and ethnotheories because of heterogeneity in how individualism and collectivism are expressed. For example, Latin American families value “bien educado” or a child who displays good manners, proper conduct and respect for adults (Fuller & Garcia Coll, 2010). While belonging to the same cultural model and showing identical parenting styles, Chinese parents prioritize a slightly distinct set of desirable traits. Chinese parents value developing a sense of familial piety (respect for one's parents, elders, and ancestors), virtues highly valued in Confucian Philosophy (Chao, 2000). The same can be said for assuming that all expressions of individualism are identical.

Harkness and Super (2006) analyzed parental descriptions of their children in several individualistic countries. Since culture affects parental perceptions and what meaning they make out of their children’s behaviors, descriptions are a rich source of information about cultural models. Specifically, descriptors (whether present or absent, negative or positive) expose the traits of the cultural prototypical child to which they compare their own child. Examples of the most frequent/common descriptors were sociable and happy (Australia), strong willed (Italy), easy (Spain), happy (Sweden) and sociable (U.S.). No statistical analysis was conducted as the sample was too small. Harkness, Super and Tijen (2000) also found that Dutch parents, as compared to Euro-Americans focused more on their children being successful members of the community and stressing the social aspect even when talking about cognitive goals. The researchers concluded that their findings (including practices and other beliefs) challenge the concept of the “Western Mind” as diversity emerged amongst countries typically grouped together as individualistic/western.
Several researchers called for exploring heterogeneity within cultural groups, including that which is related to socioeconomic background (Super & Harkness, 2006, 2002; Kagitçibasi, 1996, 2005; Keller et al., 2006; Hill, 2006; Hoff, Laursen & Tardif, 2002). In a review of research on parenting differences across African-American, Latino and Euro-American parenting, Hill (2006) recommends looking at intracultural/intra-ethnic differences. Particularly, there is a need to disentangle SES from ethnicity, which are commonly confounded in studies on cross-ethnic differences in parenting. Usually, middle and upper-class Euro-American families are compared to lower income ethnic families, often leading to results that show that Euro-American parenting promotes individualism and autonomy more than that of other ethnicities. When matching families on SES, differences in socialization goals are greatly reduced. Cheadle and Amato (2011) reached the same conclusion, whereas Super and Harkness (2002) observe that regardless of SES, culture strongly influences parental beliefs. The question of the relative importance of SES and culture is at the core of this research study. Before reviewing literature on the interaction between the two, I will present findings on parental ethnotheories and SES.

**Parental Ethnotheories Across Socioeconomic Status**

According to ecological theories like the Developmental Niche (Harkness & Super, 2002, 2006, 2012), or Ecocultural theory (Weisner, 2002), ethnotheories are highly dependent on context, shaped by and constantly adapting to larger socioeconomic and living conditions:

…apart from ethnicity and cultural background, SES also impacts parenting beliefs and practices. SES, defined as family incomes, parental education levels, prestige of parents’ occupations, wealth and material possessions, influences parents’ theories about child development, the characteristics parents want to develop in their children and their beliefs about parenting. (Hoff et al., 2002, p. 117)
This is because the goal of culturally-guided socialization is achieving optimal development; one which gives the individual the best chances of succeeding in their respective communities and cultures. Hoff pioneered studying the relationships between economic conditions and parenting in the field of psychology (Hoff et al. 2002; Leyendecker, Harwood, Comparini, & Yalcinkaya, 2005). She and others were able to establish a robust link between paternal occupation and parenting practices and beliefs so that lower income fathers (whose jobs were inflexible, required compliance, low tolerance to error and low creativity) were more likely to value and expect obedience, use physical punishment and evaluate behavior based on its consequences. White collar professionals (flexible jobs that valued independent thinking) were more likely to use reasoning with children, resorted to psychological forms of punishment and evaluated behaviors based on intent. Hoff’s rationale is that successful socialization includes fostering the skills and traits that parents expect their children will need in their future work environments. Morales (2006) conducted interviews with children of Mexican immigrants who worked in cherry orchard fields in the U.S. Their accounts show that children from a very young age are prepared for and themselves internalize pathways that resemble that of their parents:

Having a job and making money is the goal that children understand well...children believe it is good to learn about the processes now “to know what it’s going to be like when [they] are older” (Interview with Gabriel). The internalization of this “good worker” discourse is both classed as well as “racialized”. In response to the question “What do you learn in the orchard?” children shared their learning in terms of work and rules of the job. In only few cases did children speak about having “careers”; the majority of the time, they referenced the importance of having “good jobs”. (pp. 46-48)
The quote above shows one manifestation of how SES affects parenting and children’s socialization. In addition to parental work, SES is associated with income, which is in turn associated with how likely it is that individuals will have stability and opportunities in life. Parents with lower income were found to try to prepare children to endure difficulties by toughening their children through teasing, contradicting their narratives and discussing negative events (Snibbe & Markus, 2005). In one seminal study, Kusserow (1999) shows how expression of individualism can differ based on SES and neighborhood safety (as cited by Snibbe & Markus, 2005). Low, middle and high-income Euro-American parents living in poor and rich neighborhoods of New York City prioritized goals relevant to their conditions: poorer parents emphasized tougher aspects of individualism like self-reliance, self-defense and confidence. High income parents focused on soft psychological independence like self-actualization and self-expression, while middle-class parents highly valued academic achievement as it can help their children achieve social mobility. One study found a similar pattern in the Dominican Republic: mothers from a poor village emphasized conformity and obedience, while middle-class mothers valued exploration and self-direction (Foucault & Schneider, 2009).

In addition to occupation and settings, SES shapes parental socialization goals through education, which by definition is part of the construct of SES. In early childhood, maternal educational attainment has been found to be more strongly associated with children’s outcomes than family income. Generally speaking, there a well-documented positive correlation between education and individualistic parental attitudes (Hoff et al., 2002; Leyendecker et al., 2005). Manago (2014) documented the effect of urbanization and development on three generations of Maya women. She found the beliefs and practices of the second-generation Maya mothers, who attended school, were more individualistic than the beliefs of the grandmothers who grew up in a
farming community and had little or no formal education. Brazilian mothers’ education significantly correlated with more autonomous socialization goals in one study (Seidl-de-Moura et al., 2008), but not in another (Seidl-de-Moura et al., 2013). Ng, Tamis-LeMonda, Godfrey, Hunter and Yoshikawa (2012) found that in a low-income sample consisting of three ethnic groups in the U.S., “…mothers of relatively advantaged socioeconomic backgrounds in terms of education, employment and earnings prior to their children’s birth were consistently more likely to emphasize desirable qualities related to self-maximization and connectedness rather than proper demeanor…” (p. 835)

Hoff et al. (2002) point out that SES and class can have different meanings and associations across cultures. There were mixed results on the relationship between SES and cultural models in studies with Arab participants: Sukarieh (2016) explains that there is a debate whether SES is relevant at all, as some believe that it is a Eurocentric concept and that constructs like religion, clan or region may be better indicators of socioeconomic conditions in Arab countries. Her interviews with low income youth in Jordan revealed patterns across SES: participants expressed rejection of individualistic values like self-maximization and self-promotion, explaining that their relationships with families, neighbors and community members are integral to their identities. More so, they separated themselves from the “others”; middle and upper-class Jordanians who they viewed as embracing “Western” lifestyles and values. Sukraieh contrasted this with studies with higher SES individuals for whom individualism is synonymous with progress and modernity. In the context of the history of European colonialism and U.S. interventionist politics in Arab countries, values and cultural models become politicized. One cross-regional quantitative study of parenting styles found no significant effects of SES (neither education nor income) on parenting styles and practices in all the five
participating countries (Dwairy et al., 2006). The authors explain that the lack of predicted influence of SES is because parents viewed collectivist practices and beliefs to be at the core of the Arab identity so that rejecting individualism is a resistance against the perceived threat of Western political and ideological dominance in the region.

Interaction of SES and culture has been the subject of few studies as both constructs have been found to influence parenting beliefs. SES can also be seen as a form of culture within larger cultural groups defined by ethnicity or country (Cohen, 2009). Harwood et al. (1996) attempted to answer whether parents would have more common goals with others from their ethnicity/country or with parents of a similar SES who have a different cultural model. In this seminal study, they compared middle and low-SES Puerto Rican mothers to middle and low-SES Anglo-American mothers. They found that Puerto Rican mothers mentioned self-maximization more than low-SES mothers from both ethnicities. However, the main goals of Puerto Rican mothers of both SES groups was proper demeanor. These results show a complicated picture of the competing influences of SES and ethnicity. At first instance, self-maximization and proper demeanor seem irreconcilable as they follow two opposite cultural orientations: one focuses on the individual while the other on the group. However, intracultural differences and cross-cultural similarities are common and have challenged the dichotomous view of individualism and collectivism. In the next section I introduce the Family Change model which expands the individualism/collectivism dimension to include a third qualitatively different cultural model that combines aspects of both (Kagitçibasi, 1996, 2005).
Autonomous-Related Self and the Interaction Between SES and Ethnicity

Heterogeneity within groups belonging to the same culture is not unresolvable but requires a reconceptualization of the constructs of individualism/independence and collectivism/interdependence. In response to such variation and findings, several researchers proposed that the two cultural models exist in all societies. In fact, they claim that both are necessary for healthy individual/community development and are in fact not mutually exclusive (see Rogoff [2003] for a cross and intracultural review of autonomy and interdependence). Inspired by a cross-regional longitudinal study on the “value of children”, Kagitçibasi (1996, 2005) proposed a qualitatively different third cultural model called the “Autonomous-Related” which she predicts exists in urban middle class/affluent families in traditionally collectivist societies or poorer families in individualistic societies; the former is the focus of this study. This model is relevant to this study because it looks at SES and culture simultaneously, within collectivist cultures: it attempts to answer the question of whether parents from collectivist societies/heritage/values adopt aspects of individualism when they gain affluence and education.

To combine seemingly contradictory models of individualism and collectivism, the Family Change model theorizes that individualism and collectivism are multidimensional constructs defined by where the self stands in relation to the two separate dimensions of “interpersonal distance” (how close/distant interpersonal relationships are maintained) and “agency” (ability to act willingly without a sense of coercion). The Individualistic self/cultural model is high on distance and high on agency (high separation from others in intimate relationships and have high autonomy or the leverage to act without a sense of coercion), whereas the collectivist model/self is high on relatedness so that individuals maintain little interpersonal distance within relationships and low on agency (heteronomous). Since agency and
interpersonal distance are separate dimensions that can exist mutually, the autonomous-related self has high relatedness (low interpersonal distance) and high autonomy so that maintaining close interpersonal relationships is not in conflict with maintaining a high sense of agency and autonomy (See Figure 2 in Appendix B). In the autonomous-related model, families adopt individualistic aspects of parenting: mainly cognitive stimulation, fostering critical thinking and an extent of individuation; consistent with the beliefs and practices reported amongst high SES families. Yet, these families also conserve collectivist aspects: strong intergenerational bonds and emotional interdependence. In other words, autonomy does not mean distancing oneself from others. The autonomous-related self is neither individualistic nor collectivist, but a unique combination of the two (Kagitçibasi, 2005):

Thus, in the third prototypical model…autonomy becomes adaptive in changing urban society. This is because with the greater prevalence of schooling, and increasing specialization in the workplace, capacity for individual decision making emerges as a new asset…Nevertheless, even though autonomy is now valued, separation is not the goal; relatedness continues to be valued, given the enduring influence of the culture of relatedness. (p. 421)

Brazilians have been reported to have an autonomous-related self: Based on Brazilian mothers’ descriptions of their children, seven broad categories of descriptors emerged, including independence/autonomy (active, smart, intelligent, independent, strong determined etc..) and relatedness (collaborative, kind, nice) (Seidl-de-Moura et al., 2013). The study found that mothers described almost equal numbers of relatedness and autonomy overall. More so, there were no significant difference between their mention by each participant.
In the Arab context, the cross-regional study on parenting mentioned earlier, Dwairy et al. (2006) supports the autonomous-related model. Parenting styles (based on Baumrind’s model) poorly predicted participants’ answers: while there were variations across countries, Arab parents did not fit neatly into any of the three parenting styles (Authoritarian, Authoritative or Permissive) but rather exhibited variations of combinations of them. The authors concluded that control and warmth were not mutually exclusive in Arab parenting, leading to the poor fit between the parental profiles and the parenting styles. They proposed the autonomous-related model as useful for understanding Arab parenting. More so, there were no significant effects of SES, supporting Kagitçibasi’s (1996, 2005) prediction that higher SES in collectivist societies does not lead to a complete individualistic style. However, this study was not planned in a way to capture the nuances of intracultural differences, possibly masking subtle differences in parenting beliefs across SES that are not captured by the parenting styles.

McShane, Hastings, Smylie and Prince (2009) examined socialization goals of Inuit living in southern urban regions. They expected to find an autonomous-related model since this indigenous group was found to have strong aspects of relatedness previously. While there was evidence of relatedness in their descriptions and interviews, the participants did not show autonomy as expected. The authors concluded that this may be because the experience of urbanization is relatively new or that urbanization and education do not affect the Inuit population in the expected path of increasing autonomy. It is important to note, however, that 50% of the generated data was excluded as it did not fit into autonomy or relatedness. More so, SES was not explicitly explored.

Keller et al. (2006) predicted the socialization goals of mothers from communities representing the three cultural models: German, Euro-American, and Greek middle-class
individualistic group), Cameroonian Nso and Gujarati farming women Mothers (collectivist group) and urban Indian, urban Chinese, urban Mexican, and urban Costa Rican women (representing autonomous-related model). Their predictions were based on maternal answers to questionnaires measuring socialization goals, degree of familism (family cohesion) and parenting practices. They found that they could correctly predict 73% of the assumed maternal cultural model but the autonomous-related was the least predictable (only 62% of mothers were correctly identified). Keller et al. (2006) concludes that these cultural models have empirical and theoretical validity and are generalizable to a larger geographical area and that the autonomous-related model needs more explorations. They recommend intracultural studies looking at differences and similarities between members of the same communities. Intracultural studies, especially qualitative ones may also provide less variability (inherent in cross-cultural studies) and explain “individual cultural-meaning systems that lead to this variability” (p. 168). Leyendecker et al. (2002) also recommended examining intracultural differences. Like individualism and collectivism, it is possible that there are different variations of the autonomous-related model. For example, Seidl-de-Moura et al. (2008) found that maternal socialization goals varied across seven Brazilian cities; an autonomous-related cultural model was found but cities had unique profiles. That is, mothers from different cities emphasized various aspects of individualism and collectivism.

While there are mixed findings regarding the autonomous-related model, it is an appropriate framework for exploring intracultural SES-based differences in parenting beliefs; especially in collectivist societies. Further exploring Arab parenting in relation to relatedness and autonomy will contribute to a present gap in the literature. The next sections will provide some
background on the Palestinian context from which the sample of this study is derived, followed by the research goals and questions.

**Palestinian Context**

It is customary for studies looking at cultural models to provide an overview of the populations from which participants are studies. This is consistent with ecological orientations of the theories used in this study, which view culture as intimately connected with the larger socioeconomic conditions in which it exists. The Palestinian society is a traditionally agricultural society that is undergoing rapid urbanization (Shaheen, 2013). While traditionally families were extended, now 75% are nuclear families. Intergenerational relationships, however, remain strong with most of the elderly depending on their children for help and financial support (over 80%); a sign of a collectivist society. Only nineteen percent of women are enrolled in formal labor. Ninety percent of households have a TV (most of which are connected to cable), while only half have access to internet (all statistics are the latest ones available from the website of the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics).

While fertility is slowly declining (5.9 births in 1999 compared to 4.1 in 2013), it remains one of the highest in the world. This is surprising given high literacy and education levels (more that 95% of youth over 15 are literate). One reason that fertility has not declined, as is common with increasing education, is the political situation, which Pell (2016) found affected women’s reproductive decisions. Palestinians live in a unique situation of high political ambiguity as they struggle for independence and statehood. They live either under an internationally recognized occupation, under siege or as long-term refugees outside of Palestine. Political arrests, land confiscation, house demolitions, restrictions of movement, shootings and bombing of civilians are all part of the daily lives of many residing there (See United Nations report [2017] for a full
A review of humanitarian consequence of the political situation. This can possibly affect interaction between parenting and SES: Dwairy et al. (2006) found that Palestinian parents, relative to other Arab nationalities, showed higher control; which they conclude is possibly due to the dangerous political environment surrounding them. If this applies to the current sample, then there may not be any difference in autonomy across SES because higher-income parents will be afraid to do so. Another possibility is that there will be no difference across SES because lower income parents would foster self-maximization; something that was found amongst African-American parents as a way of preparing their children for possible experiences with racial discrimination (Cohen, 2009). This issue was not be included in the main hypotheses but might come up in the results.

In conclusion, studies and social trends show that the Palestinian society, like other Arab societies, is a traditionally collectivist society that is undergoing rapid change in the form of urbanization, high education years and openness to the global culture through access to internet and other media. Relative to comparable societies, Palestine is unique in its political instability due to the occupation which creates a dangerous environment for families which in turn may influence parenting goals and practices.

**Framework and Research Questions**

There is a gap in the literature related to socialization goals in collectivist cultures (Hoff et al., 2002). In particular, Keller et al. (2006) and Kagitçibasi (1996, 2005) recommend using qualitative designs. More so, Hill (2006) and Super and Harkness (2006) point to the need to disentangle the relationship between culture and SES. The current study explored the socialization goals of Palestinian mothers from different socioeconomic backgrounds through semi-structured interviews. This contributes to the field by looking at whether SES affects
parenting in diverse cultures in the same way. This study contributes to cross-cultural psychology by looking at intracultural differences within a single national group. The qualitative method ensures cultural validity and explores local meanings of the socialization goals. This is especially critical given that such research with Arab parents in general, and Palestinian in particular, is scarce. More so, universal words/traits could have local meanings that would be overlooked even possibly misunderstood when using a quantitative design (Lordelo et al., 2012). Producing new knowledge related to parenting amongst this population is useful for researchers, policy makers and practitioners working for/with urban Palestinian families.

Using the Family Change model (Kagitçibasi’s, 1996, 2005) as a framework is highly compatible, since it has developed from and in response to contexts similar to the Palestinian one: a traditionally interdependent developing country. This model also forecasts the effects of SES and culture simultaneously in relation to socialization goals, something that is missing from other theories. Finally, given that the model was developed through global cross-cultural research, it situates the study within a large body of international comparative literature, enabling a better interpretation of the findings while adding value to existing research regarding the validity of its assumptions.

According to the Family Change model, mothers from lower SES would have an interdependent cultural model, emphasizing socialization goals related to emotional interdependence, familial obligations and compliance with mainstream cultural values. Since mothers with higher SES were expected to follow an autonomous-related model, their socialization goals would combine instrumental independence with emotional interdependence. Research hypotheses are outlined below:
A. Mothers from lower SES will show a collectivist model, prioritize goals related to local constructs of “proper demeanor” and their descriptions of their children will be more relational.

B. Mothers from higher SES will have an autonomous-related model. This manifests in socialization goals equally valuing aspects of proper behavior and aspects of self-maximization as well as more individualistic descriptors

C. Mothers from higher and lower SES will both equally report goals related to decency and lovingness.

In summary, there will be significant differences in the frequency of individualistic and collectivist across mothers from higher and lower SES. Differences will also be evident in the relevant number of individualist to collectivist descriptors and socialization goals within groups of different SES.
CHAPTER II: METHOD

Selection of the Population

This study targeted Palestinian mothers of first grade children from two types of schools. Controlling for children’s age is common amongst studies looking at socialization goals as these may change with age. First graders (aged six to seven) are in transition from early childhood to an older age at which social norms become more relevant and asking mothers of children this age may lead to a better representation of cultural patterns than when asking about a younger age. Recruiting mothers through schools allows for reaching diverse SES sample since schools are a proxy for income (see below). Mothers were included because they are the primary caretakers in the Palestinian culture, and maternal attributes have a stronger connection than paternal ones to SES and parenting in the early years (Leyendecker et al., 2005; Hoff et al., 2002). More so, this allows for comparing the results with previous literature which has focused on mothers. Finally, the study focused on urban families (excluding refugee camps and villages) in order to isolate SES as a source of group variance, especially given cultural models change with type of residence (Kagitçibasi, 1996, 2005; Vieira et al., 2010).

Sample Characteristics

Twelve Palestinian mothers of 1st grade children participated in the study. This number falls slightly below that recommended by Guest, Bunce & Johnson (2006) who found that most of the main themes are obtained by the seventh interview within a homogenous sample. Eleven mothers were residents of an urban areas in Palestine and one was from a refugee camp. Her interview was included due to the scarcity of participants, bringing the number to 12. Table 1 below summarizes the sociodemographic characteristics of the sample including mean age, mean
years of school attendance, mean number of children, maternal working status and gender of their child who is in 1st grade.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ Sociodemographic Information Arranged by Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociodemographic Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age of mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of school attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of mothers working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 1st grade child being a female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ ages ranged between 23 and 55 years and their education ranged between 4 and 18 years of education with the majority having acquired a Bachelor’s degree at least (n=8). On average, mothers with children in private school were slightly older and more highly educated than mothers with children in public school. All mothers whose children are in private school had at least a university degree and all except one were working. The husbands of the mothers with children in private school all had managerial positions, worked as consultants or business owners. On the other hand, most mothers with children in public schools were not working (n=4) and their husbands worked either as lower level employees, street vendors, construction workers or were unemployed. While most of the mothers in this group did not complete high school, surprisingly, two had a BA. Like expected, school type predicted household SES, however surprisingly, to a lesser extent maternal education.
Data Collection Procedure

Random convenience sampling of schools was employed. First, a list of public and private schools in a major urban area in Palestine was collected. These were classified into three types: Christian private schools, other private schools and public schools. I was advised to use this categorization by an experienced researcher at the Institute of Community and Public Health, a center that has been conducting research locally for several decades. The connection between SES and schools is well established, especially as it related to how middle-class parents introduce and prepare their children to the values and practices of this class (Raveaud & Zanten, 2007). Schools represent parental class or class aspirations, even cultural values. Most of the private schools are significantly more expensive and more prestigious, many of which use non-conventional methods of teaching. Christian private schools are more westernized and qualitatively different from other private schools (Islamic or non-religious). Following classification, two schools were chosen at random from each category. All the schools required a permission from the Ministry of Education which was obtained and presented to the chosen schools. Principles from two schools (from the same group) refused to participate and four agreed to participate. For this reason, one type of school (private Islamic or non-religious which is equivalent to middle SES) was excluded and two were left (higher and lower SES but not mid-SES). Principals gave pamphlets to teachers who gave them to first grade students in the four remaining schools (See Appendix C). Ninety pamphlets were distributed, addressing the mothers and contained information on the research purpose, procedure and asked them to write down their contact information if they were interested in participating or wanted to be contacted to know more. A research assistant returned the next day and the day after to collect any pamphlets signed by mothers. Finally, the main researcher contacted all willing participants to answer any
questions they may have, confirm their interest in participation and schedule an interview time if an agreement was reached. While 25 pamphlets were returned, only 12 were able or willing to participate (and few were unreachable).

Data collection took place between April and June 2018. Interviews were held online via WhatsApp due to distance between where the participants are and where the researcher resides. Most people have phones and internet. Those who did not have the application were called internationally on their phone using Skype. When called to set an interview date, participants either offered to have it immediately or the next day or the day after. The mothers were able to speak on the phone from whatever place was comfortable and convenient and no restrictions were placed on that. Mothers of young children tend to be busy, and they probably appreciated flexibility from the researcher. For example, most participants had their children running around them during the interview. Interviews were conducted in Arabic, which is the native language of the researcher and interviewees. Interviews lasted between 15 and 45 minutes depending on the length of answers. Since this was a semi-structured interview (See Appendix A) some questions were open ended and so interviews times varied. All interviews except one (as the participant refused) were audio-taped and transcribed in Arabic. Only quotes presented in the study results were translated.

Ethical Issues

The IRB proposal was approved through the Illinois State University local IRB committee. Before the interviews commenced, I repeated the purpose of the study and obtained verbal consent for participation and audio recording. I avoided written consent, as it is not customary in the Palestinian culture. Instead, I read out loud the consent document, which included my commitment to maintain their privacy and confidentiality as well as the actions I
would take to do so (See Appendix D). They were informed that they could stop the interview at any time or refrain from answering questions they did not feel comfortable answering. All identifiable information was stored on a password-protected laptop that belongs to the researcher. Transcripts were separated from identifiable information. Actual names were replaced by pseudo-names in this document and whenever interviewee information, quotes or testimonies are to be disclosed in any public publication or presentation.

**Ensuring Reliability and Validity**

I believe that my position as a researcher provides validity to my analysis: I am a female Palestinian who grew up in Palestine and have previously conducted research there. I interviewed women of various backgrounds on health-related issues as part of research projects conducted by Institute of Community and Public Health at Birzeit University. As part of my work I was trained in qualitative methods and took a graduate course on this topic. Since Arabic is my native language, I was able to fluently communicate with the mothers and have a contextualized understanding of the words they used.

These advantages can have also been disadvantages in that I may take parenting beliefs and practices for granted, since I belong to the same cultural group as the participants. For this reason, other measures of reliability and validity were obtained. Research questions were peer reviewed as I conducted three interviews using a protocol like this as part of a research for the graduate level qualitative course. I received input from my class-mates and instructor. More so, I had the opportunity to see what questions worked and were engaging to participants and what questions were unclear or needed further examination. The interview questions were back-to-back translated to ensure that the English version is a good representation of the Arabic one. When analyzing data, the researcher (myself) and the research assistant (who has previous
training in qualitative research and was blind to the hypothesis) separately coded two interviews (one from each type of school). Codes were compared, and inconsistencies discussed and resolved. Coding and analysis of the rest of the interviews was divided between the two (see below for a detailed account of the coding process) with each coding another four. Finally, verbatim quotes are provided in the results section to support findings.

**Interview Structure**

The semi-structured interview questions (See Appendix A) were open-ended but limited in the responses they elicited from participants. I asked the participants to think of their child who is in first grade when answering interview questions and encouraged that throughout the interview by asking for specific examples from their own lives. Prompts such as “what does this mean” and “give me an example” served to clarify participant responses. They were used at the discretion of the interviewer so that the interview resembles a conversation to make participants feel comfortable enough to discuss their beliefs and opinions. Five preliminary kinds of data were provided by the transcripts: Demographic information (Q1) [reported under the “participant description” section], maternal descriptions of the target child (Q2, [Harkness & Super, 2006]), maternal desired and undesired socialization goals, clarifications and rationalizations of goals (Q3, Q4, [Harwood, 1992]). Finally, question six asked about gender differences in relation to goals. No limits were be placed on the number or traits or SGs mothers chose to report (Ng et al., 2012) but mothers were asked to mention their most important goal (Q5).
Preliminary Analysis

Throughout data collection, an excel sheet was used to document participants’ demographic information (Q1). Each participant was assigned a number which was also used to find their transcript after all identifiable information was removed. Once data collection was finished, the excel sheet was used to generate descriptive statistics.

Next, transcripts were read with the intention of extracting words and sentences mothers used to indicate a) descriptors (Q2), b) desired socialization goals (Q3), c) undesired socialization goals (Q4) and e) difference by gender of child (Q6). All “descriptors” were included in the analysis even those mentioned casually not in response to Q2 (Super & Harkness, 2006). Using an iterative process, starting from the first interview, the transcript was read, and different sections of the interview were color coded to indicate what parts correspond to which questions. After reading several times, codes were assigned to sentences/words/paragraphs. Each code was written down and briefly defined in a codebook (Mone et al., 2014). As analysis continued codes are revised and refined. The researcher used codes that best describe what the participant intended to say, sometimes but not always using their own words.

Each interview had a memo summarizing nonidentifiable demographic information, list of desired and undesired socialization goals and descriptors and their codes. Every descriptor and goal were accompanied by a summary of what the participant said it means. All descriptors and goals were combined in an excel sheet that indicated the code, the original content and basic information about the participants (school type and education level). This facilitated making sense of the data by seeing what codes most commonly occurred and whether they formed any patterns based on school type or maternal education.
Research Instruments

Descriptions of Children

Harkness & Super (2006) developed a tool that can be used to assess parental cultural model and consists of the open-ended question “Tell me about your son/daughter. How would you describe him/her?” Child descriptors can provide information on parental cultural models. They also have the advantage of asking about something tangible; “Parents find it easier to talk about their own child’s routines and qualities than to answer questions about abstract principles—especially because many of these may be unexamined, implicit assumptions about what is natural and right…” (Super & Harkness, 2006, p. 76). The qualities that are mentioned reflects what is important to parents even if it’s in a negative context. I.e. mentioning “that their child is not sociable” even though describes the absence of a trait, indicates that sociability is important to this parent/group. Thus, both negative and positive traits, and those that are present and absent will be included in the analysis (Super & Harkness, 2006). Participants were also asked to explain what the descriptor means and give an example as a measure of validity. After descriptors were extracted from all interviews, the 22 categories that emerged (Table E-1, Appendix E) were arranged into four categories used by Super & Harkness (2006): individualism/autonomy, collectivism/relatedness, temperament and other. In addition, the same was repeated using Seidle-de-Moura et al.’s seven categories (Seidle-de-Moura et al., 2013):

- Independence/autonomy (e.g. active; smart; intelligent; independent; strong; determined);
- Relatedness (e.g. collaborative, kind, nice), “Positive temperament (e.g. happy; sweet, easy going; calm); Negative temperament (e.g. bad-tempered; annoying; stressed);
- Introversion (e.g. shy; inhibited), Externalization (e.g. aggressive; disobedient; destructive); and others (e.g. healthy; loved; blessed). (p. 254)
The reason why two coding schemas were used is because the two studies had conflictual definitions of what collectivist and individualist descriptors are, even though Seidle-de-Moura et al.’s (2013) study design and analysis is based on that of Super and Harkness (2006). For example, the original study coded descriptors related to children’s social domain as “sociable”. This also included “shy” because while it’s the opposite of social, it still shows a focus by the parents on the relational aspects of their son or daughter. Seidle-de-Moura et al., on the other hand, placed “shy” into the separate category of “introversion”, which they do not consider relevant to individualism and collectivism. While both studies conducted a t-test to compare frequency of individualist and collectivist descriptors, the sample size in this study was too small to do that.

**Socialization Goals (SGI)**

Most of the studies mentioned in the introduction used the socialization goals interview (SGI) which was developed to gain an emic insight into parental ethnotheories. Socialization goals (SG) are the norms and values that parents desire their children to acquire or avoid for integrating and succeeding in their respective communities. SGI is administered in interview format and asks parents to describe qualities they 1) would like to see in their children as adults and 2) would not like to see. The original interview also asks parents to think of children they know that began to show these qualities but have been dropped in most subsequent studies as its validity was not confirmed. SGs were first analyzed thematically (Mone et al., 2014) and then the categories that emerged were compared to categories used by other studies utilizing SGI. This is typical of such studies as each sample of participants has its own goals, some of which it may share with other samples. The final coding (See Table 2 below), was based on a combination of categories found in three different studies comparing American and Puerto Rican
mothers (Leyendecker et al., 2002), Brazilian and Norwegian mothers (Ng et al., 2012) and Turkish and German mothers (Citlak, Leyendecker, Schölmerich, Driessen and Harwood, 2008).

Finally, when analyzed and reported, desired and undesired SGs were combined. When explaining why the goals were important to them, many participants mentioned new goals; these were also analyzed as part of the socialization goals. The question “what goal is most important to you” was removed after data collection because it was inapplicable for many participants who mentioned that they don’t set goals for their children (see the results section).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and Subcategories</th>
<th>Description of Subcategories</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Any reference to educational achievement or academic performance</td>
<td>To finish high school, any mother wishes for her son to be educated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Any reference to achieving a career or getting a job</td>
<td>To get a job, success in professional life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Maximization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Any reference to giving personal choice in relation to any goal</td>
<td>I don’t choose their career, learn and work in whatever he wants</td>
<td>Not to compare herself to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling good about oneself</td>
<td>Any reference to promoting traits related to self-esteem and self-worth</td>
<td>To have self-worth, love and adore herself, to be empowered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td>Any reference to being self-reliant and independent</td>
<td>To be independent and not rely on others, learn how to behave when I am not there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership, success and thriving</td>
<td>Any reference to achieving ones’ full potential, being successful and going beyond the ordinary</td>
<td>I want her to be extraordinary, to get her own space to be unique, to be a leader, to be successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-control</strong></td>
<td>Any reference to wanting children to curb negative impulses like temper, aggression</td>
<td>Not to be aggressive</td>
<td>I don’t want him to be snappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proper Demeanor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>Any reference to listening to and obeying adults</td>
<td>To be obedient, to listen to what he is told</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morals/values (Akhlq)</td>
<td>Any reference to having akhlq, having moral or values</td>
<td>To have morals, to have high akhlq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good treatment (Moa’mala)</td>
<td>Also reference to treatment of others and includes family obligations</td>
<td>Treating others well is everything</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories and Subcategories</td>
<td>Description of Subcategories</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of others</td>
<td>Any reference to judging others, accepting others or being considerate or selfless.</td>
<td>To be non-judgmental, not to discriminate based on religion,</td>
<td>Accepting others is a must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid illicit behavior</td>
<td>Any reference to delinquency and negative behavior like smoking, swearing</td>
<td>To stay on the right path, I see how children swear and I don’t want that</td>
<td>To avoid the wrong path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>Any mention of religiosity in the context of behavior</td>
<td>I teach them to fast and pray, to be religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectedness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Any reference to sense of belonging and identity (national/cultural/religious) and cultural competence</td>
<td>To have a sense of belonging to his community and family</td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships and friendships</td>
<td>Any mention of friendships and relationships</td>
<td>To have friends who will stay with him forever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovingness</td>
<td>Any reference to loving others or being loved</td>
<td>To love people</td>
<td>I want him to be loved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Anything that does not fit in the above categories</td>
<td>Health, grab opportunities, live her age, learn from her mistakes, comfort</td>
<td>I don’t want to isolate her from the world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Descriptors

When asked to describe their child, mothers were able to immediately answer the question without hesitation. After coding, there was a total of 22 categories [See Table E-1 (Appendix E) for original coding by researcher and research assistant]. Descriptors were in total mentioned 67 times with the number of the actual adjectives used by participants being higher. On average, mothers used 5.5 descriptors for each child ($SD=2.3$), with higher SES mothers using on average 6 descriptors ($SD=2.8$) as compared to 5 ($SD=1.9$) for lower SES mothers. Mothers with less than a BA degree reported fewer descriptors ($M=5$, $SD=1.8$) than mothers with BA and higher ($M=5.7$, $SD=2.6$). Table 3 shows how the descriptors are distributed across participants from each group and how much on average each category was mentioned by participants.

Parents’ descriptions of their children can provide clues about their cultural model as well as their goals. First, I looked at the analysis using Super and Harkness’ guidelines. The most common descriptor amongst mothers with children in public school (lower SES) was “achievement in school” [Table 3]. It was mentioned by five mothers and on average accounted for 17.8% of descriptors by each participant. This category was used whenever mothers mentioned anything related to their children’ achievement and performance in school such as grades. This category also included the frequently mentioned Arabic word, $shater$ (males) and $shatra$ (females), which participants explained meant being smart at school, getting excellent grades and being bright academically. Before considering what this descriptor means in terms of cultural model, it’s important to take few observations into account: a few mothers, especially ones with lower educational level, were confused by the recruitment pamphlets they received.
from school. For example, at the end of the interview, they asked about my evaluation of their child or asked for my advice for how to deal with their behavior or the psychosocial center where

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor Category and Subcategory</th>
<th>Public School n (% of all descriptors per mother)</th>
<th>Private School n (% of all descriptors per mother)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualism/autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart / Intelligent</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive in School</td>
<td>2 (30.6)</td>
<td>1 (6.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitive &amp; Driven to Learn</td>
<td>2 (13.9)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong willed</td>
<td>3 (26.1)</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement in School (shater/shatra)</td>
<td>5 (17.8)</td>
<td>3 (11.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectivism/relatedness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (23.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (16.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (16.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible &amp; Reliable</td>
<td>4 (11.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temperament</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easygoing (mrayehnee/beghalibnish)</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>1 (10.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lively and active</td>
<td>2 (14.2)</td>
<td>3 (21.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities &amp; Hobbies</td>
<td>2 (15.2)</td>
<td>3 (10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Behavior (shaa’e)</td>
<td>1 (60)</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loved</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>2 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfocused/focused</td>
<td>2 (9.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they can get advice or services. Believing that I worked with the school (because this is how I contacted them) may have led mothers from lower SES to emphasize “achievement in school”, thinking that this is what I was interested in or that the child may be evaluated based on what they said. It is impossible to conclude whether this was an indication of maternal cultural model or whether it was related to the recruitment method used in this study. Information from SGs clarified this. The second commonly mentioned trait was “responsible and reliable”, this constituted 11.1% of all the descriptors mentioned by the four mothers that mentioned them. Descriptors falling under this code related to the child knowing their responsibilities or being able to rely on them to buy things from the shop or that they want to work to support the family. Mothers with lower SES mentioned descriptors that fall into autonomous and relational categories as evident by the most frequent adjectives falling in the categories of “achievement in school” and “responsible and reliable” exhibiting an autonomous-related cultural model.

The most common descriptor by the higher SES mothers do not relate to autonomy and independence, but to sociability. Sociability was about how the child feels or acts around people whether they are anxious about going to events, if they feel shy or comfortable around people and whether they seek out others’ company. “Lively and active” is as frequent as “sociable” and it comes next in the percentage it makes up of the descriptors mentioned by everyone. This relates to a child’s temperament and children who are excited, playful, who love many things and generally mothers referred to their children’s positive temperament. Interestingly, in a previous study with an individualistic Euro sample, “active” was used to describe cognitive alertness and activity rather than physical or temperamental (Super & Harkness, 2006).

Table 4 also shows frequency and percentage of descriptors, but it’s based on the coding by Seidle-de-Moura and colleagues (2013). Whereas this type of coding conceals culturally-
specific descriptors, the smaller number of categories make it easier to make sense of the data. For mothers with a child in public school, a significant percentage (44.1%) of the descriptors showed a focus on their child’s independent qualities. It is important to keep in mind that much of this relates to academic achievement as it is coded by Seidle-de-Moura and colleagues (2013) under “independence/autonomy” and has the same issues mentioned previously. Analysis based on this categorization paints a picture of a cultural model that is autonomous-related for both groups of mothers in that the most common descriptors across the two groups are in the autonomy and relatedness category. While the sample size limits the conclusion that can be drawn, it is possible to say, judging from both tables, that mothers from lower and higher SES both displayed independent and collectivist perceptions of their children in different ways (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of Descriptors from Each Category Reported by Participants and the Mean Percentage that the Descriptor Constitutes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor Category</th>
<th>Public School, n (%)</th>
<th>Private School, n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence/autonomy</td>
<td>6 (44.1)</td>
<td>6 (40.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>4 (31.3)</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Temperament</td>
<td>3 (21.1)</td>
<td>4 (24.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Temperament</td>
<td>3 (23.9)</td>
<td>2 (17.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
<td>2 (10.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalization</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (25.6)</td>
<td>4 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Socialization Goals**

Mothers mentioned between one and seven SG categories with the actual numbers of goals being higher. On average, participants mentioned 4.4 goals ($SD=1.9$) with mothers with children in public school mentioned on average fewer goals ($M=3.8$, $SD=2.1$) than mothers with children in private school ($M=5$, $SD=1.5$). Mothers with higher education reported on average
4.6 goals (SD=2) whereas mothers with lower education mentioned on average 4 goals (SD=1.8). Both descriptors and socialization goals are indication of maternal cultural model. Table E-2 (Appendix E) shows the descriptor and goals mentioned by each participant. In eight out of the 12 interviews, descriptors corresponded to desired/undesired socialization goals. Asking about both descriptors and goals was a form of cross-validation, and the congruency shows that the collected data successfully represented the cultural orientations of mothers at an individual level.

The next section is divided into two subsections: firstly, I will discuss the SGs of achievement and self-maximization particularly in relation to education and career. These will be arranged by maternal education along which there was a pattern in relation to these two SGs. The second subsection will address the categories of decency, self-control and connectedness and will be organized by SES as there were not any salient patterns related to maternal education. Finally, gender will be presented in the last section. Table 5 below shows SGs mentioned by the two groups of mothers.
Before introducing the quotes, it is important to mention how the data in Table 5 is distributed across maternal education as two mothers from the lower SES group had a high education: All mothers who mentioned employment and education from the lower SES group have achieved less than a BA, and two of the lower SES mothers who mentioned SGs related to self-maximization were highly educated mothers with a BA degree.
Highly educated mothers.

Goals related to education, work and career occupied a large part of the discussions in most of the interviews with some variation across individuals. Discussion of education, such as finishing education or getting a degree greatly varied between educated and non-educated mothers. All mothers with at least a BA degree and none of the mothers with lower than BA degree mentioned that they do not set goals for their children or that it is too early to set goals, which with further questioning showed that they were specifically talking about what field of study or career their children are going into. Choice was the most common form of expression of self-actualization in this sample. When asked about why they do not set such goals, their answers varied but mostly related to success, self-maximization and their children’s unique interests and attributes. The following quotes are from interviews with educated mothers:

*Excerpt from Hanan (33 years old, education: BA, works as a beautician, daughter in public school, husband work: employee)*

**Interviewer:** what are your goals for Nour?

**Hanan:** if I had only one [child] I may be able to help you more with your research, but I have five, so I get confused as each one wants something and likes certain things…When a mother has not only Nour, but Nour and another three girls and a boy goals vary. Because they are many you divide the goals as the personality of each one is different. I don’t know if you got my point?

**Interviewer:** based on what do you put a goal for one child and another goal for another?

**Hanan:** based on what they love and what they want. Even their academic abilities vary. Each based on their ability and what they want. Each personality is different and different interests…so why should I set goals that they don’t want? I do what I must, I teach them
and help them with their homework. I give them everything they need and want and ask for. I give them the duty of love and affection. But their goals, what she should become when she grows up, what she will study, wear, buy she is free with that and it’s her personality. For example, I have a girl who I want to be a doctor but if she grew up and didn’t want to, I will not force her

When the researcher further insisted on knowing the goals and asked whether they differ by gender, the participant offered the researcher to speak with the father because she felt she couldn’t get her point across. While Hanan did not state that she has no goals, she insisted that each goal is tailored for every child’s individual interests and abilities. Her reasons for that are pragmatic, but also centered around her children’s freedom and her unwillingness to impose her desire on them. This is an attitude that fosters individualism and promotes autonomy over obedience. Another mother, Nida has a similar permissive attitude about her son’s choice of study. She is however more explicit about why autonomy is important:

*Excerpt from Nida (30 years old, education: BA, not working, son in public school, husband work: construction worker)*

**Interviewer:** what are your goals for Alaa?

**Nida:** that he gets the best upbringing and would be knowledgeable about everything and I want him to study what he likes. I don’t like to impose my view about what they want to study, that’s in studying or education. That’s it there is no specific goal

**Interviewer:** why you don’t have a specific goal?

**Nida:** because each person has their own interests in life. They are still young, when he gets older his interests will become more evident and based on that he can study because
I don’t like to impose my view. If one studies something they don’t like they will not be creative

It can be concluded from Nida’s words that choice is important because it leads to creativity. In Arabic, creativity is used to mean “excellence” or “unique fulfillment”². This is a more clearly individualistic goal, that of self-maximization and achieving ones’ potential. Goals related to self-maximization are typical of educated mothers in individualistic cultures. To find it amongst educated Palestinian mothers supports other studies that found an association between individualism and education regardless of the larger country-level/societal culture in which a person lives (Manago, 2014; Leyendecker et al., 2005 and Hoff et al., 2002).

Wajd, whose son is in a private school, also mentioned the goal of success:

Excerpt from Wajd (46 years old, education: BA, not working and used to work at a managerial level, son in private school, husband work: consultant in private sector)

Interviewer: you said you had no goals for what you want him to become, how is this different or similar for girls?

Wajd: I put goals. My strategy in life is to be successful in whatever you do. That’s it. Whatever field you go into, to be successful in it. I can’t say be a successful lawyer, it’s not up to me to decide. I show the way and support him in his choice in the best way possible. At the end of the day my goal for my children is to see them all successful in the fields they are in. To be successful and unique in whatever the field or line is. I can’t say this one is to become a lawyer but wherever they want to be. The goal? To be successful in life of course professionally and then family-wise

² Al-Maany dictionary: https://www.almaany.com/ar/dict/ar-en/%D8%A7%D8%A8%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%B9/
For Wajd, the goal is success in and of itself regardless of the field of education or career, she also mentions being “unique”. While she mentions “family-wise”, it was the only time she said that in the whole interview and in passing without any further explanation or discussion. When talking about how she achieves her goals, her practices resonated with those found amongst middle class parents in the U.S.:

Wherever he has potential, I strengthen him. For example, in activities, he doesn’t know himself well. Let’s say I give him exposure so that he sees what he is drawn to and support him in that…I want to give him things, so he is relieved later…because everything becomes an asset because everything he gets now will help him later on succeed. When he has more things and opportunities and education and exposure it increases his balance to perform later

This sort of deliberate parenting in which children’s interests and abilities are carefully observed and promoted, and their activities structured based on that, has been reported elsewhere in the literature. Laureau (2003) calls this practice “concerted cultivation” and can be explained as “…the child-rearing practices of US parents with relatively more social and cultural capital who enroll their offspring in a range of activities to develop skills that will ultimately allow them to become more economically viable in the future; this exposure to new experiences, she suggests, guides middle-class children onto a trajectory that will reproduce their own class status in the future.” (Wang, 2010, pg. 150). This strategy has also been found in non-U.S. samples like in China (Wang, 2010). Such children usually have very busy schedules and highly structured free time. Wajd saw extracurricular activities and “exposure” an important investment in her children’s future and an active way by which to enhance his chances of achieving success. Another way of looking at this is through the lens of self-efficacy beliefs: mothers with higher
SES believe that they have more control over the outcome of their children’s development and maybe more actively pursuing their goals (Hoff, Laursen & Tardiff, 2013). Some mothers with lower SES also mentioned how they try to achieve their goals, but it was mostly verbally through repeating ideas they wanted to foster in them.

Another highly educated mother, Dalia (36 years old, BA) whose daughter is in private school, also mentioned activities, particularly her daughter’s performance in them. According to Dalia, leadership is an important goal because the family has a business and she wants her to be able to run it when she grows older. Notice how this is like the connection Laureau (2003) makes between concerted cultivation, economic viability and reproduction of class status:

Dalia: I planted this in her since she was younger. When she was three. We talked about excellence and in my nature, I don’t like people who are followers. I always tell her you must be a leader. So, it seems like it worked. It worked in the right way. When she goes swimming she wouldn’t leave without knowing how to swim. She is not experimenting but rather she goes in and comes out with results. She went to Ballet and starting dancing right. She is very distinguished compared to her age. I can send you some pictures of the activities

Interviewer: what are your goals for her in the future?

Dalia: we have several types of businesses. I want her to lead it. I don’t want her to stray far away. I have a school and her dad has a business. So, I hope she will be a leader, successful manager

Interviewer: this is important to you because you have this business and you want to prepare her for this job?
Dalia: because of this and because I like her to be unique. God willing, we will go into languages now I registered her in a language center. Generally, I like excellence and I want my children to be distinguished not just regular

Excellence here is a goal because the mother likes this trait (as she herself has it) as well as for practical reasons so that her daughter inherits the business and would be capable of running it successfully. Unlike other educated mothers, Dalia wants to stir her daughter in a particular professional direction. Yet, she wants to promote her daughters’ self-actualization evident by that she wants her to be distinguished.

Individualistic values can be found in most of the examples presented above, in particular that which relates to achieving success, being “distinguished”, “unique” and “creative” professionally. The following is a rare example of a more psychological type of individualism. Sama extensively discusses her goal of empowering her daughter:

Excerpt from Sama (32 years old, education: BA, teacher, daughter in private school, husband work: missing)

Interviewer: what are your goals for Tala?

Sama: I put all my effort that she is a child and a teenager and an adult and that she is empowered. In all of what I have from knowledge and experience in life that she is empowered so she can accept life in its negative and positive. I try to tell her everything I know but always have a rule that she learns on her own. In some situations, she has to try and make mistakes and evaluate. At this stage my role is to introduce tools….

Interviewer: why is this important for you?

Sama: It’s important for me that she is empowered because I think it’s the most important thing in life to have the tools to succeed in life. Succeed not by the standard
imposed by the society. Not to finish university and get a house and a car and family…It’s important for me that she tries and makes her own mistakes because I will not be with her all the time or in every situation she gets into…

Sama explicitly uses the word “empowered” to describe her goal and every time she mentioned this goal is was in English. Interestingly, words used in another language while speaking the native language indicated that it’s a concept not native to the culture. Her priority is that her daughter defines her own success thus placing no weight on societal expectations. Also, in her practices she is preparing her for autonomy by allowing her to experiment and make her own mistakes.

Finally, two mothers from this group mentioned that their personal experience of being forced to study what their parents wanted led them to want to give their own children a choice in this matter showing how subjective experiences influence SGs. Kagıtçibasi (2005) and Keller et. al (2008) argue that whether mothers adhere to their parents’ practices is in indication of the maternal cultural model (others with a collectivist model are more likely to replicate practices and ethnotheories).

Whereas choice, being unique and successful were frequently mentioned by educated mothers (and empowerment mentioned once), those goals never came up with the less educated mothers. The goals of the latter group will be discussed in the next section, however, it’s important to keep in mind that these are based on a smaller number of interviews (only four) since as mentioned previously, some of the mothers with children in public schools turned out to have a university degree.
Mothers with lower educational attainment.

Whereas professional success implies earning a degree, most educated mothers did not mention educational achievement as a goal in and of itself (except two out of seven, one of whom only mentioned it briefly). Unlike the educated mothers, the less educated mothers did not take education for granted and for that reason perceived it as a serious and important goal. Probing showed that getting a degree was highly valued because it relates to obtaining a job or a career, which at first glance seems similar to the goals of the other group. However, their notion of what a successful professional life means varied greatly from that mentioned by more educated mothers. Whereas for the later a career included being successful, thriving or following ones’ unique interests and abilities, for less educated mothers (all of whom happened to be lower SES), work is related to securing an income, achieving financial independence or physical comfort:

*Excerpt from Ameera (39 years old, education: primary school, sells homemade food, son is in public school, husband work: street vendor)*

**Interviewer:** you said you wanted for Khalid goodness and that he excels (in school) and makes you proud…

**Ameera:** yes, God willing. Like you are getting an education I hope he does too. There is no more work in Israel, they don’t give permits, without your degree you can’t live. The degree will benefit him. It’s difficult, everything is expensive here. For girls, education is also important as two hands together is a mercy [referring to that when a husband and wife cooperate it makes things more bearable]

**Interviewer:** you want your girls to be educated?
**Ameera:** yes. My girl Farah is thriving she gets honors and the other day she got her card and it was all As. God willing she will be a doctor. Because I am not educated, and my husband isn’t, God gives. She studies on her own, you don’t have to tell her anything, she opens the book and studies and makes no mistake no mistake at all…

Ameera’s goals, even though centered around education, do not necessarily stem from an individualistic cultural model, and do not have the aim of self-actualization. Her goals reflect the changes in the job market that are triggered by changes in the political situation. This is an example of how cultural changes can be triggered by socioeconomic shifts and transitions; an assumption that is core to eco-cultural developmental theories. The same can be said of gender-related norms. For instance, Ameera, at the beginning of the interview was astounded and happy to hear that the researcher, a Palestinian woman is studying abroad. She mentioned that when she was growing up girls were not even allowed to leave the village to study. The high educational aspirations she has for her daughter (and the freedom she is allowing her) are vastly different from the social norms that existed when she was growing up. Her goal seems to be driven by being deprived of something she is passionate about as well as changing economic realities (that one income is no longer sufficient). Interestingly, she is more like the educated mothers in wanting her daughter to have an experience that is different from the one she has, showing an individualistic model. However, Ameera in another part of the interview mentions: “I make my daughter fast. Like my parents brought me up to fast and pray. Like they brought me up I want to bring them up thank God. This is an important point”. This is different from her attitude about education.
Another mother, Sumoud, also has the goal of education, but for a different reason: it relates to her child’s health. This is another example of how goals can reflect individual experiences or circumstance:

Excerpt from Sumoud (23 years old, education: secondary school, not working, son in public school, husband work: construction worker)

Interviewer: did you ever think about the goals you want for him when he grows up?

Sumoud: what I want? I want him to study something for his own good and to find something comfortable that doesn’t make him tired. Because he is always tired from his chest and has allergy from the weather, so I want something that will make him feel comfortable

The quotes from both Ameera and Sumoud illustrate that goals of achieving education or success do not always stem from an individualistic cultural model that focuses on self-actualization, like what was seen amongst the quotes of the educated mothers earlier. The quote below by a third participant further illustrates this point:

Excerpt from Fardous (32 years old, education: Diploma, unemployed, daughter in public school, husband work: street vendor and whatever seasonal work is available)

Interviewer: what is your goal for Bisan?

Fardous: that she gets a good degree. To be shatra and pass high school exams and to be for example a doctor or a teacher. To have a degree…or an architect or lawyer. My ambition is that she has a degree

Interviewer: why is this important for you?

Fardous: because of our conditions. I don’t have the opportunity to work even though I have a Diploma and I am unemployed. I wanted to work as a teacher, but they take more
qualified people. We put a lot of effort and energy and give them what they need without keeping away anything…one gets older not younger and there is no guaranteed income for the future. And no one helps the other. Your children will spend on you…. even though she’s is in first grade, we are on fire waiting for her grades card. Mainly for me and her dad and secondly for her…she is only going to second grade, but we are happy [when she gets good grades] as if she’s in university. Her grandparents show her grades to everyone and post it on social media

What Fardous is saying, strongly resonates with the literature on parenting, class and the Family Change model. Given that the household has unstable income, the mother’s emphasis on education is related to the value of “children as old age security” found in less wealthy and agricultural communities. Fardous literally states that Bisan’s school achievement is mainly for her and her husband, then for her daughter. However, elsewhere in the interview, when asked about whether her goals are different for girls and boys, Fardous focuses on the value of education in providing independence for Bisan: “Yes and it’s [education] probably more important for a girl. Her degree allows her to spend on herself. She wouldn’t wait to see if he is good or not good [husband]. She can spend on herself. You see some girls, one got her degree but did not work and she never knows who her husband will be”. This supports literature that found that parents’ goals for their children reflects and aims to prepare them for their economic and social context (here gender and women’s vulnerability in a patriarchal society). In this case, the mother is most likely referring to arranged marriage, a common phenomenon in Palestine. Fardous’s desire to protect her daughter from a bad husband in the form of financial independence is a goal that values autonomy over interdependence. However, that she also expects her to support her in old age supports the theory that collectivism and individualism are
not mutually exclusive. Distinguishing between the two types of goals (independence and relatedness) during the analysis was often complicated and this will be further explored in the next section.

**Decency, Self-control and Connectedness**

Whereas a strong pattern appeared between self-maximization and maternal education, there were either no or very subtle differences between maternal SES and the other goals mentioned by the mothers. The most common relational goals, across both groups, were related to decency, which was present in nine of the twelve interviews. These relational goals will be discussed in the following pages:

**Decency.**

Goals of decency relate to the child meeting basic needs of what the society deems as appropriate values and behaviors. Within the category of decency, five mothers across the two SES groups hoped that their children would avoid illicit behavior, which they commonly referred to as going down the “wrong path”:

*Excerpt from Sumoud (23 years old, education: secondary school, not working, son in public school, husband work: construction worker)*

**Interviewer:** what goals or things you don’t want him to have when he grows up?

**Sumoud:** when he grows up? To stay as he is not to change and to listen to what he is told [to be obedient] and to stay on the right path not to go down the wrong path like young people these days. In particular, we have young guys who are not on the right path. I want him to stay on the right one

**Interviewer:** what do you mean to stay on the right path. Do you have an example?
**Sumoud:** I mean that he stays focused on his education and doesn’t go out late at night and come back in the morning….

By “we have young guys”, Sumoud is talking about older adolescents in their neighborhood. When mentioning this goal (avoiding illicit behavior), often participants drew from their experiences or observations. The following is another example of this: “*some kids say dirty things if you come to Palestine you see crazy things. Small kids say things it’s not natural. I feel shy when I hear it. I hope my children don’t offend anyone…*” (39 years old, education: primary school, sells homemade food, son is in public school, husband work: street vendor). A further comment on the excerpt by Sumoud above is that even though obedience is a hallmark of collectivist cultures (Le Monda et al., 2007), it was mentioned as a goal only by two participants, one of whom was Sumoud and the other Nida (presented below). The goal of avoiding negative behaviors like smoking, taking drugs and staying up all night seem to be universal and were found by other studies on SGs, particularly with Turkish and Brazilian mothers who had a more collectivist or autonomous-relational model (Citlak et al., 2008; Lordelo, Roethle & Mochizuki, 2012).

Another closely related goal within the category of decency, mentioned by two mothers from the two SES groups is religiosity; and was believed to be important for “righteousness”, “knowing good from evil” and staying on the “right path”. In addition to affecting behavior, religion was associated with *akhlaq;* an Arabic word used by the mothers that means a combination of morals, values and manners. Ameera for example, who was concerned over her children swearing, mentioned religious practices and high *akhlaq* as important goals.

Another goal within decency is relationship to others. Mothers from both groups valued tolerance. Two mothers from lower SES mentioned the good treatment of others (*moa’mala*) and
being considerate of other people as goals. Mothers from higher SES used more abstract relational concepts like being non-judgmental and accepting others:

*Excerpt from Sama (32 years old, education: BA, teacher, daughter in private school, husband work: missing)*

Sama: ...my goal for her to be someone empowered to be loving to learn values that I see are appropriate for her which are the values of love and forgiveness and to not judge people based on their appearance or any other external trait because all people are alike.

**Interviewer:** why is it important that she learns those values?

Sama: because this will relieve her, when she doesn’t judge people she will be relieved. She will be someone who is at peace with herself, let’s say have no internal conflict.

When her *moa’mala* (treatment of) with everyone is that love is what brings us all together. She still doesn’t distinguish between Muslim and Christians, this will begin at school when they separate the students [for the religion class]. So, I try not to focus on the differences that I have no control over. I try to bring her back to that we are all one connected by love. This way she will be distinguished in life and it also contributes to her success when she grows up…

Sama is particularly concerned about her daughter being compassionate and non-judgmental in relation to others’ religion, physical looks and she mentioned elsewhere, poverty. Whereas decency is essentially a social and group-oriented goal, Sama sees forgiveness and love as a gateway to “feeling good about oneself”; a self-maximizing goal. Often throughout the interviews, when asked about why a goal was important, mothers mentioned another goal that was contrary to the cultural model of the first one. It is not clear whether the end goal is more or
less important, but this phenomenon, in its simplest interpretation shows how the individualistic and collectivist goals are not mutually exclusive.

Another example of how relational goals can have non-social purposes is how the goal of “good treatment” is related to success:

*Excerpt from Nida (30 years old, education: BA, not working, son in public school, husband work: construction worker)*

**Interviewer:** what do you mean best upbringing?

**Nida:** to have good *akhlaq* (morals and values), to understand the ways of life and how to *moa’mala* (treat others)

**Interviewer:** why is this important?

**Nida:** it’s important because if a person is educated and their *akhlaq* are not good it’s not be good. *Akhaq* are primary in life. And *moa’mala* because dealing with people is everything. If he’s a lawyer and has an office and treats people in a bad way, it’s not good. Even if he is a clerk or anything else no one will go to him so dealing with people is something very critical and important

Nida viewed morals/values and treating others as important for success. Another mother, in the opposite way, viewed professional success as driving social success. She is the mother who wants her daughter to support them financially when she grows older (mentioned in the previous section of the results). Later in the interview when asked about her undesired SGs, she explained how it’s “not just about the money”:

*Excerpt from Fardous (32 years old, education: Diploma, unemployed, daughter in public school, husband work: street vendor and whatever seasonal work is available)*

**Interviewer:** what goals you don’t want her to have?
**Fardous:** I want her to be *kad halha*\(^3\). That people [don’t] say she is not *shatra*. To hear people say about her that she studied and studied but she is not *shatra*. Or that she is not from the kind of girls that helps her family

**Interviewer:** why is this important for you?

**Fardous:** …when people say something good about your daughter. They’d say her mother knew how to raise her. When her dad is sitting with his friends and they say *mashallah*\(^4\) your daughter helps her father. Some children raise their parents high up while others pull them down. The principle is not only money, but that people say *mashallah* we heard your daughter is a lawyer or your daughter is a doctor. Or they say the girl is a lawyer, but she left her parents behind. It is all relates back to how her mother raised her.

Fardous wants her daughter not only to gain education and get a stable income, but also to fulfill her familial obligations as an adult. This has obvious financial reasons, and less observable social ones: Fardous’s character and quality of parenting (and that of her husband) will be judged according to her daughters’ behavior. As she says, children can raise their parents high or bring them down in the eyes of people. Her daughter’s adherence to what is expected of those “brought up well” is a source of social capital for the parents in the community. This goal was coded under “decency” and not “connectedness” because Fardous speaks of this in terms of social value and moral judgment rather than through an emotional connection.

Finally, the next excerpt is another example of how a self-maximizing goal is motivated by a collectivist purpose:

*Excerpt from Dalia (36 years old, education: BA, school principle, daughter in private school, husband work: business owner)*

---

\(^3\) *Kad halha* means “measure up to her worth” and it combines aspects of strength of character and self-reliance

\(^4\) Literarily means what god will’s and is used to express praise and admiration
Interviewer: why is it important that they are distinguished?

Dalia: I feel a person who is distinguished is comfortable in many things. They are busy with positive things instead of being distracted by negative ones…because of my work, I see how parents suffer, this [student] talks to this and this smokes etc…[they have] a lot of free time. If the person is distinguished and thrives to excellence and their time is full I expect that 70% of the problems of adolescence goes away if their time is occupied. It it’s filled with useful things. Those things lead to excellence and kills boredom.

Being distinguished is a goal that promotes self-actualization but, in this case, serves as a trait that can prevent illicit behaviors. This mother, like others, is speaking from a personal experience of being a school principal and seeing how boredom from her point of view leads children to do what to her are unacceptable behaviors.

Self-control.

The category of self-control relates to control over temperament and curbing egocentric instincts. Whereas this was a prominent goal amongst Puerto Rican, Latina and Euro-American mothers (Harwood, 1992; Leyendecker et al., 2002), only two participants mentioned self-control in relation to temper and aggression and in both cases when talking about a child who was described as a trouble maker or difficult. The following is one example:

Excerpt from Nida (30 years old, education: BA, not working, son in public school, husband work: construction worker)

Interviewer: what goals you don’t want him to have in the future?

Nida: in his personality for example I would like him to be considerate of other people’s circumstances. Sometimes I tell him “your sister did not do this on purpose” and he hits her. He also shouts. Sometimes he comes back and tells me he’s sorry. Sometimes he is
snappy but when he grows up of course I would love that to change. That’s it what’s what right now bothers me

Interviewer: why is this important to you?

Nida: for example, I am his mother, he must talk to me with some politeness regardless, or when [someone do something] not on purpose, he has to forgive. He should have forgiveness not selfishness

The following is another example of self-control as a goal that is based on the individualistic characteristics of the child. Sameera discussed her problems with her son who is aggressive and controlling of his sisters because he is a boy amongst many girls. Like other participants, what the mother observed in the neighborhood affected her goals:

Excerpt from Sameera (43 years old, education: BA, teacher, son in private school, husband work: manager)

Interviewer: what traits you wouldn’t want to see in him?

Sameera: aggressive. I don’t want him to be aggressive. I am afraid he will not finish his education

Interviewer: why are you afraid of this?

Sameera: because I see a lot of boys in our building who are aggressive, and they hit. To be a loved human being. I always try for people to love my son. I always tell him “don’t hit, forgive him, treat them well”. It’s important to me that he is loved by people

According to Harwood (1992), the purpose of self-control as an SG varies with maternal cultural model as they found that the more individualistic U.S. mothers viewed control as important for success while more collectivist Puerto Rican mothers emphasizes its value to relationships with others. Like the latter group, for Sameera, self-control here serves a relational
purpose of being loved and getting along with other people, indicating that she has a collectivist (or autonomous-relational cultural model depending on other SGs).

**Relatedness.**

Connectedness encompasses maintaining relationships with others and with things like culture and identity. Only one mother from the lower SES group mentioned this goal, hoping that her son will “...befriend people who love him and don’t betray him and do stuff do him. That they stay with him and for the friendship to stay forever”. In the higher SES group, three mothers mentioned connectedness more broadly, encompassing a sense of belonging and identity. Maintaining religious and national identity was mentioned in one study by immigrant Turkish mothers living in Germany (Citlak et al., 2008). Concern over loss of identity by the mothers in this study was related to the political situation in Palestine and to the lifestyle mothers predicted or planned for their children.

Sylvia, was the only mother who made an explicit an association between her goals and the political situation in Palestine:

*Excerpt from Sylvia (29 years old, education: MA, manager of non-profit organization, daughter in private school, husband work: manager)*

**Interviewer:** what are your goals for your child?

**Sylvia:** first education it’s number one for me. And I mean education not academic but national education also which is very important. Today’s generation is the IT or social media generation, so people are losing their identity, the Palestinian self and it’s very important to me that they have a sense of belonging to this identity, that it doesn’t disappear in this [political] condition in which we are living.
In addition to academic education, values and morals mentioned elsewhere, Sylvia talks about maintaining a sense of political identity and awareness of history. She goes on to explain the differences between her generation and that of her daughters’:

**Interviewer:** can you explain to me more why this is important?

**Sylvia:** I am the generation of the first intifada and I look at today’s generation that lacks knowledge…to me education is something more noble: it’s history and the neighborhood and how people think and accept the other and how people deal with things in an objective way not in a judgmental way. These things are important to raise children to a higher level. Our children, we must give them space at the end of the day, you want to give them space to think to be creative, I don’t constrict them within a certain frame that makes them like anyone else…I want her to have a sense of belonging to where she is living

By the “generation of the First Intifada”, she is referring to growing up during a time of a civil rights movement in the 1980s, in which education and political awareness were essential to mobilizing people for boycott and civil disobedience. She mentions elsewhere that this is kind of knowledge is currently not taught in universities and so it is up to her to foster that in her daughter. Like other mothers with high SES, to Sylvia, this alternative education must include teaching tolerance and acceptance of others. In accord with the pattern that emerged, this relational goal is also meant to foster self-maximization by giving space to be creative and unique. In the next excerpt, connectedness is more clearly described:

*Excerpt from Wajd (46 years old, education: BA, not working used to work at a managerial level, son in private school, husband work: consultant in private sector)*
Wajd: I would love that he is flexible with the society and with everyone. Inside and outside [the country]. I want that he can combine between being adaptable to societies outside and here because I feel every context has its own particularities for him to be successful in it so I want him to combine both. Outside meaning the West and U.S. like foreign countries and his own country. To have and keep both.

Interviewer: why is this important to you?

Wajd: it’s important because of where he is. He might study abroad but at the same time, I would like him to have the identity and the connection with his family and to his country to remain strong. Because it’s important to me that he remains from where he is, his atmosphere, his family, his history and for that to remain planted in him. Like OK he goes to schools and travels outside but the family and identity and religion, to continue to have that

Wajd emphasizes a sense of belonging to one’s roots, culture, community and family. She also stresses multicultural competency in that her son is able to adapt to different cultures and to be able to succeed in different contexts. Wajd’s views may be an example for a typical autonomous-related self: to have the skills to be independent and successful in new contexts while keeping emotional attachments to the family and community. Wajd’s older son is studying abroad and she is planning that for this son, too, showing, as discussed in other studies, that SGs prepare the child for optimal development within their context. None of the mothers from the lower SES expressed a concern for sense of belonging or mentioned cultural competency, possibly reflecting that they do not expect their children to study or live abroad.

The next excerpt relates more to decency than connectedness but is included here to show how maternal SGs of higher SES mothers reflect their multicultural aspirations. Renad, who
studied abroad, wants to strike a balance between exposing her daughter to different life
experiences similar to the ones she had while also protecting her from the negative things that
may come with that:

Excerpt from Renad (38 years old, education: MA, consultant for non-profit
organizations, daughter in private school, husband work: manager)

Renad: one of the things that scares me right now in Fairouz’s generation is how much
there is drug abuse all over the world. This is one of the things that are known and I
always think about the best way that one can guide their children about this. This is the
only thing I can think of that I don’t want her. Because I want her to go and have fun and
do a lot of things and be exposed but at the same time how can I stop this from happening

Interviewer: what do you mean you want her to be exposed?

Renad: I want her to try. I want her to have experiences in life. I don’t want her to be
isolated. I want her to travel and study abroad. I want her to go to parties of course at a
certain age when she grows older. I have no problem with this openness, but I have some
problems with it. So how to balance this life that I lived but also stop her from the
negative

Like the participants before her, Renad drew on her life experiences and expectations for
the future of her child to shape SGs.

Gender

The majority of the participants (10 out of 12) said that their child’s gender does not
affect their SGs as they have the same goals for boys and girls. Overall, mothers did not discuss
gender related differences or similarities, mostly commenting with “no they are not different”
except for five mothers who discussed it in depth: One mother acknowledged that gender
differences exist in society, but not to her. Three mothers emphasized that there were no differences, especially in relation to education. Quotes from them were presented earlier in the results section. Finally, the two mothers that mentioned differences were from the higher SES group, which is surprising since middle class families were found to have more egalitarian gender roles as compared to working class and very high SES families (McAuliffe, 2013). The first mother discussed that to her, the difference only relates to the biological aspects of women’s ability to have children, which may affect the relative priority of their careers as compared to other things. The second mother spoke about how she structures her son’s and daughters’ chores to reflect what is expected of their gender roles.

None of the mothers disagreed that education is very important for girls, even mothers with low educational attainment agreed that it is important for economic reasons like increased income and fulfilling familial obligations. These mothers, however, valued education even more because they were deprived of it. Emphasizing equal educational opportunities is not very surprising, as Palestinian culture, for historical and political reasons, values education regardless of gender. It is however, surprising that there were no differences in goals related to decency or any of the other categories.
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

This study explored the socialization goals that twelve urban Palestinian (Arab) mothers from diverse educational and SES backgrounds have for their 1st grade children. According to the eco-cultural model of development, socialization goals (SGs) are culturally determined and reflect the prioritized and optimal developmental trajectory of that environment (Greenfield et al., 2003). The aim of the study was to determine the cultural models of urban Palestinian mothers by asking and analyzing their SGs. There are two typical and idealized trajectories of development: individualistic and collectivist. Compared to the collectivist self, the individualist self is more independent and less reliant psychologically and materially on relations with others. At the same time, individuals with this sense of self have more leverage to act freely and with less regards to group norms and expectations as compared to those with collectivist self. These two models exist within and in response to two socioeconomically and culturally different societies (Greenfield et al., 2003). Collectivist self exists in smaller close-knit communities which has subsidence-based economies, whereas individualistic self if promoted in larger, more affluent and industrialized societies. Kagitçibasi (2005) coined the term “autonomous-related” to describe a third developmental trajectory which found amongst middle class families in traditionally collectivist societies. These families adopt individualistic aspects of parenting; mainly cognitive stimulation, fostering critical thinking and an extent of individualism. All while conserving collectivist aspects: strong intergenerational bonds and emotional interdependence. The autonomous-related is believed to be neither individualistic nor collectivist, but a unique combination of the two. In this study, both groups of mothers showed characteristics of an autonomous-related cultural model.
Kagitçibasi (1996, 2005) and Keller et al. (2006) recommended researchers to explore, through qualitative research, samples expected to have an autonomous-related cultural model. While the size of this sample limits the conclusions that can be drawn about the cultural models of urban Palestinian mothers, this design gives valuable information about SGs and diversity within this sample that is brought about by maternal education and household SES. Two measures aimed to capture the cultural model of participants: maternal descriptions of their children and maternal desired and undesired socialization goals. For the majority of the sample, SGs mirrored descriptors, showing that these two measures complement each other. This study set out to answer the following research questions:

A. Mothers from lower SES will show a collectivist model, prioritize goals related to local constructs of “proper demeanor” and their descriptions of their children will be more relational.

The most frequent descriptor amongst this group was related to academic achievement, in particular, the word shatra (females) and shater (males) were often used to describe a child who is smart at school and has good grades. The second most common goal was responsible and reliable, a typically collectivist descriptor. When combining individualistic and collectivist categories together, descriptors show a combination of individualistic and collectivist perceptions unlike what was expected in the research hypothesis above.

Within this group, there were variations between highly educated mothers (BA and above) and mothers with lower education (less than BA degree). Giving personal choice to children and promoting their unique interests and capabilities in order to thrive and succeed was a prominent goal amongst educated mothers in both SES groups. The link between maternal education and individualistic goals (e.g. self-maximization in this case) has been reported in
some studies previously (Manago, 2014; Leyendecker et al., 2005 and Hoff et al., 2002). This study indicates that this link remains strong even when the household SES is low, as evidenced by husbands’ work and that children are in public school. Mothers with lower education focused on education as a goal in and of itself and prioritized job security and comfort over self-actualization, creativity and achieving high success in career.

While there was a clear pattern between maternal education/SES and self-actualization, education and work goals related to proper demeanor were harder to map out. Unlike what was found in other studies on SGs (Harwood, 1992; Harwood et al., 1996; Harwood et al., 2002; Leyendecker et al., 2002), very few mothers mentioned goals related to proper demeanor (only two mothers mentioned obedience). Instead, there was emphasis on goals labeled as “decency”. Palestinian mothers were particularly feared that their child would falling into what are socially considered “illicit behaviors” such as staying up late, swearing and other generic negative behaviors that they labeled “the wrong path”. This goal was also found to be valued by (Lordelo at al., 2012) and Turkish immigrant mothers (Citlak et al, 2008).

Mothers with higher education in this group show a related-autonomous cultural model in that their goals largely fell into the categories of self-actualization and decency. Whether mothers with lower education had a similar model is questionable: it largely depends on whether academic achievement is considered an individualistic or collectivist goal and there is no consensus about this in the literature. In some studies, it is considered a separate category while in other studies it is considered a self-actualizing goal. Another reason is that only four mothers had both low household SES and low education, making any generalizations difficult to make.
B. Mothers from higher SES will have an autonomous-related model. This manifests in socialization goals equally valuing aspects of proper behavior and aspects of self-maximization as well as more individualistic descriptors.

“Social”, a relational descriptor, was most commonly used by higher SES mothers, followed by “lively and active”, a category that falls under temperament and is not considered related to cultural models. When however, all individualistic and collectivist categories are combined, it shows that this group of mothers almost equally reported individualistic and collectivist descriptors; thus, like hypothesis B states, indicating an autonomous-related model.

Since all the mothers in this group were highly educated, the majority mentioned goals related to self-maximization, especially in relation to the professional future of their children. Like educated mothers in the low SES group, self-actualization was mostly expressed in relation to allowing children to have choice over their education and career. While independent was a common individualistic descriptor and goal in other studies (Harwood, 1992; Harwood et al., 1996; Harwood et al., 2002; Leyendecker et al., 2002), this was not the case with this sample. Leadership, thriving and being empowered are other examples of self-actualizing goals that educated mothers mentioned.

Unlike what the hypothesis predicted, “proper demeanor” was not mentioned at all but goals related to decency were common. Like with the low SES group, these were related to avoiding illicit behaviors (such as drugs), having good moral and ethics and treating others well. That the most common descriptors and goals fall into individualistic and collectivist categories, generally indicates that these mothers have an autonomous-related cultural model. Another common goal within this category was related to tolerance, specifically, being non-judgmental and accepting others.
C. Mothers from mid-higher and lower SES will both equally report goals related to decency and lovingness.

As mentioned previously, decency was indeed common across both SES groups and mentioned by mothers with high and low educational attainment. Lovingness, which relates to warmth and getting along in interpersonal relationships was mentioned only by one participant in relation to friendship. The category of “connectedness” emerged and was related to maintaining national and cultural identity and having a sense of belonging to one’s community. This category was unique to the higher SES group and was not mentioned in the lower SES group even by highly educated mothers.

The findings of this study in some ways support but in other ways challenge the Family Change model: SGs did reflect socioeconomic conditions and aimed to prepare children for optimal development within their respective environments. For example, mothers who expected their children to study abroad valued multicultural competency while maintaining a sense of belonging. Mothers’ observations of their neighborhoods informed their desired and undesired SGs, especially in relation to self-control and avoiding illicit behaviors. Other examples include fostering traits like leadership because there is a family business that needs a manager and having the goal of education because the political situation no longer allows for uneducated laborers to work in Israel. This was also intersected with gender: one mother placed high value on educational achievement as a way of protecting her daughter in the future from a bad husband.

Another way the findings support the Family Change model is that autonomous and relational goals were not mutually exclusive so that the same mothers had individualistic and collectivist descriptors and goals. More so, with some goals it was impossible to determine
whether they serve relational or individualistic purposes: for example, maintaining a sense of 
belonging, tolerating differences and treating others well were seen as important because they 
lead to professional success, internal psychological wellbeing and thriving. On the other hand, 
individualistic goals like success and thriving served collectivist purposes like social approval 
and fostering decency respectively. Harwood (1992) also found that self-control served an 
individualistic purpose in middle class Anglo but a relational one in Puerto Rican mothers.

A challenge to the autonomous-related cultural model is that it states that collectivist 
goals will be mostly related to maintaining emotional connections with the family while 
individualistic goals will relate to critical thinking and fostering instrumental independence. 
Most of the collectivist goals that the higher SES mothers had were tolerance and having a sense 
of belonging to the community. Many of these goals are abstract and do not relate specifically to 
maintaining bonds with the family or the parents. The individualistic goals were related to 
thriving and self-maximization but there was no emphasis on critical thinking or independence. 
Would the specific goals found in this study still constitute an autonomous-related model just 
because they are both individualistic and collectivist? Or must the goals correspond to 
Kagitçibasi’s definition, which is based on a certain theoretical reasoning. Keller et al. (2006) 
recommend looking at intracultural differences within the autonomous-relational cultural model, 
indicating the possibility that there are many types or forms of expression of this model.

In addition to understanding the SGs of Palestinian mothers, this study aimed to explore 
the concepts of individualism and collectivism and how these relate to both culture and class as 
recommended by Hill (2006) and Super and Harkness (2006). This study adds to the body of 
research that highlights SES as a determinant of ethnotheories and parental practices within both 
collectivist and individualistic societies. While many SGs across both groups were collectivist in
ways unique to Palestinian mothers, trends along household income and maternal education followed universal patterns: higher income and higher maternal education were associated with individualism. Another finding is that middle-class mothers from a “collectivist” society, used concerted cultivation (Wang, 2012), a practice found in most middle-class “individualistic” societies.

In conclusion, it is difficult to determine the cultural model of Palestinian families because the sample size of this study is too small. This study was the first one to explore SGs of Palestinian mothers and the diversity within them, shedding light on important differences between highly educated and less educated mothers, as well as local constructs of decency. It also contributes to the international literature on the relative role of class and culture in affecting maternal ethnotheories, particularly in collectivist societies. Future studies must consider maternal education and continue to see development through an eco-cultural lens, which has shown to be very useful for understanding ethnotheories in the Palestinian context. The qualitative study also sets the stage for creating culturally relevant questionnaires, that may with bigger sample sizes provide more decisive conclusions about the cultural models of Palestinian mothers.
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APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

I would like your answers to be specific to your own experiences as a mother. Please think about your own child who is in first grade, remember situations that happened with them etc…There are no right and wrong answers; the focus is on your own experiences, perceptions and beliefs.

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself (prompt for: age, education, working/not working, how many children you have, how old are they, how long have you lived in the city, how many children live in your household)

2. Tell me about your son/ daughter. How would you describe him/her? (prompt: Tell me more about what this quality means; can you give me an example)

3. What are your goals for this child when they grow up (further explanation: describe qualities you would like to see in your child as an adult), (prompts: tell me more about what it means; can you give me an example; why is this quality important to you?)

4. Describe qualities you would not like to see in your child as an adult (prompts: tell me more about what this quality means; can you give me an example; why is this quality important to you?)

5. Out of the goals that you mentioned, which one would you say is the most important for your child to have and the one you would say is most important for them not to have (mention the goals to remind the participant)

6. In what ways are your goals for (opposite gender of the target child) different or similar?

Thank you for your time. Do you have any thoughts or anything that you would like to add?

Your time and contribution to the study is greatly appreciated. Please let me know if you are
interested in the results and I can contact you in the case that results are disseminated, or any publication is made.
APPENDIX B: FIGURES

Figure 1: Developmental Niche (Harkness & Super, 2012).

Figure 2: Interpersonal Distance and Agency Combine to Create Four Cultural Models (Kagitçibasi, 2005).
APPENDIX C: RECRUITMENT PAMPHLET

Dear parent,

My name is Layaly Hamayel, a Masters student at Illinois State University in the field of developmental psychology. For my thesis, I want to learn about yours and others’ opinions about parenting and being a mother. Participation is voluntary, but I would appreciate your insights and hope you would help me with my study. Interviews will take between 20 and 40 minutes. Since I am currently living abroad for study purposes, I will arrange with you, if you agree, a time and day to call you. I will record our call, transcribe the information and then delete the recordings and remove your names to ensure your privacy.

If you are interested in participation or if you have further questions about the study please provide your phone number and name below. Then please return this paper with your child tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. We will be in touch with you shortly after to answer any questions or arrange for an interview time.

Thank you very much.

Layali Hamayel
Masters student
Illinois State University

*If you wish to be contacted please fill in the information below:

Name: ........................................

Phone number: ...............................
APPENDIX D: CONSENT FORM

Dear Mrs.:

My name is Layali Hamayel, a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Gregory Braswell in the Master in Developmental Psychology program in the psychology department at Illinois State University. I am conducting a research study to explore parenting practices and beliefs of mothers living in Ramallah. This study will shed light on the cultural orientations of families currently living in an urban Palestinian community. These results may be useful for policy makers and practitioners working with families in Palestine. Hopefully, it might also be an enjoyable experience for you to talk about your daughter/son.

Your participation in the study is strictly voluntary. If you refuse to participate, you are free to do so with no consequence or penalty. If you choose to participate, you have the right to withdraw at any time without any consequences or penalty. The interview will take between 20 and 40 minutes depending on your answers. I will ask you questions related to your opinions and experiences of being a parent. Because the questions relate to personal experiences, at times you may feel uncomfortable disclosing certain things. You are entirely free to refrain from answering any questions you do not want to or feel uncomfortable to answer. More so, if this happens, I can advise you on where to go for support. The name and contact information of a professional organization is also attached at the end of this document.

I will audio tape your interview and then transcribe so it is in a written form. Next, I will delete the recordings and will not include your names in the written transcripts. Your transcripts will be stored in a secure place and will be used for research purposes only. I will use your testimonies along with those of the other participants to extract themes and information to be
analyzed. When I present the findings of the study, I will summarize and describe your responses. I may also use direct quotations but will not mention your read names, only pseudo names accompanied with information like age.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Illinois State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact me at [Redacted] or [Redacted] (WhatsApp). You may also contact my professor, Dr. Braswel at [Redacted]. Also, if you have any questions regarding your rights in relation to the study, you may contact the Research Ethics & Compliance Office at Illinois State University at +1 (309) 438-2529 and/or rec@ilstu.edu.

Given the information above, would you like to participate in this study?

Sincerely,

Layali Hamayel
Masters student
Illinois State University
Normal, IL, U.S.A
Email: [Redacted]

Principal Investigator:
Dr. Gregory Braswell
Associate Professor,
Illinois State University
Normal, IL, 61791-4620, U.S.A
Email: [Redacted]

Contact information for psychosocial support center:
Palestinian Counselling Centre
Al-Tashree’e building, 3rd floor, Al-Masyoon, Ramallah
## APPENDIX E: CODING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table E-1</th>
<th>Coding of Descriptives Based on Two types of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Analysis (Mone et al., 2014)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Code Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>Achievement/smart in School (shater/shatra</em>)</em>*</td>
<td>Shater (smart at school), grades (good/excellent/bad), teacher says he/she is shater outstanding in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities &amp; Hobbies</strong></td>
<td>Loves to play, loves to dance and sing, outgoing and loves nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spends time on the internet, likes shopping, she likes to dress up and buy clothes and put cremes and perfumes, goes to ballet and swimming classes, likes music and drawing, loves to eat.</strong></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lively &amp; Active</strong></td>
<td>Active, during events he gets really excited, gets excited about little things, jumps happily and smiles, likes fun and loves life, wants to try new things, full of life, spreads energy and life around her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talks a lot, communicates with people actively and positively.</strong></td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inquisitive &amp; Driven to Learn</strong></td>
<td>Asks a lot of questions, asks about everything and anything, wants to learn everything, wants to attend extracurricular activities, asks a lot of deep questions, doesn’t go to activates just to enjoy but to learn, interested in knowledge and remembers facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easygoing (Mrayehnee/beghalibnish</strong>*/difficult**</td>
<td>Light doesn't cause trouble, easygoing around people, flexible with change, doesn’t cause problems with homework when mother teaches him because he’s a quick learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very difficult for mother to get him to study, doesn't want to do his homework.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shater and Shatra (male/females) is “smartness” but was mostly used in relation to school and academic achievement. Was a very common description.

** In Arabic mrayehneh literary means “is comfortable for me” while beghalibnish means “doesn’t cause me discomfort or difficulties”.

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Analysis (Mone et al., 2014)</th>
<th>Code Content</th>
<th>Seidle-de-Moura et al. (2013) Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart / intelligent***</td>
<td>Smart/very smart, doesn’t do something he/she isn’t convinced with, older than his/her age, aware of everything around him and understands what’s happening, good at life, observes his/her surroundings and learns from it, learns everything fast, counts money and can tell if it’s enough for grocery, knows how to use the internet, wants to repeat everything he sees around him, really creative with Lego and puzzles, rich language, knows a lot and participates in discussions within the family, teacher says she’s smart.</td>
<td>Independence/autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible &amp; Reliable</td>
<td>Knows his responsibilities, wants to work to support the family financially</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can buy anything the mother asks him/her from the shop.</td>
<td>Independence/autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>When she understands how and why, she’s cooperative, listens and pays attention,</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive in School</td>
<td>Loves school, participates in class, doesn’t delay doing homework when he/she gets home, asks for homework when he/she misses school, competitive and cares about her/his grades, respects school rules, mother can rely on her to do her own homework.</td>
<td>Independence/autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Wants to meet people, teachers mentioned he is social, makes new friends, has friends over and goes over to her friends, now she gets used to people faster, she loves people, interacts with people.</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loved</td>
<td>Teachers love him, close to the heart, loved</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfocused/focused</td>
<td>Gets distracted, focused at home and at school</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Behavior (shaa’e***</td>
<td>Demanding, never calms downs, she causes trouble (fuss/problem) if she saw her siblings sitting quietly</td>
<td>Internalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He thinks he’s the man of house and tries to control his sisters because he came after eight girls, as, he hits his sisters</td>
<td>Externalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** This coding based on participants’ explanation of what this word means to them
**** Shaa’e means trouble makes and this was the original word used by mothers (not negative behavior)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Analysis (Mone et al., 2014)</th>
<th>Code Content</th>
<th>Seidle-de-Moura et al. (2013) Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articulate</td>
<td>Easily expresses his feelings</td>
<td>Independence/autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Willed</td>
<td>Insists on choosing things for himself, imposes his view, doesn't compromise when he’s right, must get back if someone wronged him. teachers complain from his stubbornness, does not listen, she has to get what she wants</td>
<td>Independence/autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Gets upset if she makes her parents upset, doesn’t like shouting or to hear anyone shout even her baby brother, if gets easily upset and cries when her siblings take something from her</td>
<td>Negative Temperament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>She wants to be a leader, bold, wants to be number one in everything.</td>
<td>Independence/autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>Takes others into account</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>Able to be friends with everyone without upsetting anyone-this is the feedback from school</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Sometimes he helps me with cooking</td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solver</td>
<td>A thinker and problem solver, this is what the school says about her, finds the solution to everything</td>
<td>Independence/autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>Loves her family</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Education</td>
<td>I and C Descriptors</td>
<td>Desired Socialization Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school lower education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Achievement in school</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong willed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible &amp; reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Proactive in school</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 5</td>
<td>Achievement in school</td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquisitive &amp; driven to learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent/smart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible &amp; reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 11</td>
<td>Achievement in school</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive in school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible &amp; reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 7</td>
<td>Achievement in school</td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquisitive &amp; driven to learn</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong willed</td>
<td>Decency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible &amp; reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 8</td>
<td>Strong willed</td>
<td>Self -Maximization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 3</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>Connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Decency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-Education</th>
<th>Land C Descriptors</th>
<th>Desired Socialization Goals</th>
<th>Undesired Socialization Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview 4</td>
<td>Achievement in school</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquisitive &amp; driven to learn</td>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>Connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent/smart</td>
<td>Decency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 6</td>
<td>Achievement in school</td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent/smart</td>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Decency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 9</td>
<td>Inquisitive &amp; driven to learn</td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
<td>Proper demeanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem solver</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 10</td>
<td>Achievement in school</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Proper demeanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper demeanor</td>
<td>Connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 12</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Proper demeanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-maximization</td>
<td>Proper demeanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper demeanor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>