

University Students' Attitudes towards Perceived Family Support in Individual Musical Instrument Education

Berrin Özden, Selin Özdemir*

Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, Turkey

Corresponding author: Selin Özdemir, E-mail: selinozdemir@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: September 02, 2022

Accepted: October 14, 2022

Published: October 31, 2022

Volume: 10 Issue: 4

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

Education promotes mental, physical and emotional development of individuals. In particular, music education has a great impact on an individual's personal development in terms of self-recognition and self-actualization of the individual. One of the most significant factors in the development of the individual is their family. The family support is crucial in terms of education as well as in all aspects of life. This study is aimed to determine university students' attitudes towards perceived family support in individual musical instrument education and to analyze the differences in family support in this context. A set of different variables for the perceived family support in individual instrument education of the university students studying in music education undergraduate programs were examined in the study. Three different variables were identified, including gender, undergraduate level and university where the students receive education. This descriptive study is based on a correlational survey model. The study sample consists of 216 students studying in music education programs in 2021-2022 academic year. 120 (55.6 %) of the students are female while 96 (44.4 %) of them are male. When the perceived family support of music education students in terms of instrument education was examined, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the gender of the students in the dimensions of the families' valuing instrument education and their involvement in the process. However, there was no significant relationship in the dimension of the families' valuing instrument education while there was a significant relationship in their involvement in the process. Considering the perceived family support of the students studying in the music education program in terms of instrument education, the responses of the students indicated a positive relationship.

Key words: Music Education, Individual Instrument Education, Family Support

INTRODUCTION

"Education refers to all of the processes in which the individuals develop their set of values, abilities, attitudes and other forms of behavior in the society in which they live" (Ada et al., 2017, p. 5). The influence of the environment and the society in which individuals live on education varies. Since education requires continuous development and change, the individuals need to recognize themselves.

Music means revealing the inner world of human beings through emotions, thoughts and intuitive sounds. Music education immeasurably contributes to human progress. "Development refers to the change occurring in constant progress of the organism with interaction of growth, maturation and learning. When we consider the development as a product, we can define the progress as its process" (Senemoğlu, 2012, p. 3). Development involves a process. The development process of an individual begins before birth. "In the broadest sense, the development encompasses continuously changing process of the organism starting from fertilization until the last stage under certain conditions, the

change that records progress in view of physical, mental, linguistic, emotional, and social aspects," (Senemoğlu, 2012, p. 3). The development process positively affects learning and should include positive elements. It is thought that one of these elements that promotes the development of individuals is instrument education. Therefore, parents should motivate their children about playing the musical instruments and develop their self-awareness in order to boost their children's development. The individuals may change, but they cannot develop at any time since this process can be both positive and negative.

"Abilities are born and developed by the action of the important powers of organisms that attempt to live in and adapt to their environment from the first day. In other words, the only ability that a child has compared to others is his/her adaptation to his/her environment faster and more sensitively" (Suzuki, 2010, p.10). In order for the individual's development to continue in a positive direction, he/she must adapt to social and physical environment. He/she complements a significant part of social development in the family and school

with his/her social and physical growth and harmony with the environment. Education provides the development of individuals in terms of mental, physical and emotional aspects. In the continuation of this process, the education yields more appropriate and effective results to development. The physical development of an individual affects a successful learning. Music education has also beneficial effects on personal development in terms of self-recognition and skill development of the individual. "Music directs individuals in the developmental process and positively influencing cognitive processes" (Özdemir & Yıldız, 2010, p. 78). Based on this interpretation, it can be argued that the music education is a tool to prepare people for a social and emotional life. The impact of music education on development also begins with positive attitudes. "One of the main dimensions of music education is the playing instruments. Instrument education shapes the musical life of the students and presents opportunities to improve their musical knowledge, skills, abilities and tastes" (Akbulut, 1999, p. 511). The effects of instrument education on the development include developing individual characteristics, self-educating and ensuring continuous development. It is thought that the interest, desire and attitude of the family are important factors in this regard in order to ensure that development success in individual instrument education. Family support has a different place in the field of education as well as in all areas. Parents who are involved in their children's general education process and literacy process at school support their children's social and academic success. Gül (2007, p. 22) states that the participation of families in the literacy process; Gül stated that it can be in four different ways: being the teachers of his children, being a member of the organizations in his children's school, increasing communication and cooperation with the school where his children are staying, and providing effective home support for his children. It is thought that a home life that supports children's study and learning is related to the success and future performance of the child. "The parents are the most important supporters in the learning process. For this reason, they must be careful and fully grasp the philosophy of education. The biggest mistake they can make will be to compare their children with others, not to support their children's ambitions, not to accept the variable course of the developing ability, to keep their expectations higher than they should have, and to put pressure on the child. Such attitudes and behaviors of family members lead to the negative impact on the student. The parent should be a part of the process, patient and behave in a controlled manner and should not exceed the instructions of the teachers" (Yalçın Dittgen, 2018, p.18). Based on this statement, it is clear that the family plays a crucial role in the factors affecting the candidates for music teachers. It is thought that one of the reasons of the failure of music teacher candidates in the individual instrument education course is the family support factor.

Objective and Research Questions

In this study, three different variables (gender, university and undergraduate levels of the students) were identified while examining perceived family support in the individual

instrument education of the students studying in the department of music education. Based on this problem, this study sought for answers to the question: "What is the relationship between the perceived family support in individual instrument education among the students of the department of music education with different variables?" The objectives of the study are presented below:

1. Is there a significant relationship between the gender of the students and the families' valuing for and their involvement in the instrument education?
2. Is there a significant relationship between the university where the students study and the families' valuing for and the involvement in the instrument education?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the families' valuing for and their involvement in the instrument education process with the undergraduate level of the students?

The aim of this study is to determine the perceived family support of the students (individuals) in music education programs in individual instrument education and to examine the differences in family support in individual instrument education in this context. The sub-objective of the study is to reveal the interest and perspectives of the perceived family support in individual instrument education on part of the participant students in instrument education.

METHOD

Study Model

A correlational survey model was used in this descriptive study. "Descriptive research defines a situation as fully and carefully as possible., The most common descriptive method is surveying in the field of educational research since researchers summarize the characteristics of individuals, groups or (sometimes) physical environments (such as schools) (talents, preferences, behaviors, etc.)" (Büyükoztürk et al., 2010, p.21).

Study Sample

The sample of the study consisted of the students studying in music education departments of Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Gazi University, Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University in 2021-2022 academic year. Of the students (n= 216) who agreed to participate in the study, 120 (55.6%) were female and 96 (44.4%) were male.

Data Collection

In this study, the Perceived Family Support in the Instrument Education Scale developed by Demet Girgin (2016) was used. There were 23 items on this scale. It was found that these 23 items were distributed in 2 sub-scales: involvement in the process and valuing the instrument education. There were 5 options for 23 questions on the developed scale, responded in the following: I fully agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and fully disagree.

In addition to the scale developed, 3 demographic items were added by the researchers in order to determine the variables of the study including gender, undergraduate level and the university where they study.

Data Analysis

The data were collected from the study sample through on-line questionnaires. The frequency table of the demographic data of the participants was prepared. At the same time, the distribution of the answers given to the scale questions was calculated and additional information was reached. Reliability analysis was conducted to measure the consistency of the answers. As shown in Table 1, it can be suggested that the sub-scales and the scale are "very reliable".

The subscales of valuing and involvement were found by taking average scores. Shapiro-Wilk Normality Test was performed first in order to select the appropriate statistical analyses on the sub-scales. As shown in Table 2, it was decided that both sub-scales were not suitable for normal distribution ($p < 0.05$), and the statistical methods to be performed on these variables were selected from non-parametric methods.

While Mann-Whitney U test was used to investigate the difference between two-category variables, the difference in

Table 1. The results of reliability analysis of the scale and the sub-scales

Subscales	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Valuing	0.943	12
Involvement	0.944	11
Total	0.970	23

Table 2. Shapiro-Wilk test results

	Shapiro-Wilk	sd.	p
Valuing	0.872	216	<.001
Involvement	0.859	216	<.001

Table 3. The results of correlation analysis of the subscales

Subscale	Statistics	Involvement
Valuing	r	0.922
	p	<.001

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of the subscales

	Mean±Sd (Min.-Max.)
Valuing	4.20±0.82 (1.08-5)
Involvement	4.23±0.82 (1.27-5)

Table 5. The results of the gender of the students and the families' valuing for and the involvement in the instrument education

Variable	Category	Valuing	p	Involvement	p
		Mean±SD (Min.-Max.)		Mean±SD (Min.-Max.)	
Gender	Female	4.28±0.79 (2.08-5)	0.131	4.33±0.77 (1.55-5)	0.076
	Male	4.1±0.86 (1.08-5)		4.1±0.87 (1.27-5)	

more than two category variables was calculated by Kruskal-Wallis H test. Finally, the correlations between the sub-scales were demonstrated by Spearman correlation analysis (Table 3).

As the degree of perception that the participants are valued by their parents increases, it is obvious that their families will be involved in the process. As the valuing increases, the involvement in the process increases with 92.2 % probability. A strong relationship was found between these two variables.

As shown in Table 4, the total perception of the students was found as 4.20 out of 5 points. The analyses conducted in this study were interpreted at 95% confidence level. The analyses were made using SPSS 23.0 statistical package program.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings relevant to the first problem: Is there a significant relationship between the gender of the students and the families' valuing for and the involvement in the instrument education?

According to Table 5, there is no significant difference between the gender of the students and valuing of the families in the instrument education ($p > 0.05$). There is no significant difference between the gender of the students and their family involvement in the instrument education ($p > 0.05$). In line with this, it can be argued that the families' valuing instrument education and their involvement in the process do not vary in terms of the gender of the students.

Findings relevant to the second problem: Is there a significant relationship between the university where the students study and the families' valuing for and the involvement in the instrument education?

According to Table 6, there is no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) compared to the universities where the students study and valuing of the families and their family involvement in the instrument education. In line with this, it can be suggested that valuing of the families and their involvement in the instrument education process do not vary in view of the universities the students study.

Findings relevant to the third problem: Is there a significant relationship between the undergraduate level of the students the families' valuing for and the involvement in the instrument education?

According to Table 7, there is no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) between the undergraduate levels and the valuing of families for instrument education. However, there is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in view of involvement in the process. Accordingly, it seems that the valuing of

families for instrument education does not vary in view of the undergraduate level, but their involvement in the process varies.

As shown in Table 8, there are remarkable percentage differences between the answers on the online survey data. For instance, in the 4th question, the statement “My family

Table 6. The results of the university where the students study and the families’ valuing for and the involvement in the instrument education

Variable	Category	Valuing		p	Involvement		p
		Mean	±SD. (Min.-Max.)		Mean	±SD. (Min.-Max.)	
University	Sivas Cumhuriyet University	4.16	±0.84 (2-5)	0.714	4.13	±0.88 (1.55-5)	0.420
	Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University	4.33	±0.78 (2.17-5)		4.42	±0.77 (2.36-5)	
	Gazi University	4.23	±0.86 (1.08-5)		4.28	±0.82 (1.27-5)	
	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	4.27	±0.61 (3.5-5)		4.17	±0.52 (3.45-5)	
	Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University	4.08	±0.82 (2.42-5)		4.18	±0.81 (2.18-5)	

Table 7. The results of the undergraduate level of the students and their families’ valuing for and the involvement in the instrument education

Variable	Category	Valuing		p	Involvement		p
		Mean	±SD. (Min.-Max.)		Mean	±SD. (Min.-Max.)	
Undergraduate Level	1 st Year	4.24	±0.7 (2.08-5)	0.471	4.22	±0.68 (2.45-5)	0.034 ^a
	2 nd Year	4.08	±0.88 (1.08-5)		4.02	±0.9 (1.27-5)	
	3 rd Year	4.22	±0.83 (2,42-5)		4.34	±0.76 (2.18-5)	
	4 th Year	4.23	±0.96 (2-5)		4.29	±0.98 (1.55-5)	

a: $p_{1^{st} \text{ Year} - 4^{th} \text{ Year}} = 0.036$; $p_{2^{nd} \text{ Year} - 3^{rd} \text{ Year}} = 0.044$; $p_{2^{nd} \text{ Year} - 4^{th} \text{ Year}} = 0.016$

Table 8. Frequency of the responses

Questions	Completely Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Completely Agree	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	126	58.3	57	26.4	21	9.7	8	3.7	4	1.9
2	132	61.1	57	26.4	13	6	11	5.1	3	1.4
3	133	61.6	57	26.4	15	6.9	9	4.2	2	0.9
4	140	64.8	56	25.9	10	4.6	8	3.7	2	0.9
5	133	61.6	51	23.6	16	7.4	10	4.6	6	2.8
6	4	1.9	10	4.6	13	6	60	27.8	129	59.7
7	126	58.3	56	25.9	12	5.6	14	6.5	8	3.7
8	4	1.9	8	3.7	12	5.6	59	27.3	133	61.6
9	3	1.4	4	1.9	18	8.3	69	31.9	122	56.5
10	2	0.9	6	2.8	20	9.3	58	26.9	130	60.2
11	117	54.2	37	17.1	19	8.8	31	14.4	12	5.6
12	116	53.7	48	22.2	20	9.3	29	13.4	3	1.4
13	5	2.3	13	6	34	15.7	51	23.6	113	52.3
14	5	2.3	19	8.8	17	7.9	58	26.9	117	54.2
15	6	2.8	25	11.6	17	7.9	61	28.2	107	49.5
16	8	3.7	16	7.4	25	11.6	60	27.8	107	49.5
17	8	3.7	34	15.7	29	13.4	60	27.8	85	39.4
18	11	5.1	27	12.5	23	10.6	57	26.4	98	45.4
19	10	4.6	34	15.7	31	14.4	55	25.5	86	39.8
20	7	3.2	20	9.3	26	12	68	31.5	95	44
21	7	3.2	20	9.3	32	14.8	62	28.7	95	44
22	2	0.9	11	5.1	27	12.5	63	29.2	113	52.30
23	5	2.3	10	4.6	20	9.3	53	24.5	128	59.30

does not care about my success in instrument education” has the highest percentage of complete disagreement. In the 5th question, the statement “My playing instruments at home is a disturbing situation for my family” was responded by 61.60 % of the participants as completely disagree. In the 6th question, the statement “My family always supports me spiritually in the activities related to my instrument education” was responded by 59.70 % of the participants as completely agree. As can be inferred from the answers in the questions 5 and 6, it can be argued that the families support their children spiritually in instrument education. In the 8th question, the statement “My family members are pleased to see that I am playing an instrument” has the highest percentage of complete agreement. In the 9th question, the statement “My family is willing to participate in my concerts” was responded by 56.50 % of the participants as completely agree. In the 14th question, the statement “My family will help me to make plans for my instrument education was responded by 54.20 % of the participants as completely agree.

In the 17th question, the statement “My family will follow my studies about instrument education” was responded by 39.40 % of the participants as completely agree. Compared to other questions, the answer “completely agree” seems to be lower. 15.70 % of the participants responded that they did not agree with the statements. In the 21st question, the statement “My family provides all kinds of support for my participation in the studies that will enable my development in instrument education (workshops etc.)” was responded by 44.00 % of the participants as completely agree. In the 22nd question, the statement “The support of my family in the instrument education gives me strength” was responded by 52.30 % of the participants as completely agree but a percentage of 0.90 % responded that they did not agree with the statement.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

When the perceived family support of music education students in the instrument education is examined, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the gender of the students in the dimensions of the value of families and the involvement in the instrument education. Bozoğlu Demir and Kumtepe (2021), Yüksel and Onur (2020), Arslanhan et al. (2019), in their research conducted with the scale developed by Girgin (2018) found similar results with this survey study. As a result, it is obvious that gender does not affect the perceived family support and their involvement in the process regardless of the type of institution and level of education.

Unlike these studies, Yüksel (2018) found in his study titled “The Investigation of Family Support in Instrument Education in Secondary Music Course” administered “The Family Support Scale, among the 5th grade students, and found that the sub-scale of involvement differed significantly in terms of female students.

Given the family support of music education students in the instrument education, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the universities where the students study in terms of the valuing of families and their involvement in the instrument education. However, Yüksel

(2018) found that there was a positive strong relationship between the sensitivity of the students and the involvement in the process. Considering this study, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between the valuing of families in the instrument education, but there was a significant relationship in the involvement process.

Based on the responses on the questionnaire, it is clear that families support their children in instrument education and related activities. However, it is apparent that families do not closely follow the studies on instrument education compared to other questions. Therefore, it is recommended that families motivate their children by supporting and listening to their children while playing instruments. In individual instrument education, families need to create more efficient working environments for their children. As the support of families to their children increases, it is thought that students' desire to work and play will be promoted more.

In this study, Girgin's (2016) perceived family support scale in the instrument education was used for the students studying in music education program. In other studies, information about the family supporting status of the students studying in music education programs was obtained. In this study, the students' thoughts and responses about the instrument education were evaluated without asking their family educational status. The results have shown that family support is positive regardless of the educational status of the family. For this reason, it is recommended to carry out studies with different working groups and variables in order to understand the valuing of the students' families in the music education programs that provide education at the undergraduate level and to be involved in the instrument education.

REFERENCES

- Ada, Ş. Başar, E. Dağlı, A. Ekinci, E. Ergün, M. Gelbal, S. Hoşgörür, V. Kiroğlu, K. Mahiroğlu, A., & Taştan, N. (2017). *Eğitim bilimine giriş*. (13. Baskı). PegemA.
- Akbulut, E. (1999). *Çalgı eğitiminde davranışların önemi*. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Sempozyumu. Denizli.
- Arslanhan, E., Eğilmez, H. O., & Engur, D. (2019). Analysis of the parental support perceived by pre-service music teachers in instrumental education in line with some variables: Uludağ University sample. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(2), 535-543. Date of access: 02.08.2022. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1213034>.
- Bozoğlu Demir, H., & Kumtepe, M. A., (2021). Müzikoloji öğrencilerinin çalgı eğitiminde algılanan aile desteğinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Kırıkkale örneği, *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*, 6(16), 1726-1746.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. Kılıç Çakmak, E. Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. (5. Baskı). PegemA.
- Girgin, D. (2016). Çalgı eğitiminde algılanan aile desteği ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *İlköğretim Online*, 15(3), 778- 786, 2016. DOI:10.17051/ilo.2016.90950.
- Gül, G. (2007). Okuryazarlık sürecinde aile katılımının rolü. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 8(1), 17-30.

- Özdemir, G., & Yıldız, G. (2010). Genel gelişim sürecinde müziksel gelişim. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(2), 80-94.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2012). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim*. (21. Baskı). PegemA.
- Suzuki, S. (2010). *Sevgiyle eğitmek*. Porte Müzik Eğitim.
- Yalçın Dittgen, J. (2018). Suzuki yönteminde ailenin yeri ve önemi. *Sahne ve Müzik*, 6, 13-20. Date of access: 02.08.2022. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/smead/issue/34898/386978>.
- Yüksel, G., & Onur, G. (2020). A study on family support perceived by pre-service music teachers in musical instrument education. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 15(5), 1191-1203. Date of access: 02.08.2022. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i5.5163>.
- Yüksel, U. (2018). *Ortaöğretim müzik dersi çalgı eğitiminde aile katkısının incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.