Migrants and the meaning of parenthood: involuntary childless Turkish migrants in The Netherlands
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BACKGROUND: Parenthood motives of infertile Turkish migrant men and women in The Netherlands are compared with those of infertile Dutch men and women. Additionally, the question of whether the importance of various parenthood motives of Turkish migrants are related to the degree of adaptation to the Dutch culture was investigated.

METHODS: Questionnaires were administered to 58 involuntary childless Turkish migrant men and women and 162 involuntary childless Dutch men and women.

RESULTS: Individual parenthood motives were most important to both Turkish migrant and Dutch men and women. While social motives were quite important to Turkish migrants, they were unimportant to Dutch men and women. Four aspects of adaptation (norms and values, social integration, skills, absence of feelings of loss related to migration) were negatively related to the importance of social parenthood motives for Turkish migrant women. For Turkish migrant men two aspects of adaptation (traditions and absence of loss) were negatively related to the importance of social parenthood motives.

CONCLUSION: Turkish migrant and Dutch men and women differ in the importance of social motives. However, Turkish migrants who are more adapted to the Dutch culture give less importance to social parenthood motives.
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Introduction

The desire to have a child is a universal phenomenon. However, the reasons why people want to have a child differ. Studies regarding the parenthood motives of people show a wide variety in motives, and the importance people attach to these motives (Van Balen and Inhorn, 2002). In their description of the differences in parenthood motives around the world, Van Balen and Inhorn (2002) divide the diverse reasons into two types: social parenthood motives and individual parenthood motives. Social motives include social power reasons (having children gives status or adult identity), continuation motives (the desire for immortality through one’s own children, continuation of family name and human survival), social pressure motives (implicit and explicit expectations to have children) and economical reasons (the contribution children can have to the family survival by labour and by taking care of their parents). Individual motives are related to the child (the joy and feelings of luck children bring and the unique relationship with the child), and also to the partner. Motives concerning the biological urge and having children as life or family fulfillment also belong to the individual cluster. While individual motives generally appear to be universally present in all cultures, differences across cultures exist regarding social motives (Van Balen and Inhorn, 2002). As shown in several studies, these differences can be related to variation in national cultural variables (such as degree of pronatalist social norms, position of men and women, family structure), religion, economic welfare and demographic variables (e.g. Aghajanian, 1988; Newton et al., 1992; Miller, 1994; Jacobs, 1995; Colpin et al., 1998; Schenker, 2000; Van Balen and Inhorn, 2002; Kagitcibasi and Ataca, 2005; Trommsdorff et al., 2005). However, little is known about parenthood motives of people with a non-western background living in a Western society (henceforth called migrants). In this study a specific group of migrants (involuntary childless Turkish migrants in The Netherlands) is studied as a step towards understanding the relationship of parenthood motives with the relative influence of the culture of origin and the culture of the country of residence. The parenthood motives of involuntary childless men and women are generally easier to study because they often have more manifest reasons to desire a child than fertile people, while their parenthood motives do not differ from the general population (Van Balen and Trimbos-Kemper, 1995). Therefore we have chosen this group for our study.

Previous studies in Turkey and in The Netherlands about parenthood motives revealed differences in parenthood motives in the Turkish and the Dutch cultures. Studies about the desire for a child and the value of children in Turkey show, besides the great importance of individual parenthood motives, the high social importance of having children (Ataca and Sunar, 1999; Kagitcibasi and Ataca, 2005). Having children is
the social norm, functions for men as a proof of manhood and provides status for both men and women (Sahinoglu Pelin, 1997; Unalan, 1997; Hortacsu, 1999; Guz et al., 2003). Turkish men and women also marry relatively early and have children relatively early in their marriage (Ataca et al., 2005). This pronatalist feature of the Turkish society might be related to the strong emphasis within Islam, the dominant religion in Turkey, on procreation, and to traditional patriarchal cultural beliefs regarding procreation (Beller-Hann, 1999; Schenker, 2000; Van Rooij et al., 2004). Additionally, the pronatalist character might be related to the relatively moderate economical welfare (World Health Organization, 2005). In rural areas, particularly, having children can provide income. Turkish migrants in The Netherlands, however, are confronted with a new culture, a different religion and more economical welfare. Their parenthood motives might be influenced by the Dutch culture. In the Dutch culture individual motives are the most important motives, while social motives are far less important. Besides, there are differences regarding parenthood motivations between men and women. For example, having children as a life-fulfillment is more important to Dutch women than to Dutch men (Bos et al., 2003; Van Balen and Trimbos-Kemper, 1995).

Although the confrontation with a Western culture might influence the cultural framework of migrants in several directions (e.g. Berry, 1998; Berry et al., 1989), we focussed on adaptation, which means adopting the host culture and active participation in that host culture. In this article we investigated the role of adaptation to the Dutch culture with regard to the parenthood motives of involuntary childless Turkish migrants in The Netherlands. We supposed that a greater adaptation to the Dutch culture is related to fewer differences in their parenthood motives with those of Dutch men and women. We first addressed the question of whether there are differences between Turkish migrant men and women on the one hand and Dutch men and women on the other hand. Also differences between women and men in both groups with respect to parenthood motives were examined. Secondly, we analysed how parenthood motives of Turkish migrants were related to their adaptation to the Dutch culture to answer our hypothesis.

Materials and methods

Recruitment

Infertile Turkish migrants who were involuntarily childless in their current relationship and living in The Netherlands, were recruited both inside and outside the Dutch medical system. A total of 58 respondents were recruited (23 couples, 1 man and 11 women). Thirty respondents were recruited through hospitals. In the hospitals a member of the medical team functioned as a contact person for the researchers and organized the recruitment of patients in their hospitals. We asked the contact person to provide all patients who met the inclusion criteria with an information letter in Dutch and Turkish during their hospital visits. After reading the letter they asked patients to sign an informed consent form as to whether they were willing to participate or not. Although hospitals were asked to report both the number of patients willing to participate and the number of patients not willing to participate, not all hospitals reported the numbers of the latter group. It is our impression that due to other priorities medical staff often failed to provide patients with information about our study. Therefore no exact response rates can be given. However, the few hospitals that did mention the negative responses reported that a majority of patients did not want to participate. According to the medical staff of these hospitals, reasons given by non-participating patients were that they were too busy, too emotional and the subject too private. These reasons also applied to the non-participating partners of subjects. Additionally, some partners were not included in the study as they had a different ethnic background. Medical staff suggested that feelings of guilt, shame and unwilling partners were reasons not to participate. The other 28 respondents were recruited through other entries, mainly through advertisements on the website of the Dutch Patient Association for people with fertility problems (Freya), through advertisements in Turkish-Dutch magazines and through Turkish migrant community workers. As these entries mainly depend on the active actions of the subjects themselves, no response rates can be given.

Due to the absence of national population data about the prevalence of infertility among Turkish migrants, we do not know whether our sample is representative or not. However, we have tried to enhance the representativeness by recruitment through different entries (medical and non-medical entries), located in all different areas were Turkish migrants live in The Netherlands. It was expected that the Turkish migrants would be significantly younger than the Dutch men and women, as in the general population the average age of Turkish migrants when marrying and the average age of Turkish migrant females when having their first child are significantly lower than among Dutch women (Distelbrink and Loozen, 2005; Garsen et al., 2005). Consequently, Turkish migrant women dealing with fertility problems might also be younger than Dutch women (see also Gacinski et al., 2002). Additionally, it was expected that the Turkish migrant group would have lower education than the Dutch, as the general Dutch population is more highly educated than the Turkish migrants in The Netherlands (Statistics Netherlands, 2004). As a referent group, a sample collected by Van Balen and Trimbos-Kemper (1995) in a previous study about the experiences of involuntary childlessness among involuntary childless Dutch men and women was used. Van Balen and Trimbos-Kemper selected a total of 328 involuntary childless subjects (164 couples), who had been examined in an academic hospital, from the files of the hospital and asked them by letter to participate in the study. Of these, 216 subjects (108 couples) were willing to cooperate in the study (66% response rate). The sample was a good representation of the Dutch population with respect to age, religious denomination, community-character and age differences between husbands and wives. The educational level was a little higher than the educational level of the general population. The most important reasons mentioned for not cooperating were that it would be too emotional and the fear of reliving their infertility experiences. For the current study 162 subjects (70 couples and 7 men and 15 women) were selected according to the same criteria as the Turkish migrant sample (the absence of foster or adoptive children, and a continuing desire for a child) and to their Dutch background.

Procedure

Subjects of both groups were asked to answer a structured written questionnaire at home. An interviewer was present to help if necessary and, if both partners participated, to certify that men and women answered the questionnaire separately. The Turkish migrant sample was visited by a bilingual Dutch interviewer. They could choose between a Dutch version and a Turkish version of the questionnaire. To obtain a Turkish version of the questionnaire several steps were taken. The first step consisted of collecting existing Turkish versions of scales. All other scales were translated into Turkish and independently translated back into Dutch. Afterwards, the few differences in translations were resolved by discussion. Furthermore, several experts (medical, Turkish and anthropological) and laypersons were consulted.
on the cultural relevance and comprehensibility of the questionnaire (as suggested by Van de Vijver and Tanzer, 2004). A preliminary version of the questionnaire was piloted, after which no changes were made with respect to the scales used in this study.

**Measures**

**Parenthood motives**

Data concerning the motives subjects have for wanting children were collected by using the Parenthood Motivation List (PML) (Van Balen and Trimbos-Kemper, 1995). The PML is a self-report questionnaire and consists of 18 items, divided equally over six motives: (1) happiness, (2) well-being, (3) parenthood, (4) identity, (5) continuity and (6) social control. The first three subscales—happiness, well-being and parenthood, include individual motives, while the latter (identity, continuity and social control) fall within the cluster of social motives. Happiness refers to the expected feelings of affection and joy in the relationship with children (e.g. ‘children make me happy’). Well-being includes the expected positive effects for the family-relationship and having children as an accomplishment of life (e.g. ‘makes life complete’). Parenthood refers to the feelings of being a parent and experiencing pregnancy and birth (e.g. ‘to experience pregnancy and birth’). Identity refers to the desire to have children as means of achieving adulthood and strengthening identity (e.g. ‘sign of being grown up’). Continuity refers to the desired affective relationship with grown-up children and the wish to live on after death through one’s children (e.g. ‘to continue living’). Social control or pressure encompasses implicit or explicit pressure from outside the couple to procreate (e.g. ‘is expected by others’). Respondents were asked to indicate on a 3-point Likert-scale (1 = not important, 3 = very important) how important the mentioned item was to them. The reliability of the subscales in this study ranged from sufficient to good regarding the Dutch sample, the reliability of the subscales ranged from α = 0.56 to 0.77.

**Happiness**

Happiness refers to the expected feelings of affection and joy in the relationship with children (e.g. ‘children make me happy’). Life satisfaction measures whether respondents are happy with the current situation and happy with life (e.g. ‘I feel satisfied’). With respect to the Dutch sample, the reliability of the subscales ranged from sufficient to good for all subscales (ranging from α = 0.56 to 0.77).

**Adaptation to Dutch culture**

To determine the adaptation of Turkish migrants to the Dutch culture an adapted version of the Lowlands Acculturation Scale (LAS: Mooreen et al., 2001) was used. The LAS has been used in research on Turkish migrants in The Netherlands (Kamperman et al., 2003a, 2003b; Trinidad et al., 2005) and measures whether respondents are adapted to the Dutch culture (1 = not at all adapted to the Dutch culture; 5 = fully adapted to the Dutch culture). The LAS includes 5 subscales: (1) norms and values (5 items, α = 0.56), (2) traditions (4 items, α = 0.65), (3) loss related to migration (7 items, α = 0.82), (4) social integration (4 items, α = 0.64) and (5) skills (5 items, α = 0.72). ‘Norms and values’ assesses attitudes towards Dutch morality (e.g. ‘I feel the Dutch man has little authority within his family’). The second subscale ‘Preserving traditions’ measures daily behaviour and cognition (e.g. ‘I consider it important to pass our traditions on to the next generation’). The third subscale (loss related to migration) assesses the thoughts and attitudes around the issue of loss related to migration (e.g. ‘My working status is lower than it used to be’). Social integration focuses on integration into the Dutch society (e.g. ‘Dutch people make me feel welcome’). The fifth subscale, acquiring new skills, is directed towards the accomplishment of new requirements (e.g. ‘I have fewer career opportunities than Dutch people’).

**Sociodemographic variables**

Several sociodemographic variables were assessed: age, ethnicity, educational level, urbanity and migration history. Ethnicity was measured by place of birth of respondents and their parents. Educational level was assessed by grouping subjects’ highest completed education into: (1) no or primary education, and lower theoretical and practical secondary school; (2) higher theoretical secondary or middle professional school; (3) higher education (such as universities) (in line with Statistics Netherlands).

**Statistical analyses**

To test for differences between the Turkish migrant and the Dutch sample on parenthood motives two methods of data analysis were used. First, independent sample t-tests were conducted including all subjects to test for differences in parenthood motives between Turkish migrant men and Dutch men and between Turkish migrant women and Dutch women. Additionally, when differences between the two sample in age and or educational level were found, MANCOVA analyses were used using these differences as covariates. Paired t-tests were used including only couples to test for differences between the sexes in parenthood motives and in adaptation. The relationship between parenthood motives and adaptation of Turkish migrant men and women to the Dutch culture was assessed by using Pearson correlation.

With respect to background variables, independent sample t-tests were used to test for differences between Turkish migrants and Dutch men and women in age. Paired t-tests were used including only couples to test for age differences between the sexes. Differences between Turkish migrant men and Dutch men and women in the educational level were assessed by using the Mann–Whitney U-test. Wilcoxon tests were used to test for gender differences in educational level, including only couples.

**Subjects sociodemographic background**

The sociodemographic characteristics of the Turkish migrant and Dutch group are listed in Table I. The Turkish migrant sample included 58 respondents (23 couples, 1 men and 11 women). Turkish migrant men were significantly older than their wives. Turkish migrant women and men did not differ in their educational level. The majority of the Turkish migrant men and women were born in Turkey (82%); 16% were born in The Netherlands. One person was born as a Turkish migrant, but raised in Turkey. Almost half of the people born in Turkey came to The Netherlands because of their marriage (45%). Thirty-eight percent came to The Netherlands with their families or to be reunited with their families. A few people had other reasons to migrate to The Netherlands (economical reasons, curiosity etc.) (17%). The average duration of living in The Netherlands for both men and women was 17 years (SD = 10.62). All Turkish migrants visited Dutch hospitals because of fertility problems.

The Dutch sample consisted of 162 respondents (70 couples, 7 men and 15 women). Dutch men were significantly older than Turkish women. There was no significant difference between the educational levels of Dutch men and women.

As expected, both Dutch male and female respondents were significantly older than the Turkish migrant respondents. Contrary to our expectations, Dutch and Turkish migrant respondents did not differ significantly in educational level. All participants from both samples visited hospitals due to fertility problems.

**Results**

**Parenthood motives**

Comparisons between the Turkish migrant sample and the Dutch sample revealed that all social parenthood motives—identity, continuity and social control—were more important to both Turkish migrant men and women than to Dutch men and
Parenthood motives of infertile Turkish migrants

Table I. Sociodemographic characteristics of subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish migrant</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Women (n = 34)</th>
<th>Men (n = 24)</th>
<th>Women (n = 85)</th>
<th>Men (n = 77)</th>
<th>Turkish migrant women versus Dutch women</th>
<th>Turkish migrant men versus Dutch men</th>
<th>Turkish migrant women versus Turkish migrant men</th>
<th>Dutch women versus Dutch men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.001b</td>
<td>0.001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>29.74</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>37.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NSc</td>
<td>NSd</td>
<td>NSd</td>
<td>NSd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4Independent sample t-test.
5Paired t-test.
6Mann–Whitney U-test.
7Wilcoxon test.
NS, not significant.

Table II. Parenthood motives of involuntary childless Turkish migrants and Dutch (mean, standard deviation and comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish migrant</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Women (n = 82–85)</th>
<th>Men (n = 76–77)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>2.62 (0.35)</td>
<td>2.50 (0.49)</td>
<td>2.53 (0.47)</td>
<td>2.42 (0.51)</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>2.54 (0.51)</td>
<td>2.12 (0.67)</td>
<td>2.46 (0.68)</td>
<td>2.02 (0.64)</td>
<td>3.28**</td>
<td>2.88**</td>
<td>−0.15</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood</td>
<td>2.53 (0.45)</td>
<td>2.35 (0.60)</td>
<td>2.33 (0.58)</td>
<td>2.02 (0.58)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>2.28 (0.50)</td>
<td>1.40 (0.48)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.49)</td>
<td>1.40 (0.47)</td>
<td>8.88***</td>
<td>8.37***</td>
<td>−0.73</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>2.13 (0.62)</td>
<td>1.45 (0.47)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.65)</td>
<td>1.48 (0.52)</td>
<td>5.79***</td>
<td>6.46***</td>
<td>−2.10*</td>
<td>−0.29</td>
<td>−0.29</td>
<td>−0.29</td>
<td>−0.29</td>
<td>−0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control</td>
<td>1.71 (0.59)</td>
<td>1.24 (0.40)</td>
<td>1.67 (0.60)</td>
<td>1.17 (0.58)</td>
<td>4.22***</td>
<td>3.83**</td>
<td>−0.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parenthood motives: 1 = Not important at all; 3 = Very important.
*P < 0.05.
**P < 0.01.
***P < 0.001.

women (see Table II). No differences existed concerning the importance of the parenthood motive happiness between Turkish migrant men and Dutch men and between Turkish migrant women and Dutch women. Differences were found in the importance of the parenthood motive well-being. Well-being was more important to both Turkish migrant men and women than to Dutch men and women. The parenthood motive parenthood was more important to Turkish migrant men than to Dutch men. However, no differences in the importance of the parenthood motive were found between Turkish migrant and Dutch women. Comparisons between the sexes showed a few differences between men and women on the distinguished motives. Turkish migrant men and women differed significantly on the importance of continuation in their desire for a child. Having children for continuation reasons was significantly more important for Turkish migrant men than for Turkish migrant women. Dutch couples only differed from each other in the emphasis they gave to parenthood as a life-fulfillment, Dutch women giving higher rates than Dutch men. The hierarchy of motives, however, is similar for both the Dutch and The Turkish migrant male and female groups.

As significant differences were found between the two samples in age (Dutch being older than Turkish migrant men and women), additional analyses were conducted using age as a covariate. However, after controlling for age, all differences between Turkish migrant men and Dutch men and between Turkish migrant women and Dutch women in parenthood motives remained significant.

Cultural adaptation

The degree of cultural adaptation of Turkish migrant men and women to the Dutch culture is shown in Table III. Both men and women were moderately adapted to the Dutch culture with respect to feelings of loss related to their migration, were quite well adapted to the Dutch culture regarding their skills to participate in the Dutch society, were quite well adapted with respect to social integration and were just slightly adapted to the Dutch culture with regard to traditions. Turkish migrant men and women differed with respect to their norms and values, women adapting slightly more to Dutch norms and values than men. No differences between the sexes were found on the subscales social integration, traditions, skills and loss.

Relationship between adaptation and parenthood motives

For Turkish migrant women a significant negative correlation existed between the subscale norms and values and the parenthood motives of well-being, identity, continuity, and social control.
Adaptation to the Dutch culture of Turkish migrant men and women (mean, standard deviation and comparison)

*Note. 1 = Not at all adapted to the Dutch culture; 5 = Fully adapted to the Dutch culture.
*P < 0.05.
**P < 0.01.
***P < 0.001.

Other significant negative correlations were found between the subscale social integration and the motive parenthood, between the subscale skills and the motive identity, and between the subscale loss and the motive identity. For Turkish migrant men a significant positive correlation was found between the subscale skills and the motive well-being. Significant negative correlations for Turkish migrant men were found between the subscales feelings of loss related to migration and the motives parenthood, identity, social control and continuity. Other significant negative correlations existed between the subscales traditions and the motives well-being, parenthood and continuity (see Table IV).

Discussion

This study compares the parenthood motives of involuntary childless Turkish migrant men and women and those of involuntary childless Dutch men and women. Furthermore, its purpose was to examine the relation between adaptation to Dutch culture and parenthood motives. The results of this study show that, in the desire for a child, individual motives are the most important parenthood motives for both involuntary childless Turkish migrant and Dutch men and women. However, while social motives are of little importance to Dutch, these motives play a quite important to very important role for Turkish migrant men and women. Conforming with our expectations the infertile Turkish migrants were younger than the infertile Dutch men and women, due to marrying earlier and trying to have children early in their marriage. Therefore, we conducted additional analyses controlling for age. However, the differences between the two samples remained significant when age was controlled for. The continuing importance of social parenthood motives for Turkish migrants might be the consequence of the continuation of several factors influencing social parenthood motives: the pronatalist characteristic of the Turkish culture, Islam and the patriarchal feature of the Turkish culture. Yüksel and colleagues (Yüksel et al., 1996; Gacinski et al., 2002) reported an ongoing pronatalist culture within the Turkish migrant community. This might also be valid for The Netherlands. Additionally, Islam remained the most important religion among Turkish migrants in The Netherlands (Statistics Netherlands, 2005). Nauck and Kohlmann (1999) observed that the patrilineal feature of the Turkish society is continuing among Turkish migrants in Germany. This might also be the case among Turkish migrants in The Netherlands and might account for the findings that the continuation of family name and family line is more important to Turkish migrant men than to Turkish migrant women. No differences in this respect were found between Dutch men and women. This is in accordance with the findings of other Dutch studies (e.g. Bos et al., 2003).

The equal importance of the motives parenthood and identity to Turkish migrant women and men suggests that within the Turkish migrant society both men and women are guided to parenthood. The existence of individual as well as social parenthood motives among Turkish migrants is in line with findings in Turkey (Ataca et al., 2005; Kagitcibasi and Ataca, 2005). Nevertheless, relationships were found between the importance of certain parenthood motives and adaptation to the Dutch culture. As our findings regarding the Turkish migrants are based on a limited sample size our results have to be interpreted with caution. We, therefore, first focus on these sub-scales of adaptation that show significant relationships with more than one type of parenthood motive. These aspects are for Turkish migrant men traditions and no feelings of loss. For

Table III. Adaptation to the Dutch culture of Turkish migrant men and women (mean, standard deviation and comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women (n = 32)</th>
<th>Men (n = 24)</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms and values</td>
<td>3.21 (0.73)</td>
<td>2.91 (0.68)</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>3.54 (0.78)</td>
<td>3.55 (0.65)</td>
<td>−0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>2.20 (0.75)</td>
<td>2.17 (0.88)</td>
<td>−0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>3.71 (0.97)</td>
<td>3.62 (0.78)</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feelings of loss</td>
<td>3.01 (0.89)</td>
<td>3.11 (0.82)</td>
<td>−1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV. Correlation between parenthood motives and adaptation to the Dutch culture (LAS) (one-tailed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Happiness</th>
<th>Well-being</th>
<th>Parenthood</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Continuity</th>
<th>Social control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish migrant women (n = 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms and values</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>−0.45**</td>
<td>−0.10</td>
<td>−0.37*</td>
<td>−0.56***</td>
<td>−0.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>−0.24</td>
<td>−0.39*</td>
<td>−0.17</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
<td>−0.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>−0.09</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>−0.17</td>
<td>−0.19</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>−0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>−0.33*</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feelings of loss</td>
<td>−0.18</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>−0.31*</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish migrant men (n = 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms and values</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
<td>−0.34</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>−0.33</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>−0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>−0.25</td>
<td>−0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>−0.39*</td>
<td>−0.39*</td>
<td>−0.18</td>
<td>−0.35*</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feelings of loss</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>−0.24</td>
<td>−0.37*</td>
<td>−0.42*</td>
<td>−0.43*</td>
<td>−0.55**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parenthood motives: 1= Not important at all; 3=Very important; LAS: 1 = Not at all adapted to the Dutch culture; 5 = Fully adapted to the Dutch culture.
*P < 0.05.
**P < 0.01.
***P < 0.001.
Turkish migrant women these aspects are norms and values. All social motives are less important to Turkish migrant men, if they experience fewer feelings of loss related to migration. One of the social aspects, having children for continuation reasons, also becomes less important to Turkish migrant men, if less importance is given to Turkish traditions. For Turkish migrant men, less importance to preserving Turkish traditions and fewer feelings of loss also correspond with less weight to the individual motive parenthood. Traditions also correspond with less importance to the individual parenthood motive well-being. Hence, if Turkish migrant men adapt to the Dutch culture in terms of traditions and feeling at home, their parenthood motives also become more similar to the parenthood motives of Dutch men. For Turkish migrant women the adaptation to the Dutch norms and values related negatively to identity, continuity, social control and well-being. These same parenthood motives were found to be more important to Turkish migrant women than to Dutch women. Consequently, if Turkish migrant women adapt to Dutch norms and values, their parenthood motives become more similar to the parenthood motives of Dutch women. For Turkish migrant women, aspects of adaptation that only had relationships with one type of parenthood motives were skills, feelings of loss and social integration. When Turkish migrant women have more skills to participate in the Dutch culture and feel less loss related to their migration, having children is also less important for their own identity. The more socially integrated the Turkish migrant women are, the less important the motive parenthood is. As no differences were found between Turkish migrant women and Dutch women on the importance of the motive parenthood, this finding does not correspond with our expectations and is difficult to explain. Regarding Turkish migrant men, more skills to participate in the Dutch culture are related to a higher importance of the motive well-being. As Turkish migrant men already gave significantly more importance to the parenthood motive well-being, this finding is difficult to explain and might be a chance finding.

Possible limitations to this study are, first, that the data of the two samples were collected in different decades. However, within Dutch society the economical welfare and the cultural beliefs regarding procreation, factors that supposedly influence social and individual motives, have remained relatively stable over the last two decades. Additionally, some other studies about the parenthood motives of infertile people in Western cultures show similar findings to the results of our Dutch sample (e.g. Colpin et al., 1998; Langridge et al., 2000; Van Balen and Inhorn, 2002; Bollebakker, 2003). Another issue is the representativeness of our samples. As mentioned earlier there are no population data about the prevalence of infertility among Turkish migrants. However, our sample included Turkish migrants from almost all areas where Turkish migrants live in The Netherlands, included Turkish migrants with education backgrounds ranging from no education at all to university education and included both non-Dutch-speaking and Dutch-speaking Turkish migrants. Nonetheless, the Turkish migrant sample was more educated than the general Turkish migrant population (Statistics Netherlands, 2005). This was also the case for the Dutch sample. The higher levels of education among research participants are a common finding and might be the consequence of the use of written material for recruitment and data-collection (see also Bostrom et al., 1993; Hoffman et al., 1998; Picavet, 2001). A further limitation might be response-set biases. Cross-cultural differences may result in extreme response styles and acquiescence response styles (e.g. Cheung and Rensvold, 2000; Phalet and Verkuyten, 2001; Van de Vijver and Tanzer, 2004). Additionally, the answers given by Turkish respondents might be influenced by the presence of a Dutch researcher.

In conclusion, our results indicate that the parenthood motives of Turkish migrants and Dutch men and women differ in that social motives are more important to Turkish migrants than to the indigenous Dutch. However, these differences are less if people are more culturally adapted to the Dutch culture. Thus, parenthood motives appear to be dynamic and are influenced by the surrounding culture.

References


Unalan T (1997) Reproductive expectations and fertility trends in Turkey. In Hacettepe University, Institute of Populationstudies (HIPS) and Macro International Inc. (MI), (eds) Fertility trends, women’s status and reproductive expectations in Turkey: Results of further analysis of the 1993 Turkish Demographic and Health Survey. HIPS and MI, Calvertown, Maryland, pp. 105–127.


Submitted on November 7, 2005; resubmitted on December 19, 2005, January 23, 2006; accepted on January 28, 2006