

## Investigating Opinions of Mothers on Different Socioeconomic Status in Terms of Perceived Maternal Styles<sup>1</sup>

Esra ÇALIK VAR \*

Şükran KILIÇ \*\*

Hatice KUMANDAŞ \*\*\*

### Suggested Citation:

Calik-Var, E., Kilic, S., Kumandas, H. (2015). Investigating Opinions of Mothers on Different Socioeconomic Status in Terms of Perceived Maternal Styles. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 61, 81-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2015.61.5>

### Abstract

*Problem Statement:* There are various environmental factors such as culture, socioeconomic status, family patterns, parental personality, family size, and education system among others, which affect development of individuals. Especially in the childhood period, parenting style is an important variable in forming physical, emotional, cognitive, and social development. Parenting style affects the capacity of children to interact with others, psychological wellbeing, and life skills; therefore, parenting style has increasingly been recognized for its importance in fostering children's social, emotional, and cognitive areas of development. In the literature, there are different types of categorizations of parental style, however, most the acceptable parenting styles are described as democratic, authoritative, and permissive.

*Purpose of the Study:* The aim of this study is to investigate perceptions of the parenting styles of mothers who have children between 2-6 years old, depending on their socioeconomic status (upper, middle, or lower).

*Method:* In this study, a quantitative research method was used as the research design to collect and analyze the interpretations and meanings of mothers' perceptions for maternal style from their responses. In

<sup>1</sup> This study was submitted in EJER 2014 (I. International Eurasian Educational Research Congress) in 24-26 April, Istanbul, Turkey.

\* Corresponding author: Assist. Prof. Dr. Yildirim Beyazit University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Social Work, Ankara, Turkey, [esracalik82@gmail.com](mailto:esracalik82@gmail.com).

\*\* Assist. Prof. Dr. Aksaray University, Faculty of Education, Department of Early Childhood and Education, Aksaray, Turkey, [kilic.sukran@gmail.com](mailto:kilic.sukran@gmail.com).

\*\*\* Assist. Prof. Dr. Artvin Coruh University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Measurement and Evaluation, Artvin, Turkey, [kumandashatice@gmail.com](mailto:kumandashatice@gmail.com).

determining the research group, purposive sampling is a type of non-probability sampling technique has been applied. In this respect, within the research process, 20 mothers from upper, middle, and lower socioeconomic levels have been selected and interviewed by using a semi-structured interview form generated with regards to Baumrind's parental model. Interviews were analyzed by content analysis and descriptive analysis.

*Findings and Results:* Finding of analyses were held separately according to socioeconomic level. It was researched whether perceived maternal styles differ depending on SES or not. Mothers from upper socioeconomic level reflect a democratic parental style. Mothers from all socioeconomic levels emphasise that there are rules for children to obey but only mothers in upper socioeconomic level make rules together with children. All of the mothers in upper and middle socio-economic levels and some of mothers in the lower socioeconomic level report to explaining emotions toward behaviours of their children. But when opinions of mothers are examined, it is seen that they do not use "I language" to express their emotions.

*Conclusion and Recommendations:* Findings of the present study are thought to be crucial in explaining maternal styles over Baumrind's parenting styles based on the dimensions – unlike the other studies in literature – in the early childhood period based on the SES of mothers. For further studies, it can be recommended that parental style should be evaluated based on the parenting socialisation, practices, and beliefs, and furthermore, in preparing and implementing parent-education.

*Keywords:* parenting, parental education level, parental income, qualitative research model.

## Introduction

The research focused on the reflection of relationships between the caregiver and children based on the children's behaviour, which has been studied in terms of how and in which way parental styles affect the children's development. The reasons for the differences of why the relationship between children and parents becomes different from parent to parent, and whether these differences have important results for children or not, are still presented as problems. Moreover, the variables of parental styles are discussed in the literature (Cowan, Powell, & Cowan 1997; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Revealing the relationship between the culture, educational level, parental structure, socioeconomic level, and parental style, has supported the researchers in determining the developmental process of the children.

According to September, Rich, and Roman (2015) parenting is paramount to foster quality parent-child interaction. Before describing the parenting style, clarifying the concept of parenting is more understandable, which is defined as a specific behaviour that a parent chooses to use in his/her child's care, raising, and education (Doinita & Maria, 2015). Parenting styles are described as a psycho-social structure

that involves the strategies that families use in raising children, which are shaped by the behaviours of parents, children, culture, and behaviour patterns that the parents learned from their own family (Santrock, 2007). Baumrind (1991), by observing practices of parents towards their children, described three parenting styles: authoritative, democratic, and permissive. Maccoby and Martin (1983) stated that Baumrind (1996) has explained those styles on dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness.

The dimension of responsiveness originated from an etiology perspective, representing reciprocal formation of behaviours between the child and caregiver for the sake of harmony (Bowlby, 1982). Responsiveness is the families' ability to respond to the demands and needs of children in an accepting and supportive way by supporting the individuality and assertiveness of the child (Greenberg, Cumming, & Cicchetti, 1990). Baumrind (1967) has explained responsiveness through the sub-concepts of warmth, open-communication, and care.

Warmth is the family's ability to assert the love they feel towards their children sentimentally; emotion and empathy within the family motivates the child's attendance to collaborative strategies and supports the children's development of internalized moral orientation (Eisenberg, 1992). Despite being warm and affectionate, families may apply a strict discipline in response to their child's insistence and negative behaviours, which may ruin the cohesiveness within the family (Grusec & Lytton, 1988). Families that do not demonstrate warmth may punish or judge children when they need support and approval, and this may affect negatively the children from presenting positive social behaviours and adaptation skills (Dix, 1991). Another sub-concept Baumrind (1996) has used to explain responsiveness is open-communication whereby parents' transfer of messages to the child occurs in direct, comprehensible, and clear statements (Eisenberg, 1992). Parents using open communication, compared with parents using power-oriented language, help children internalise rules and values within the home more, and stronger communication is effected in this way, where the child can make connections between their behaviours and their thoughts (Hoffman, 1983).

Care, which is the basis of the mother-baby attachment, means meeting both physical and emotional needs of the child since the birth (Halverson, 1995). It is supporting the child's cognitive and emotional development by the way of care, giving the message of acceptance, love, and approval (Crockenberg & Litman, 1990). While parents are practicing the physical care of their children, an emotional interchange comes out and this interchange affects children's development in a positive way (Halpeny, Nixon, & Watson, 2010). Another basic dimension that Baumrind (1996) used together with responsiveness while explaining parenting styles is parental demandingness, which is the degree of parents' expecting of mature and responsible behaviours from their children. Demanding parents who set high and realistic goals to their children, instead of direct interference of the child's behaviour, face children with their own behaviours by the way of monitoring and supervising, which thereby prevents conflicts (Hoff, Laursen, & Tardif, 2002). Parental control is the process of guiding the child towards goals chosen by parents,

such as changing immature expressions, preventing dependent or hostile behaviours, and increasing the compliance to meet standards that parents set forth. Within a well-established home environment, there are consistent expectations, and clear and stated rules. Identified responsibilities and close-monitoring behaviours (such as behaviour of having information about the child's activities) support the child's self-regulation and being organised (Baumrind, 1996).

On the basis of these dimensions, democratic parenting is the leading parenting styles outlined by Baumrind (1966; 1967; 1991; 1996). Democratic parents use concepts like warmth, responsiveness, tolerance, and discipline in a way to support the development of the child. They are also demanding and responsive at a high level. They openly communicate with their children, adopt teaching and disciplining ways within a cause and effect relationship, make expectations appropriate to their children's developmental level, expect responsible behaviours while supporting the child's autonomy, and ensures that the child is aware of both his/her own rights and other family members' rights (Baumrind, 1996).

According to Maccoby and Martin (1983), authoritative parents demonstrate high control and low emotional warmth, applying rigid rules in response to children's demands, and do not argue these rules with children. Baumrind (1996) has classified parents as authoritative if they are high in control and maturity expectation, and low in the other two dimensions. According to Baumrind (1991), authoritative parents focus on the obedience of rules and hierarchy while expecting their demands to be met unconditionally and avoid verbal communication with their children. Permissive parents do not put borders on their children, rarely apply discipline, and allows the child full freedom; their demands about their children's behaviours are under expectation and their tolerance level can be as much as neglect (Baumrind, 1966; 1967).

When the literature on parenting styles is reviewed, there are many research studies referring to effect and importance of socioeconomic status on parenting styles (Barber & Harmon, 2002; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Income, education, and job status are seen as the most important aspects of social class or socioeconomic status (SES) (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). Families who have high SES can support children's development, reach different sources to increase children's knowledge, make investments for their children to be more skilled and successful, and make better conditions of nutrition (Conger & Dogan, 2007). It is argued that parents in rural areas or low SES residential areas apply more authoritative styles, use more physical punishment, expect obedience from children, do not establish cause-effect relationship between the child's behaviours and punishments, and do not make reasoning together with their children (Hoffman, 2003). Besides these findings, parents with higher SES have more consistent parenting practices like less punishment, less strict rules, and have more open communication (Deckers, Falk, Fosse & Schildberg-Horisch, 2015). Research focusing on reflections of motherhood styles according to socioeconomic status has been thought to be an important contribution to literature.

The early childhood period has been recognised to be the most crucial trajectory to long-term social, emotional, and cognitive development (September et al., 2015). The relationship between parenting behaviours and the development of the child has been the subject of many studies (e.g., Belsky, 1984). As Scarr and MacCartney (1983) stated, younger children are more affected by their parents than by the older children. There are important evidences demonstrating how the home environment affects development of children in the early childhood years (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). The aim of this study has examined the perception of parenting styles of mothers of 2-6 year olds, according to upper, middle, and lower SES.

## **Method**

### *Research Design*

In this study, a case study, which is one of qualitative study models, was used. The case study was described as a method dealing with different situations where personal interests are placed in and based on different sources about the evidence (Kohlbecher, 2006).

### *Research Sample*

In determining the study group, purposive sampling that has a no-probability sampling was used. Purposive sampling enables the detailed working on situations in which important and substantial information exists in qualitative studies (Patton, 1987). In this respect, within the research process, mothers who have children aged between 2-6 years old who were accessible to researchers have been chosen and then, 20 mothers from upper, middle, and lower SES out of the determined group were further chosen and interviewed. In classifying mothers according to SES, variables used in previous studies to determine SES like income, educational level, and participation in social activities have been taken into account. SES of mothers according to the variables determined is given in Table 1. Participants are identified with the letter "G".

**Table 1.**  
*Distribution of mothers in terms of SES*

Variables		SES		
		Lower	Middle	Upper
Family's income level per month	903TL or less	G1--- G7		
	903TL - 1.807TL		G8---G13	
	1.807TL or more			G14---G20
Educational level	Primary school	G1,G2,G5,G7	----	----
	high school	G3,G4, G6	G9, G11	----
	University	----	G8,G10, G12,G13	G14---G20
Participating in social activities (at least)	Once a week		G8	G15,G16,G18, G19,G20
	Once a month	G2,G3,G5	G10	G14 ,G17
	Once a year	G1,G4,G6,G7	G9,G11, G12,G13	
Job status	Housemaker	G1,G2,G4, G6,G7	----	G14
	Retired	----	----	----
	Working	G3,G5	G8,G9,G10, G11,G12,G13	G15,16,G17,G18, G19,G20

Distribution of mothers according to SES is as follows: seven are in the lower (35%), six are in the middle (30%), and seven are in the upper (35%) SES levels. Monthly income of mothers in lower SES is 2000 TL or less, and most of them have graduated from primary school and are unemployed. Monthly income of mothers in the middle SES is between 903-1.807 TL and they are mostly university graduated and employed. Mothers in the upper SES have a monthly income of 1.807 TL or more, are university graduated, and employed. Furthermore, in terms of participating in social activities, mothers in lower and middle SES participate in activities 1-2 times per year; however, mothers in upper SES participate in activities mostly once a week.

#### *Research Instrument and Procedure*

A semi-structured interview form has been generated regarding dimensions of discipline/control strategies, care and warmth, communication, and expectation of maturity, describing democratic, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles (Baumrind, 1966; 1991).

#### *Data Analysis*

Interviews were analysed by content analysis and descriptive analysis. Results of analyses were held separately, according to SES, and it was first researched whether

perceived motherhood styles differ depending on SES or not. Content analysis was conducted via NVIVO program.

### Results

Mothers' who were interviewed shared opinions related to motherhood styles, investigated under six basic themes. There are sub-themes of discipline/control strategies, warmth, care, communication, and expectation of maturity. Opinions of mothers' discipline and control were summarized in the following Table 2.

**Table 2.**  
*Opinions of mothers about discipline and control*

Opinions of Mothers		SES		
		Lower	Middle	Upper
Whether there are rules child should obey or not and manners of rulemaking	Establishing rules with my child	G3	G8	G16, G17, G18, G20
	Yes, there are rules	G1, G2, G4, G7	G9, G11,	G14, G15
	Establishing rules with my spouse	G5, G6	G10, G12, G13	G19
Response of the mother when child is not obeying the rules	Physical violence	G1, G7	G9, G11	G14
	Shouting loudly	G1, G4	G10, G13	G15
	Threatening with something scary	G7	G9, G13	G14
	Talking to negotiate	G3, G5,	G8, G10,	G16, G17 G19, G20
	Warning or punishing if the behaviour continues	G2, G6	G9, G11	G18, G19
	Depriving of something desirable	---	G11, G13	G18, G20
Control/Tracing	Following or tracing continuously	G3	G8, G10, G13	G16, G17, G19
	Not controlling if environment is ok	G5, G6	G12	G14
	Not controlling within house	G7	---	G20
	Controlling in specific situations	G2, G4	G9, G11	G15
	Controlling if doing something wrong	G1	G10	
Allowing child to question and explore	Allowing asking of questions and wondering	G2, G3, G5, G6	G8, G10, G12	G16, G17 G19
	Letting ask questions but providing exploration under control	G4, G7	G11, G13	G14, G15, G18, G20
	Letting question and exploring when there is not a risk of harm	G1	G9	---

As shown in Table 2, mothers from all SES groups emphasise that there are rules for children to obey but only mothers in upper SES make rules together with their children. In this respect, it can be said that rulemaking manners of mothers in upper SES suits the democratic manner. When mothers' behaviour towards situations in which children do not obey rules is examined, upper SES mothers seem to be more democratic while lower and middle SES mothers' attitudes are alike. Opinions of some mothers related to findings are as follows:

G2: "I have twins and there are rules my children must obey. I put these rules observing their behaviours of each other. When they don't obey, I tell them why these rules should be obeyed—without blaming them—I give punishment if their behaviour continues..."

G8: "Should obey rules like eating on the table, tidying up. I made rules talking to my child, with suggestions. We have rules, because we work and have limited time. Therefore, I tell why we must obey the rules...usually my child obeys the rules, if s/he doesn't and then I tell them reasons and s/he becomes persuaded. S/he doesn't make me tired of this..."

G9: "...Of course there are rules. I set up rules especially when s/he makes something negative. I punish when s/he doesn't obey rules. Sometimes I make him/her afraid saying, 'if you don't eat, police will come and take you' or if I can't keep patience, sometimes I slap him/her."

G18: "There are general rules to obey. We set rules together, talking to our child and explaining the reasons of rules... I warn when s/he doesn't obey, but if [the bad behaviour] continues, I punish or don't give a toy s/he likes, or don't let him/her make an activity s/he likes..."

When the opinions of mothers about controlling behaviours are examined, it is seen that mothers in the middle and upper SES groups have a tendency to control their children continuously but mothers in lower SES control less. Opinions of some mothers on this subject are as follows:

G4: "...I control in specific times especially when we are outside or eating. At other times, I don't control much..."

G13: "I usually keep an eye on, I often control..."

G16: "... I sometimes act paranoid, controlling continuously. I feel like s/he will harm him/herself or s/he will get in trouble when my eyes are not on..."

Another finding of the study is that most of mothers say that they let their child question and explore freely. This does not differ much depending on SES. Mothers' opinions about care and warmth towards their children are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.



**Table 3.**  
*Opinions of mothers about care*

Care		SES		
		Lower	Middle	Upper
Organizing daily routine (eating, sleeping, cleaning)	Always	G2, G3, G4, G6	G8, G10, G11	G16, G18, G19, G20
	Sometimes	G1, G5, G7	G9, G12, G13	G14, G15, G17
	Never	--	---	---
Sharing the task of organizing daily routine	Only the mother	G1, G3, G4, G5, G6, G7	G9, G10, G11, G13	G14, G15, G18, G19, G20
	Only the father	---	---	---
	Parents together	G2	G8, G12	G16, G17

Related to care, mothers in all SES groups stated that they give importance to the care of their children, that they feel proficient in childcare, and that they have most of the responsibility in organizing daily routine. Some of the mothers' opinions related to this finding are as follows:

G4: "... I pay attention to sleep and eating hours in daily routine. I especially care about eating because it's my responsibility. I feel usually proficient in dealing with my child and providing care..."

G12: "I can't keep to eating and sleeping routine especially when we are on a visit. I may have a deficit in this but I think I took care of my child..."

G15: "I can't keep regularly all the time. Sometimes something fails. I do my best but sometimes I can't keep up, I sometimes have insufficiently..."

**Table 4.**  
*Mothers' opinions about warmth*

Warmth	Opinions	SES		
		Lower	Middle	Upper
Warmth style of mother when child demonstrates positive manner	I hug, cuddle, and kiss	G1, G2, G4, G6, G7	G8, G9, G11, G12, G13	G15, G16, G18, G19, G20
	I say nice words or I praise	G3, G5	G10	G14, G17
In which conditions demonstrated more warmth	When s/he behaves well	G2, G3	G8, G11, G12	G16, G17, G18, G20
	When I want	G1, G4, G6	G9, G10	G14, G15, G16, G18
	When going out and coming in	G4, G5	G8, G13	G20
	In all situations	---	--	G16
Rate of using kind words	Always	G2, G3, G6	G8, G10, G11, G12	G15, ---G20
	When needed (sometimes)	G1, G4, G5, G7	G9, G13	G14
	Never	---	---	---

As shown in Table 4, mothers state that they show warmth to their children verbally, physically, and emotionally. Distribution of opinions depending on the SES variable is not different much. Mothers state that they hug, kiss, and cuddle their children. In addition, they tell showing warmth when their children show desired behaviours.

In line with the aim of research, the opinions of mothers about communicating with their children are summarized in Table 5.

**Table 5.**  
*Opinions of mothers about communication*

Opinions about communication		SES		
		Lower	Middle	Upper
Communication with child	Shares everything with me easily, like an adult	G3,G4, G5	G8,G11, G12	G16,G18
	Our communication is fine but sometimes do not want to share everything	G2,G6	G13	G17,G19, G20
	We sometimes don't communicate well; we sometimes yell at each other	G1	G9	G15
	When I put rules s/he doesn't like, s/he doesn't communicate with me	---	G11,G10	---
	S/he says, "I don't love you, I want another mother"	G7	G9	G14
Child's expressing of opinions about rules/responsibilities	Because I encourage him/her to express opinions, expresses comfortably	G2,G4, G7	G8,G10, G13	G16,G17, G18,G19, G20
	Although s/he expresses opinions generally, sometimes insist on not obeying rules but doesn't tell reason	G3,G5, G6	G9	G15
	Doesn't tell opinions generally.	G1	G11	G14
	I encourage him/her to express opinions but s/he tells them when s/he wants.	---	G12	---
Mother's expressing of emotions toward child and behaviours	I say directly what s/he did ('you made me sad', 'you misbehaved')	G2,G3, G4,G5G 6	G9,G10, G11,G12 / G13	G14,G15, G17,G20
	I descend to his level, make eye contact and try to use 'I' language ('I feel happy/sad when you...')	---	G8	G16,G18, G19
	I don't say	G1,G7	---	---

In the dimension of communication, mothers report that their communication with their children is usually good; they encourage their children to communicate but experience conflict about obeying rules. All of the mothers in upper and middle SES and some of mothers in lower SES report to explaining emotions about the behaviours of their children. But when opinions of mothers are examined, it is seen that they do not use I language when expressing their emotions.

Mothers' opinions of expectation of maturity from their children are summarized in Table 6.

**Table 6.**  
*Opinions of mothers about expectation of maturity*

Expectation of maturity		SES		
		Lower	Middle	Upper
Demonstrating behaviours in accordance with age	Yes, behaves appropriate to his/her age	G1---G7	G8---G13	G14---G20
	No, not appropriate to age.	--	--	--
Realistic level of expectation of child's behaviours	I'm usually realistic	G1---G7	G8,G9, G11,G12, G13	G14,G15, G17,G19, G20
	Sometimes I expect more than what is appropriate to his/her age	---	G10	G16,G18

Mothers in all SES groups report that their children behave appropriately for their age. Related to this finding, the opinions of someone in the G1 group in the lower SES was shared as follows: "... I think my child is behaving appropriately to his/her age but in toilet cleaning, s/he demands help". Additionally, mothers in the middle and upper SES express that their children's behaviours and their expectations are realistic.

### Discussion and Conclusion

Studies of parenting style have many dimensions as discussed earlier. In this study, dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness within parenting styles has been taken into account and grounded and results of interviews have been evaluated over these dimensions and related to maternal styles. Results of analyses show that mothers in all SES groups emphasize that there should be rules for children but usually mothers from upper SES put these rules together with children. According to Baumrind (1996), democratic parents observe their children's development process and understand qualitatively different characteristics of developmental periods, and interfere when necessary. These parents manifest expected standard of the child's behaviours clearly according to child's developmental characteristics and needs.

When children with democratic parents force the limits, their parents shape disciplining behaviours through systematic reinforcements and explanatory feedback. In this respect, when the ruling styles and behaviours of SES mothers are examined towards children when they are not obeying the rules, it can be said that they show a democratic attitude. These findings seem to be in parallel with the literature. For example, Yagmurlu, Citlak, Dost, and Leyendecker (2009) found that Turkish mothers' differing aims of socializing their children depend on education and may be parallel with explaining and interpreting the present study, which according to the mothers with high education level, demand less obedient behaviours and give less punishment. Nevertheless, power-exerting child rearing practices are common in families of low SES in big cities or in traditional families of rural areas, and there is a relationship between the economic value of children in traditional social structures in demanding obedience in child rearing practices (Kagitcibasi, 1982).

In the present study, it is reported that mothers in middle and upper SES control their children continuously while mothers in lower SES do not. This difference may be interpreted as mothers of lower SES demonstrating a more permissive maternal style. This finding is similar to Rosier and Corsaro (1993) who also found that mothers in low SES households tend to encourage autonomy and individuality in their children as a means of teaching their children developmental skills. In contrast to these findings, Kagitcibasi (2000) states that parents living in urbanized and industrialized societies have a permissive parenting style characterized with less control parenting behaviour to support their children's autonomy. The differences of these studies show that more focus is needed on the relationship between cultural differences and parenting style.

According to warmth and care, mothers of all SES reported that they give importance to the care of their children, and that they feel proficient in childcare and in the responsibility of organizing daily care. In addition, they showed physical and emotional warmth to their children. These findings are supported in the literature with Evans (1997) and Ozyurek and Tezel Sahin (2005), in which research shows that mothers have been reported to deal with childcare more and childcare is perceived to be main task of motherhood. Concordant with these findings, Kagitcibasi, Sunar, and Bekman's (2001) study on attention and interaction level of low-income mothers with children aged 3-5 years old found that 62% of the mothers answered "never or almost never and rarely" to the question: "How often you show full attention to children?"

According to expectation of maturity, mothers in all SES groups reported that their children behave appropriately to their age. This finding is not consistent with the study of Mansbach and Greenbaum (1999) that found parents in high education and income level expect maturity from their children at a level beyond their age. These differences are interpreted because of cultural differences, gender, and temperament of child.

Mothers reported that communication was important but they had problems in how to communicate in conflict situations. In this respect, it can be asserted that mothers of children aged 2-6 experience conflict related to opinions and beliefs on their children's developmental needs. It is suspected that mothers in upper SES have basic communication skills like using "I language", using eye-contact, and that they reflect these skills in their child-rearing practices. This finding is supported by Chen and Kennedy's (2004) findings showing positive effect of open and individual-oriented communication on child development. In the study, it is determined that mothers from middle and upper SES try to continue communicating over rules of open communication.

Findings of the present study are thought to be important in explaining maternal styles over Baumrind's parenting styles based on the dimensions – unlike the other studies in literature – in the early childhood period according to the SES of mothers. For further studies, it can be recommended that parental style should be evaluated based on the parenting socialization, practices, and belief. Also, in preparing and implementing parent-education programs, it is important to take into account SES, culture, and existing parenting styles.

#### References

- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior, *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75(1), 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11 (1), 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1996). The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relations*, 45(4), 405-414.
- Barber, B. K., & Harmon, E. L. (2002). Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescents. In B. K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting* (pp. 15-52). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*, 55, 83- 96.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss* (2<sup>th</sup> Ed.) New York: Basic Books
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002) 'Socioeconomic status & child development', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 371-399.
- Chen, J. L., & Kennedy, C. (2004). Family functioning, parenting style, and Chinese children's weight status. *Journal of Family Nursing*, 10(2), 262-279.

- Crockenberg, S., & Litman, C. (1990). Autonomy as competence in 2-year-olds: Maternal correlates of child defiance, compliance, and Self-assertion. *Developmental Psychology, 26*, 961-971.
- Conger, R. D., & Dogan, S. J. (2007). Socialization class and socialization in family In J. E. Grusec., and P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization* (pp. 433-461). New York: Guilford.
- Cowan, P. A., Powell, D., & Cowan, C. P. (1997). Parenting interventions: A family systems perspective. In I. E. Sigel & K. A. Renninger (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol 4. Child psychology in practice* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.) New York: Wiley.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113* (3), 487-496.
- Deckers, T., Falk, A., Fosse, F., & Schildberg-Horisch. (2015). How Does Socio-Economic Status Shape a Child's Personality?. Discussion Paper Series, Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit Institute for the Study of Labor. Retrieved October 10, 2015, from <http://ftp.iza.org/dp8977.pdf>.
- Dix, T. (1991). The affective organization of parenting: Adaptive and maladaptive processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*, 3-25.
- Doinita, N. E., & Maria, N.D. (2015). Attachment and parenting style. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 203*, 199-204.
- Eisenberg, N. (1992). *The caring child*. Cambridge, MA.
- Evans, C. (1997). *Turkish fathers' attitudes to and involvement in their fathering Role: A Low Socio-economic Sample* (Master's thesis). Bogazici University, Turkey.
- Grusec, J. E., & Lytton, H. (1988). *Social development: History, theory, and research*. Springer-Verlag Publishing.
- Greenberg, M. T., Cummings, M., & Cicchetti, D. (1990). *Attachment in the preschool years; theory research and intervention*. Chicago.
- Halpeny, A. H., Nixon, E., & Watson, D. (2010). Summary Report on Parents' and Children's Perspectives on Parenting Styles and Discipline in Ireland. Reports. Retrieved October 10, 2015, from <http://arrow.dit.ie/aaschslrep/13>.
- Halverson, A. M. (1995). The importance of caring and attachment in direct practice with adolescents. *In Child and Youth Care Forum, 24* (3), 169-173.
- Hoff, E., Laursen, B., & Tardif, T. (2002). Socioeconomic status and parenting. In H. Borstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Parenting: Vol 2. Biology and Ecology of Parenting* (pp.231-253). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1983). Affective and cognitive processes in moral internalisation. In E.T. Higgins, D. Ruble & W. Hartup (Eds.), *Social Cognition and Social Development: A Socio-Cultural Perspective*. (pp. 236-74). New York: Cambridge.

- Hoffman, L. W. (2003). Methodological issues in the studies of SES, parenting, and child development. In M. H. Bornstein & R. H. Bradley (Eds.), *Socioeconomic Status, Parenting, and Child Development*. (pp. 125-143). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kagıtcıbası, C. (1982). Old age security value of children and socioeconomic development: Cross-national evidence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13, 29-42.
- Kagıtcıbası, C. (2000). *Kültürel psikoloji: Kültür bağlamında insan ve aile*. [Cultural psychology: human and family in the cultural context]. İstanbul: Evrim Yayinevi. [İstanbul: Evrim Press]
- Kagıtcıbası, C., Sunar, B., & Bekman, S. (2001). Long-term effects of early intervention: Turkish low income mothers and children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 22, 333-361.
- Kohlbacher, F. (2006). The use of qualitative content analysis in case study. *FQS. Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7(1), 21.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. *Handbook of child psychology*, 4, 1-101.
- Mansbach, I. K., & Greenbaum, C. W. (1999). Developmental maturity expectations of Israeli fathers and mothers: Effects of education, ethnic origin, and religiosity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 23(3), 771-797.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rosier, K.B., & Corsaro, W.A. (1993). Competent parents, complex lives: Managing parenthood in poverty. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22 (2), 171-204
- Ozyurek, A., & Tezel Sahin, F. (2005). 5-6 yaş grubunda cocugu olan ebeveynlerin tutumlarının incelenmesi [Examining the attitudes of parents who have children at the age of 5-6]. *Gazi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 25 (2), 19-34.
- Santrock, J.W. (2007). *A topical approach to life-span development* (3<sup>th</sup> Ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- September, S. J., Rich, E. G., Roman, V. N. (2015). The role of parenting styles and socio-economic status in parents' knowledge of child development. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185 (4), 614-630.
- Scarr, S., & MacCartney, K. (1983). How people make their own environments: A theory of genotype → environment effects. *Child Development*, 54, 2, 424-435.
- Yagmurlu, B., Citlak, B., Dost, A., & Leyendecker, B. (2009). Turk annelerin cocuk sosyallestirme hedeflerinde egitime bagli olarak gozlenen farkliliklar [Turkish mothers: An investigation of education related within-culture variation]. *Turk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 24(63), 1-15.

## Farklı Sosyoekonomik Düzeydeki Annelerin Algıladıkları Annelik Stilllerine İlişkin Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi

### Atf:

Calik-Var, E., Kilic, S., Kumandas, H. (2015). Investigating Opinions of Mothers on Different Socioeconomic Status in Terms of Perceived Maternal Styles. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 61, 81-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2015.61.5>

### Özet

*Problem Durumu:* Anne baba stilleri çocukluk dönemi duygu ve davranışların şekillenmesinde, çocuğun kişisel, sosyal ve akademik gelişimin desteklenmesinde oldukça önemli bir değişkendir. Ev ortamının küçük yaştaki çocukları daha fazla etkilendiğine yönelik araştırma bulguları, araştırmacıları anne babalık stilleri ve çocuğun gelişimi arasındaki ilişkiyi ortaya koymaya çalışan araştırmalara yönlendirmiştir. Anne baba stilleri, ailelerin çocuk yetiştirmede kullandıkları stratejileri içeren, anne, baba ve çocuğun davranışlarıyla, kültürle ve anne babanın kendi ailesinden edindiği davranış örüntüleriyle şekillenen psiko-sosyal bir yapı olarak tanımlanabilir. Alan yazında anne babaların çocuklarına yönelik uygulamaları, otoriter, demokratik, izin verici ve ihmalkar olmak üzere dört farklı anne babalık stili başlığı altında tanımlanmıştır. Bununla birlikte literatürde anne baba stilleri tanımlarken, olgunluk beklentisi, disiplin stratejileri, iletişim, bakım, süpervizyon, izleme, reddetme ve ceza gibi boyutlar da incelenmiştir. Anne babalık stillerine ilişkin alanyazın incelendiğinde, pek çok araştırma anne babalık stillerinde sosyo-ekonomik düzeyin etkisinden ve öneminden bahsetmiştir. Gelir, eğitim, mesleki statüsü, sosyal sınıfın ya da sosyoekonomik statünün en önemli boyutları olarak görülmektedir. Sosyo-ekonomik düzeyi (SED) gelir düzeyi yüksek aileler; çocukların gelişimi için gerekli eğitimi, bilgiyi arttırabilen çeşitli kaynakları sağlayabilmekte, uyarıcı açısından zengin bir çevre sunabilmekte, çocuklarına daha yetenekli ve başarılı olması için yatırım yapabilmekte, iyi beslenme koşullarını sağlayabilmekte, kuralları ve olaylar arasındaki neden sonuç ilişkilerini açık bir iletişimle sağlayabilmektedirler. Kırsal bölgelerde ve büyük şehirlerdeki alt sed yerleşim yerlerinde yaşayan anne babaların ise otoriter bir stil benimsediği, çocuktan daha fazla itaat beklediği, yaşadıkları olaylara ve kontrol etmeye çalıştıkları durumlara ilişkin neden sonuç ilişkisi kurmakta zorlandıkları alan yazına yansımıştır. Bu doğrultuda çalışmanın annelik stillerinin çocuk gelişimine yönelik yansımalarının sosyoekonomik düzey açısından incelemiş olmasının alan yazınına önemli bir katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

*Araştırmanın Amacı:* Bu araştırmanın amacı, sosyo-ekonomik düzeye (üst, orta, alt) göre 2-6 yaş aralığında çocuğu olan annelerin anne babalık stillerine yönelik algılarını incelemektir. Bu çerçevede ülkemizde annelik stillerinin sosyo-ekonomik düzeye göre değişip değişmediğinin belirlenmesi gerekli olduğu anlaşılmaktadır.



*Araştırmanın Yöntemi:* Araştırmada nitel araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Verilerin çözümlenmesinde ise nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden içerik analizi yapılmıştır. Araştırmada seçkisiz örnekleme yöntemlerinden amaçsal örnekleme ve uygun örnekleme yöntemleri kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sürecinde 2-6 yaş aralığında çocuğu olan 20 anneden görüş alınmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan annelerin yedisi (%35) alt, altısı (%30) orta ve yedisi (%35) üst sosyoekonomik düzeye sahiptir. Alt sosyoekonomik düzeydeki annelerin ailelerinin aylık gelir düzeyinin 2000TL ve altında, çoğunlukla ilkokul mezunu ve çalışmayan bireyler olduğu görülmektedir. Orta düzeydeki annelerin ise aylık gelir düzeyinin 2001TL ve 4000TL arasında değıştiğı, çoğunlukla üniversite mezunu ve çalışan bireyler olduğu görülmektedir. Üst düzeydeki annelerin ise aylık gelir düzeyinin 4001TL ve üzerinde olduğu, üniversite mezunu ve çalışan bireyler olduğu görülmektedir. Bununla birlikte sosyal etkinliklere katılma durumları açısından, alt ve orta sosyoekonomik düzeyde yer alan annelerin çoğunlukla yılda bir iki kez sosyal etkinliklere katıldıkları, üst sosyoekonomik düzeydeki annelerin ise çoğunlukla haftada bir sosyal etkinliğe katıldıkları görülmektedir. Görüşmeler araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanmış yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formu ile gerçekleştirilmiştir ve içerik analizi yoluyla çözümlenmiştir. Analiz sonuçları sosyoekonomik düzeye (SED) göre ayrı ayrı ele alınmış ve algılanan annelik stillerinin sosyo ekonomik düzeye göre farklılaşp farklılaşmadığı belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır.

*Araştırmanın Bulguları:* Analiz sonuçlarına göre her sed düzeyinde anneler çocukların uyması gereken kurallar olduğunu vurgulamaktadır ancak bu kuralları çoğunlukla üst sed'deki annelerin çocuğıyla birlikte koydukları görülmektedir. Bu açıdan üst sed'deki annelerin kural koyma biçimlerinin demokratik anne stiline uyduğu söylenebilir. Kurallara uymadığında sergilenen davranışlar incelendiğinde ise alt ve orta sed'deki ailelerin annelik stilleri benzerlik gösterirken üst sed'deki annelerin demokratik bir tutum sergilediğı ifade edilebilir. Çocuğı kontrol etme davranışları açısından annelerin görüşleri incelendiğinde orta ve üst sed'deki annelerin çocuklarını sürekli kontrole etme eğiliminde olduğu ancak alt sed'deki annelerin daha az kontrol ettikleri sonucuna varılmıştır. Sıcaklık ve bakım boyutunda tüm sed'de yer alan anneler çocuklarının bakımına önem verdiklerini, bu konuda kendilerini yeterli hissettiklerini ve günlük düzeni ayarlama sorumluluğuna çoğunlukla kendilerinde olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca anneler çocuklarına fiziksel ve duygusal olarak sıcaklık gösterdiklerini ifade etmişlerdir. İletişim stilleri ve olgunluk beklentisi alt boyutunda ise anneler ve çocuklarla iletişimin genel olarak iyi olduğu, onları iletişim kurma konusunda cesaretlendirdiklerini, ancak kurallara uyma konusunda çatışma yaşadıklarını bildirmişlerdir. Üst ve orta sed'deki annelerin tümü ve alt sed'deki annelerin bir kısmı çocuğun davranışına yönelik duygularını çocuğa açıkladıklarını bildirmişlerdir. Annelerin tümü çocuğun yaşına uygun davranışlar sergilediğini vurgulamakta, annelerin olgunluk beklentisinin çoğunlukla çocuklarının yaşlarına uygun olduğu anlaşılmaktadır.

*Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri:* Bu bilgiler ışığı altında bu çalışmanın ülkemizde annelik stillerinin çocuk gelişimine yönelik yansımalarının sosyoekonomik düzey açısından incelenmiş olmasının alan yazınına önemli bir katkı sağlayacağı

düŐünölmektedir. Bununla birlikte bu alıŐmada erken ocukluk döneminde annelik stillerinin ocukların gelişimsel ıktılarına olumlu bir etki oluşturabilmesi için okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarının anneye ve ocuĐa önemli bir destek kaynaĐı olduĐuna da işaret edilmektedir. Bu alıŐmanın sonuçları deĐerlendirilerek ölkemizde gerçekleştirilecek olan ailelere yönelik alıŐmalarda anne baba eğitimlerine aĐırlık verilmesi önerilebilir. Bu gereklilik anne babaların ihtiyaçları ve ocukların gelişimsel özellikleri dikkate alınarak spesifik başlıkları ve konuları içeren anne baba eğitimleri ile karşılanmalıdır. Yapılması planlanan araŐtırmalar ve eğitim programlarının anne babalık uygulamaları, sosyalleŐtirme hedefleri ve inanıŐlarını da içermesi önerilmektedir.

*Anahtar Kelimeler:* Anne babalık, aile eğitim düzeyi, aile geliri, nitel araŐtırma yöntemleri