Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

2013

An Exploratory Study of Turkish Fathers' Involvement in the Lives of Their Preschool Aged Children

Burcu Izci

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF TURKISH FATHERS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE
LIVES OF THEIR PRESCHOOL AGED CHILDREN

By
BURCU IZCI

A Thesis submitted to the
School of Teacher Education
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Degree Awarded:
Fall Semester, 2013

© Burcu Izci

Burcu Izci defended this thesis on November 1, 2013.

The members of the supervisory committee were:

Ithel Jones
Professor Directing Thesis

Diana Rice
Committee Member

Lindsay Dennis
Committee Member

The Graduate School has verified and approved the above-named committee members, and certifies that the thesis has been approved in accordance with university requirements.

To my precious family,
To all mothers and children of my country,
To our greatest leader Mustafa Kemal Ataturk (Father of All Turks)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all the greatest people who believed in me and supported me in this marathon; without your love, support and guidance, I would not have been able to finish my thesis.

First, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Jones, for his guidance and patience every step of my research. His guidance and feedbacks helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Rice and Dr. Dennis, for being my committee members and giving different perspectives for my thesis.

Secondly, I would like to thank Oguzcan Cig and Neslihan Canpolat Cig who answered all my questions and helped me all the time. I also thank my friends and classmates, Tuna Batuhan, Ahmet Simsar, Joseph Lyons, Seval Kizildag and Mecit Korkmaz for their encouragement and help when needed.

I especially thank my mom, dad, and sister who always believed in me and encouraged me with their best wishes. They taught me the value of hard work and to never give up. I would not have made it this far without them.

Finally, I would like to thank the Ministry of National Education of Turkey for this scholarship and education opportunity in the U.S. Thanks to you; I am one more step closer to my dreams.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.2 Significance of the Study	5
1.3 Purpose of the Study	5
1.4 Definitions of Important Terms	6
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
2.1 The Importance of Early Years and Early Childhood Education	8
2.2 Family: First Immediate Environment of Children	9
2.3 Fathers: From “Invisible” Parents to Today’s Fathers.....	10
2.4 Definition of Father Involvement and Its Components	12
2.5 Possible Factors Affecting Father Involvement.....	13
2.6 Turkey Example and Family Structure in Turkey	15
2.7 Early Childhood Education in Turkey	17
2.8 Father Involvement Programs and Studies in Turkey.....	21
2.8.1 Mother-Father School Project.....	23
2.8.2 Father Support Program.....	23
2.8.3 Its Good to Be a Father	24
2.9 The Theoretical Perspective behind the Study: Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Contexts.....	25
3. METHODOLOGY	29
3.1 Population and Participants.....	29
3.2 Protection of Human Subjects	30
3.3 Instruments.....	30
3.4 Validity and Reliability of the Instruments.....	32
3.5 Procedures	33
3.6 Data Analyses	34
4. RESULTS.....	36
4.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	36
4.1.1 Sample Characteristics and Demographics (Part A).....	37

4.1.2	Data Analysis of Responsibility of Fathers (Part B).....	46
4.1.3	Data Analysis of Engagement of Fathers (Part C).....	47
4.2	Analysis of Research Questions.....	49
4.2.1	Research Questions 1 and 2	50
4.2.2	Research Question 3	54
5.	DISCUSSION.....	58
5.1	Discussion of Research Questions	59
5.2	Limitations of the Study.....	65
5.3	Implications of the Study	67
5.4	Recommendations for Future Research	67
5.5	Conclusion	68
	APPENDICES	69
A.	RESEARCH INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	69
B.	FATHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE	71
C.	IRB APPROVAL LETTER	78
	REFERENCES	79
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	84

LIST OF TABLES

1	Percentages of males and females achieving each level of education in Turkey, 2011-2012.....	16
2	Number of formal pre-primary education schools, teachers and students between 2003 and 2013 years	19
3	Percentage of preschool aged children in early childhood education settings between years 2009 and 2013	20
4	Distribution of the fathers according to age groups.....	38
5	Distribution of the fathers according to educational levels	38
6	Distribution of the fathers according to occupation types	39
7	Distribution of the fathers according to monthly incomes.....	40
8	Distribution of the fathers according to marital statuses	40
9	Distribution of the fathers according to years of marriage	41
10	Distribution of the fathers according to the number of children	42
11	Distribution of the fathers according to the age of children they have in early childhood education	42
12	Distribution of the fathers according to work hours and days in a week.....	43
13	Distribution of approximate time fathers and children spend together in a day	44
14	Distribution of people care children when fathers are at work	44
15	Distribution of the mothers according to work hours and days in a week.....	45
16	Distribution of responsibility taking behaviors.....	46
17	Descriptive statistics of items in Part C	48
18	Distribution and percentages of tasks in Part B	51
19	Distribution of items fathers ranked highest based on the data (Part C)	53
20	Distribution of items fathers ranked lowest based on the data (Part C).....	53

21	Factors affecting father involvement in the current study	57
----	---	----

ABSTRACT

During the past few decades, there have been significant social changes affecting children and their families. Fathers are assuming a more active role in child rearing, primarily as a result of increases in the numbers of women in the work force, and numbers of children in non-parental care. Fathers as well as mothers play a significant role in young children's development. Findings from research studies conducted in North America suggest that there are several positive effects of father involvement on young children. However, father involvement is a relatively recent topic in early childhood education in Turkey, and little is known about the extent of Turkish fathers' involvement.

The present study examined Turkish fathers' involvement in the lives of their preschool aged children. The amount of time that fathers and children spend together, the types of activities they engage in, and factors that could be related to father involvement (e.g., age, education, income, working hours) were investigated. Participating in the study were 84 fathers of 3-6 year old children enrolled in four public early childhood education settings in Istanbul, Turkey. An instrument titled, "Father Involvement Questionnaire", was used to measure father involvement. Findings indicated that father's occupation type, monthly income, number of marriage years, numbers of children in the family, and fathers' work hours affected their involvement. Findings are discussed with reference to fathers' accessibility, responsibility and engagement.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

It is well established that family members play a significant role in the well-being and development of young children. What happens within the family can have a direct effect on children's learning and development in both positive and negative ways (Morrison, 2000). Since children bring all the experiences that they have with and from their families when they first enter school, it is important to understand families. It is also important to identify family characteristics and activities that support and enhance children's learning in the early childhood years (Couchenour & Chrisman, 2008).

Given the importance of families for children's learning in the early childhood years, it is hardly surprising that scholars have focused on children's families. Typically, most family studies were conducted with mothers and their young children. Mother-child interactions and contributions of the mothers to their families were investigated in such studies (Lamb, 2010). It was believed that a father's participation was minimal and that it did not have any important effect on children's development (Saracho & Spodek, 2008). Fathers were seen as "*forgotten contributors to child development*" (Lamb, 1975) and "*invisible parents*"; as a result, fathers were neglected in those studies (Saracho & Spodek, 2008).

Since the mid-1970s, father-child interaction and the roles of fathers in the family received more attention from researchers and studies were conducted in an attempt to understand the role of fathers and father involvement with young children (Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Bradley, Hofferth, & Lamb, 2000; Lamb, 1975; Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, & Levine, 1985; Lamb et al., 1987; Marsiglio, 1991, 1993; Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000; McBride, 1990, 1991;

McBride & Mills, 1993). Research findings highlighted the importance of fathers in children's lives, and that their involvement makes a difference in terms of children's learning, development, and well-being. Children of more involved fathers had higher cognitive abilities, increased empathy skills, less sex-stereotyped beliefs, and more internal locus of control than children of less involved fathers (Lamb, 2010). Moreover, children become more successful in their school lives (Lamb, 2010), and involvement of fathers directly affects social-emotional, cognitive, and language developments of children (Cabrera, Shannon & Tamis-Le Monda, 2007).

During the past few decades, there have been significant social changes affecting children and families, including changes in family structures. In the 21st century, the numbers of women in the work force and numbers of children in non-parental care have increased dramatically (Cabrera et al., 2000). Furthermore, many couples do not live in close proximity to their extended family members, and fathers and mothers are more likely to share parenting roles when they raise their children (Gordon & Williams-Browne, 1995). Hence, fathers are assuming a more active role in child rearing as a consequence of those social changes (Cabrera et al., 2000; Lamb, 2010).

Such social and family changes have primarily been restricted to North America. However, similar changes have occurred in other countries such as Turkey. In recent years, increasing numbers of Turkish women have entered the work force, and fathers are no longer the sole economic providers for their families. Nowadays, it is not uncommon for women to work as long as men do, and to share with their husbands the responsibility of financially supporting their families. Consequently, it is believed that Turkish fathers are spending more time with their children, and that they are more likely to share child care responsibilities (Unuvar, 2011).

Despite the promising changes in Turkish father involvement, some fathers remain reluctant to engage with their children and assume more child care duties and responsibilities. That is, there are still differences among fathers and their involvement in children's lives. Some fathers are more actively involved in the lives of their children, while some are less involved. There can be many reasons for such differences in levels of father involvement including the father's age, income, education, number of children in the family, working hours, having a working wife, etc. To date, there is limited information and studies concerning the nature and extent of Turkish fathers' involvement with young children (Evans, 1997; Ogut, 1998; Ari Gulec, 1998; Aydin, 2003; Ivrendi & Isikoglu, 2010; Unuvar, 2011). The present study sought to identify the current situation concerning father involvement by focusing on Turkish father involvement in the lives of their preschool aged children (ages 3 to 6). In addition to describing their involvement, the study sought to identify possible factors that influence or affect their involvement.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Recent trends and changes in Turkish society including economic, cultural, as well as socio-demographic have had a significant impact on families. The complexity of these changes is possibly tied to the fact that Turkish society is a complex mixture of historical and cultural values with modern tastes and trends. With its unique geographic location between the East and the West, Turkey adopted aspects of both Eastern and Western cultures (Ataca, 2006). Nauck and Klaus (2008) agree that Turkey is an example of diversity and change in family systems based on three main factors. Firstly, Turkish society was traditionally agrarian throughout its

foundational years. Then, around the middle of the Second Millennium, Islamic influence developed during the reign of Ottoman Empire. Thirdly, after the Ottoman Empire fell, the Turkish Republic was founded in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk. This led to the establishment of a new national culture shaped around Ataturk's vision of a more secular, modern, and western state. These three forces are undoubtedly reflected throughout Turkish society and specifically in Turkish family lives.

According to Cindoglu, Cemrek, Toktas and Zencirci (2008), the Turkish family is “the battleground of the modern and the traditional” (p. 235). Because of mass migration from rural to urban areas, industrialization and an increase in the numbers of working women, family lives have changed dramatically. Additionally, a mix of Islamic traditionalism from rural areas and Western lifestyles in the cities has created a new Turkish family structure which is a hybrid of both traditional and modern influences (Cindoglu et al., 2008). In the Turkish family structure, men are generally perceived as the head of the family, decision maker, and breadwinner (Ataca, 2006; Kagitcibasi, 1996). Further, despite increasing numbers of dual-earner families, women are still seen as their children's primary caregivers even if they work as long as their husbands do. It has been reported that women are primarily responsible for childcare, education and the discipline of their children during the early childhood years. Although both mothers and fathers make decisions concerning the education of their children, Turkish fathers do not seem to be willing to be engaged in the care of their children, and their involvement is typically limited (Ozgun & Sterling Honig, 2005).

Given this background, the current study sought to investigate the extent of father involvement in the lives of preschool aged children amongst one group of families in Istanbul, Turkey.

1.2. Significance of the Study

Fathers as well as mothers play a significant role in young children's development. Research studies suggest that children are likely to have better cognitive and social-emotional skills and will be successful in their schools when their fathers are involved (Cabrera et al., 2007). However, paternal involvement is a relatively recent topic in early childhood education in Turkey, and little is known about the extent of Turkish fathers' involvement. To the researcher's knowledge, a limited number of studies have examined Turkish father involvement with preschool aged children (Evans, 1997; Ogut, 1998; Ari Gulec, 1998; Aydin, 2003; Ivrendi & Isikoglu, 2010; Unuvar, 2011). The current study should shed light on this understudied area by documenting how one group of fathers engaged with their young children, including how they spent time together, what kind of activities they engaged in, as well as possible reasons for their involvement, or lack of involvement, as the case might have been. Understanding more about the nature of father involvement should assist educators and others in developing activities, and practices that support families and encourage fathers to be involved with their children.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The present study examined Turkish father involvement in the lives of preschool aged children. The amount of time that fathers and children spend together, the type of activities they do, and possible contributing factors (age, education, income, working hours, etc.) affecting father involvement were investigated. The descriptive study was guided by the following three broad questions:

- What is the nature and extent of Turkish father involvement in the lives of their preschool-aged (ages 3 to 6) children?
- How do Turkish fathers and their children spend time together, and what kind of activities do they do?
- What are the effects of various socio-demographic factors on father involvement?

1.4. Definitions of Important Terms

Father: In the current study, a father is defined as a male parent (either biological or stepfather) who has a preschool aged child in a public early childhood education setting in Turkey.

Preschool Aged Children: 3-6 year old children who receive public early childhood education.

Father Involvement: In this study, Lamb et al.'s (1985) model is used to describe father involvement within three categories: *availability* (father's presence or accessibility to their children), *responsibility* (an arrangement of resources for welfare and care of children) and *engagement* (a direct contact and shared interactions between the father and children).

Possible Factors Behind Father Involvement: Factors affecting level of father involvement in the present study: fathers' age, education, occupation type, income, marital status, having a working wife or not, father's working days and hours, age and gender of the child, and number of children in the family, the amount of time father and child spend together and person/people who care child when father is not at home.

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Contexts: Bronfenbrenner's theory (Ecological Models of Human Development) includes five contexts: *microsystem* (the first immediate environment of the person where mostly face-to-face interactions take place in), *mesosystem* (interactions among

few contexts that person actively participates in), *exosystem* (one or more settings that person is not actively involved, but is somehow influenced by what happens in those settings), *macrosystem* (a product of microsystem, mesosystem and exosystem where culture, beliefs and ideology have parts in), and *chronosystem* (a context that includes a change or stability over time not only in characteristics of the person, but also of the environment that person lives in) (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1994).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. The Importance of Early Years and Early Childhood Education

The early years are considered a time of significant and important developmental changes in individuals. It is hardly surprising, therefore that the care and attention that a child receives from birth to age eight is considered important. This is because parental care and out-of home care can have a significant influence on a child's development across several domains (i.e., physical, intellectual, social and emotional). It is during the early years that most of the brain's development takes place and the foundation for future learning occurs. Thus, providing positive experiences for the well-being and development of young children is crucial in their early childhood years (UNICEF, 2012).

Early childhood education is typically designed to provide for the developmental needs of young children before they enter elementary school (Encyclopedia of Children's Health, 2013). According to Lynch (2004), early childhood education programs yield positive benefits for children, for families and even for countries. For example, it was found that preschool education had a significant affects on the intellectual and academic achievement of children (Gorey, 2001). Early education provides children with an opportunity to develop more advanced language abilities, prepares them for elementary education, and increases the probability that they will continue secondary and high school education. Early education is also associated with decreases in school dropout rates as well as decreases in the need for special education placement (Lynch, 2004). Families whose children receive early childhood education have fewer additional births, fewer instances of abuse or neglect, and they commit less crime. Instead, parents are more likely

to work, earn higher salaries and complete more years of their education (Lynch, 2004). Also, there is strong evidence that high quality early childhood education programs support the positive development of children, encourage parents to work and contribute to the local economy (Morrissey & Warner, 2007). Investing in early childhood education programs is cost effective, because it brings higher financial returns to nations in the future by decreasing inequality among children from different socioeconomic statuses (Woodhead, 2006).

Given the benefits of early childhood education outlined above, nations across the globe have invested in programs for educating young children. Many educators now believe that early childhood education has earned the attention it deserves, and that it has a solid place in the education policies of governments. Yet, despite the importance of formal early education programs, it is also well established that families play as important a role in children's lives as do schools. As such, parents and families are integral to any early childhood education program. According to Bronfenbrenner (1979), schools and families are considered microsystems where the first interactions of childhood occur, and children are directly affected by activities, social roles and interpersonal relations within their microsystems. For this reason, it is difficult to fully support children's development during the early childhood years unless parents and families are involved.

2.2. Family: First Immediate Environment of Children

A family is defined as the context that people live together with marriage, blood, adoption, emotional or social ties (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2009). The family is the immediate environment where children's development and education begins, and no other contexts in

children's lives are as important as their families (Morrison, 2000). The primary responsibilities of families are to meet the needs of their children, provide for their care and nurturance, and contribute toward the healthy development of their children. Parents are a child's first caregivers, safety providers and emotional supporters; all during the years before children receive early childhood education. Children experience early communication and socialization skills at home with their parents (Couchenour & Chrisman, 2008). Furthermore, parents are considered children's first teachers. This is because children first learn and practice things at home by spending time and interacting with their parents (Ozeke-Kocabas, 2006).

In traditional families, women are the ones who care for and nurture their children, while men are the breadwinners and financial providers for their families. However, during the past few decades, there have been significant social changes affecting children and families, including changes in family structures. In the 21st century, the numbers of women in the work force and numbers of children in non-parental care increased dramatically (Cabrera et al., 2000). Also, many couples do not live in close proximity to their extended family members, and fathers and mothers are more likely to share parenting roles when they raise their children (Gordon & Williams-Browne, 1995). Hence, such changes resulted in fathers having a more active role in children's lives than they did in the past (Lamb, 2000).

2.3. Fathers: From “Invisible” Parents to Today's Fathers

In recent years, fathers have become more involved in raising their children and they no longer keep themselves apart from child rearing. As a result how we define fatherhood has changed. Yet, fathers were seen as patriarchs of the families, and in the past they were

responsible for the moral education of their children. During the colonial era, for example, fathers, as moral teachers of the family, were teaching moral values and religious scripts to their children. After the Industrial Revolution, fathers' roles shifted from being moral teachers to being the breadwinner, and they became responsible for supporting their families financially (Lamb, 2010). The Great Depression and Second World War affected the role of fathers in society and fathers were seen as sex-role models for children, especially for their sons. Besides being a moral teacher, breadwinner and sex-role model in the family, fathers were defined as active, nurturing and care giving parents in the mid-1970s (Lamb, 1987). More recently, increasing numbers of women in the workforce, and contemporary changes in traditional roles of families resulted in higher expectations from fathers (Lamb, 2010). As a result, the role of fathers in child rearing and child development has shifted from “invisible” parents to “involved” fathers (Saracho & Spodek, 2008). Nowadays, just as mothers do, fathers play a significant role in child care and in the development of their children. Today’s fathers care for and supervise their children, support their wives’ career plans, and have more parenting responsibilities than before (Morrison, 2000).

Fathering scholars have conducted numerous studies in an effort to understand the importance of fathers in children’s lives. Three types of studies have been conducted concerning the roles of fathers and the effects of father involvement: correlation studies, father absence and divorce studies, and studies of involved fathers. Researchers assumed that fathers were sex role models for their children, especially for their sons. The masculinity of fathers and sons were assessed and compared in correlational studies. The results showed that boys tended to be more masculine if they had good relationships with their fathers. In father absence and divorce studies, researchers looked at the roles of father in the family. Such studies were conducted with children who were raised with and without fathers, to understand the effects of father absence on children.

The results of these studies suggested that that children, especially boys who were raised without fathers had sex role, gender identity and psychological problems in the future. Also, they had a tendency to have trouble in school and to have difficulty controlling their aggressive behaviors. The last type of studies suggested that children of more involved fathers had higher cognitive abilities, increased empathy skills, less sex-stereotyped beliefs, and more internal locus of control than children of less involved fathers (Lamb, 2010). Moreover, children become more successful in their school lives, and involvement of fathers directly affects social-emotional, cognitive, behavioral and psychological development of children (Cabrera et al., 2007; Marsiglio, Amato, Day & Lamb, 2000).

2.4. Definition of Father Involvement and Its Components

Today, fathers are more involved in children's lives than fathers who raised children 30-40 years ago (Unuvar, 2011), and their involvement seems to make a difference in children's lives. According to Lamb, Pleck, Charnov and Levine (1985) father involvement is a combination of three main components: availability, responsibility, and engagement.

Availability: This refers a father's presence or accessibility to their children. Father's direct interaction is not necessary if the father is physically and psychologically available to the child. A child playing in the room while the father is cooking in the kitchen or doing some house work is an example of father's availability (Lamb et al., 1985; Lamb, 1997).

Responsibility: This refers to the arrangement of resources for the welfare and care of children. Being responsible does not require direct interaction with the child. According to father

involvement model, knowing when the child needs to go to the doctor, making child care and babysitting arrangements are responsibilities of fathers (Lamb et al., 1985; Lamb, 1997).

Engagement (Interaction): This refers to direct contact and shared interactions between the father and his children during care, play, and leisure activities. Feeding children, playing with them or reading to them are examples of father's engagement. Because direct contact is required between the father and the child, sitting in the living room while the child is playing in her room does not constitute father engagement or interaction (Lamb et al., 1985; Lamb, 1997).

2.5. Possible Factors Affecting Father Involvement

Fathering scholars believe that increased paternal involvement yield benefits for children's development. Although positive effects of father involvement are known, there are still differences among fathers and their levels of involvement in children's lives. Differences between levels of their involvement may be a result or related to several factors as described in the following section.

Father's age, education, income, working hours, marital status and the amount of time spent with his child are factors that have typically been examined in father involvement studies. According to results of previously conducted studies, younger fathers have more interactions with their children (McBride, 1990), and fathers who are better educated are more involved with their children (Ahmeduzzaman & Roopnarine, 1992; Bailey, 1993). Besides fathers' age and education, working hours is another important factor related to father involvement. When fathers spend more hours at work, they tend to spend less time with their children on weekdays (Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth, 2001). According to Marsiglio(1991), fathers who worked

more hours spent less time for reading and leisure time activities with their children. Also, fathers with higher incomes had less interaction with children, and they were less accessible on workdays (McBride, 1990). Working in a full time or part time job directly affected fathers' availability to their children (Ivrendi & Isikoglu, 2010). Family type is another relevant factor affecting involvement of the fathers. It is also reported that fathers spend more time playing with their children in two parent families (Ivrendi & Isikoglu, 2010). Also, fathers are more likely to have more stable marriages when they are more involved in their children's lives (Kalmijn, 1999).

The number of children in the family, children's ages and gender are other factors that possibly affect fathers' involvement and their interactions with children. Fathers who have more than one child and fathers of second children have fewer interactions with their children (McBride, 1990). Rustia and Abbott (1993) found that fathers are more engaged with first-born children than with later children in their families. Also, when families are larger, there are fewer interactions with older children, and almost no association with younger children (Marsiglio, 1991). Although some scholars found that engagement and accessibility of fathers are more frequent with their younger children (McBride & Mills, 1993). Child's gender, according to previous studies, is another possible factor affecting father involvement. Fathers were more involved with their sons, they had more communication, play and activities with their sons than they had with their daughters (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Lamb, 2000). Similar results were found in Ogut's study (1998), who noted that fathers who had sons took more responsibility for childcare.

Mothers' occupation status directly affects fathers and their involvement with children based on the following studies. It was found that fathers are more actively involved when they

have working wives (McBride & Mills, 1993; Lamb, 2000). Another study of two parent families showed that fathers who have working wives spend more time with their children by engaging in activities and being accessible (Lamb et al., 1985).

Most of the father involvement studies referred to above were conducted in the United States. It is unclear whether the same findings would be evident in other countries. Yet, many other countries have experienced social changes and changing family practices. Turkey is one of those countries investing in early childhood programs, and seeking ways to improve the education and well-being of their youngest citizens.

2.6. Turkey Example and Family Structure in Turkey

The Turkish Republic was founded in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the “Father of the Turks” (The World Factbook, 2013). Turkey is located between Europe, Asia and the Middle East, and approximately eighty million residents live in Turkey. 70-75 % of its population is Turkish, 18-20 % of them are Kurdish and 7-12 % of them are from other minorities. The official language is Turkish and a large number of the population is Muslim (99.8 %). According to recent data, most of the Turkish population (70 %) live in cities and work in industry (26.2 %) and service sectors (48.4), whereas the remaining population are (almost 25 %) employed in agriculture (The World Factbook, 2013). Both men and women are in the workforce: the labor force participation rate is 70.4 % for males and 29.3 % for females in the first month of 2013. Although literacy ratios are pretty close to each other, female literacy is still lower (92.2 %) than male literacy (98.3 %) (Turkstat, 2013). Table 1 reports schooling percentages of both genders in

primary, secondary and higher education and provides an overview of the educational levels of men and women in Turkey.

Table 1

Percentages of males and females achieving each level of education in Turkey, 2011-2012

<i>Level of Education</i>	<i>Female Percentage</i>	<i>Male Percentage</i>
Primary Education (Grade 1-8)	98.6 %	98.8 %
Secondary Education (High School Grades)	66.1 %	68.5 %
Higher Education (College/University)	35.4 %	35.6 %

Source: Turkstat (2013)

As a family structure, extended families were common in the past, and fathers were not only head of their families, but also breadwinners and decision-makers. As a result of urbanization, industrialization and entrance of women into the work force, society and family structures have changed (Kagitcibasi, 1996). Families have shifted from extended to nuclear in the structure, and the educational level of families has risen. Families have started to give more values to their children, and they have fewer children than families did in the past. Also, expectations from fathers have changed and patriarchal characteristics of fathers have weakened over time (Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005). Today, 54.2 % of families have at least one child below age 18. Almost 90 % of the children below age five are cared for by their mothers, 8.3 % of the children are cared for by grandparents, and only 1.5 % of the children are cared for by fathers (Turkstat, 2013).

The information presented above provides a brief overview of the education, occupation and family lifestyles of individuals in Turkey. While Turkish society is changing, families and

their lifestyles are changing naturally, and those changes directly affect the care, development and education of children.

2.7. Early Childhood Education in Turkey

The early childhood education movement began during different periods of time in various parts of the world. In Turkey, the first early childhood programs were run by charity foundations; this at a time before the Turkish Republic was founded in 1923. These initial programs were designed to provide shelter, food, education and medical care for orphan children, and the Ottoman Ministry of Education developed and implemented rules and regulations to organize those charities during the period 1914 to 1915. Following World War I and the Turkish War of Independence, those early educational movements lost their importance (Oktay & Zembat, 1995), and by 1923 there were just 80 foundation schools in 38 cities (Oktay, 1989).

In 1928, a language reform was started and the Latin alphabet was accepted by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk. Because Arabic letters had been used in written language throughout the centuries, there was a necessity to teach citizens reading and writing in a new alphabet (Chapin Metz, 1995). Hence, priority was given to the primary education of individuals in the first few decades of the new Turkish Republic (Bekman, 2005), and early childhood education institutions were modified to primary schools or they were shut down at that time (Oktay, 1983). Early in the 1930s, a large number of people were illiterate, and the illiteracy rate was 90 % for women and 70 % for men (Nauck & Klaus, 2005). Since that time, efforts to provide primary education yielded positive results such that by today 92.2 % of females and 98.3 % males are literate (Turkstat, 2013).

A limited number of students were able to get early childhood education before the 1990s. This is because at that time the priority was on providing elementary (primary) education (Bekman, 2005). Early childhood education was mostly provided by private nurseries and preschools that were center based and located in large cities (Bekman, 1998). Moreover, in Turkey there was no comprehensive and standardized program for the education of young children until the 1990's. Early childhood education received considerable attention by the government in the 1990s. At that time, the Preschool Education General Directorate was founded within the Ministry of National Education in an effort to organize existing education settings and meet early childhood education needs of the country (Bekman, 2005).

Today, it is primarily the Ministry of National Education (MONE) and the Ministry of Family and Social Policies who are responsible for formal early childhood education. The Ministry of National Education (2013) defines pre-primary education (early childhood education) as the optional education of children who are between ages 3-5 before they enter in to compulsory primary (elementary) education. The aims of the pre-primary education are to support children's physical, mental and emotional development, prepare them for primary education and teach them good habits and Turkish speaking skills. There are mainly three types of early childhood education institutions: nursery schools (kindergartens) for 5-6 year old children before they start primary education, preschool centers for children between ages 3-6, and crèches (day care centers) for children from 0-6 years of age (Bekman, 2005). Besides those institutions, there are summer preschools and mobile classrooms. Summer preschools are for 60-66 month-old children who are not able to get pre-primary education. And mobile classrooms provide education opportunities for 36-66 month-old children who come from low income families (MONE, 2013).

As a result of increased attention on early childhood education, the number of formal pre-primary education schools, preschool teachers and students in the schools have increased year by year. The recent data reported in Table 2 shows the numbers of schools, teachers and students in the last decade.

Table 2

Number of formal pre-primary education schools, teachers and students between 2003 and 2013 years

Year	School	Teacher	Student
2003/2004	13 285	17 511	344 741
2004/2005	15 978	22 152	434 771
2005/2006	18 539	20 910	550 146
2006/2007	20 675	24 775	640 849
2007/2008	22 506	25 901	701 762
2008/2009	23 653	29 342	804 765
2009/2010	26 681	42 716	980 654
2010/2011	27 606	48 330	1115 818
2011/2012	28 625	55 883	1169 556
2012/2013	27 197	62 933	1077 933

Source: The Ministry of National Education (MONE) & Turkstat (2013)

Despite increasing numbers of schools, teachers and students between 2003 and 2012 years, there was a sudden decrease in those numbers in the 2012/2013 education year. The possible reason for that decrease may be a new education policy, “4+4+4” which divides twelve year compulsory education into three four year stages (four years for primary education, four years for middle school and four years for high school education). As a result of this “4+4+4” policy, the starting age for primary school education shifted from 72 months to 66 months. This means that 66 month-old children can legally start 1st grade, and children between 60-65 months

are able to start 1st grade with parental permission in the fall semester of 2012/2013 (MONE, 2012).

Also, Table 3 reports the schooling percentages per age group between 2009 and 2013. In 2009, almost 27 % children between 3-5 ages, and 38-39 % children between 4-5 ages reached early childhood education. Schooling percentages have increased for each age group and gender in the later few years. However, 5 year old children's schooling has dropped dramatically in the 2012/2013 education year. While 65-66 % of all 5 year old children were receiving early childhood education in 2011-2012, it is 57 % for males and 53 % for females among 5 year olds in 2012/2013. Again, it is clear to see the negative effects of the "4+4+4" education policy on schooling percentages of 5 year old children in Turkey.

Table 3

Percentage of preschool aged children in early childhood education settings between years 2009 and 2013

Year	Age Group	Males	Females
2009/2010	3-5 year	27.34 %	26.48 %
	4-5 year	39.17 %	37.91 %
2010/2011	3-5 year	30.25 %	29.43 %
	4-5 year	43.70 %	42.47 %
2011/2012	3-5 year	31.23 %	30.49 %
	4-5 year	44.56 %	43.50 %
	5 year	66.20 %	65.16 %
2012/2013	3-5 year	31.42 %	30.41 %
	4-5 year	44.86 %	43.18 %
	5 year	57.34 %	53.24 %

Source: Turkstat (2013)

2.8. Father Involvement Programs and Studies in Turkey

In the 1990s, the importance and the necessity of early childhood education in Turkey was recognized, and positive effects of early schooling on children and their families have been supported by research studies. Because center based early childhood education was limited, researchers focused on mothers as children's first or primary caregivers. Mother education programs were designed to support the education of children in the early years. For this reason, the importance of mother education and mother involvement was recognized in the late 1980s, and mothers were participants of those research studies at that time. Thus, a large number of studies have been conducted with mothers to understand the significance of mother-child relationships and their involvement in early childhood education.

The roles of fathers and father involvement seem to have been neglected until the late 1990s and one of the first father involvement studies in Turkey was conducted in 1997. Both dual earner and single earner families participated in Evans' (1997) study. The results indicated that fathers were the financial providers of their families and mothers were mostly responsible for child care. It was found that teaching moral and social behaviors to their children were responsibilities of both parents, and mother's employment had somehow influenced father involvement. Another study was conducted with fathers who came from middle and upper class socioeconomic backgrounds. There were 80 fathers of firstborn children and fathers' level of engagement and responsibility were investigated in Ogut's study (1998). It was found that mothers were primarily seen as caregivers for their children; whereas, fathers were financial providers for their families. Yet both parents made decisions concerning the education of their children. Also, upper SES fathers and fathers who had male children were more willing to take responsibility for child care, and fathers of young children had more interactions with their

children. In Ari Gulec's (1998) study, both mothers' and fathers' involvement was investigated. Thirty five single earner and 35 dual earner families who came from high SES backgrounds were subjects of that study and they all had children between ages 3 and 5. Mothers' working status was the only factor affecting involvement of mothers. Non-working mothers were found more involved in care and activities of their children than were working mothers. There were no differences between maternal and paternal involvement, and father involvement was not influenced by having a working or non-working wife in that study.

Several father involvement studies have been conducted by researchers in 2000s. Aydin (2003) created father involvement training for fathers who have preschool aged children, and looked at possible effects of training on father involvement and fathering perceptions. It was found that the training has increased fathers' interaction with their children. Fathers were more actively involved in care giving and leisure time activities of their children. For the most part mothers were responsible of care giving tasks of their children in the study. Another study was conducted by Ivrendi & Isikoglu (2010) with 97 fathers who had children in public early childhood education settings. Fathers' participation and views about children's play were examined in the study. The results indicated that fathers had positive views about children's play and they were frequently involved in play. Fathers who had medium and high incomes had more positive views than fathers from low income backgrounds. Moreover, part time working fathers and fathers of nuclear families were more highly involved in children's plays than were other fathers. Also, Unuvar (2011) found that today's fathers are more involved in caring for children and engaging in more activities with them as compared to fathers of 30-40 years ago. Besides those studies, several programs were designed to educate fathers and create awareness among

fathers about father involvement during the early childhood years. The following programs are examples of father education in Turkey:

2.8.1. Mother-Father School Project

The Mother-Father School Project was launched by Yavuzer in 1989 in an effort to encourage mothers and fathers to raise healthy and confident children, and educate them about children's development and school successes. The project reached more than 17,000 families in 27 Turkish cities since 1989 (Yavuzer, 2005).

2.8.2. Father Support Program

Mother Child Education Foundation (ACEV) has played a leading role in father education by creating two programs for fathers since 1996. “Father Support Program” (FSP) was designed to create awareness and consciousness among fathers, especially those who come from low income families (Atmaca Kocak, 2004). The Father Support Program was developed as a result of requests from mothers who engage in mother-support training programs of the same foundation. The main aims of the program are to create awareness among fathers and to give them knowledge about the roles of fathers in child development. Additionally, supporting fathers to behave more democratic at home, encouraging them to spend more time with their children and to create better communication between fathers and children are other aims of Father Support Program (Mother Child Education Foundation, 2013).

The Ministry of National Education and the Ministry of Family and Social Policy have supported the program and have collaborated with the Mother Child Education Foundation. The Father Support Program was conducted by counselors and classroom teachers who had been previously trained. Research results suggest that fathers had closer and warmer relationships with their children at the end of the program. Fathers who participated in the program showed less authoritative and patriarchal behaviors in their families; instead, they had more supportive roles than previously (Mother Child Education Foundation, 2013). Moreover, fathers' behaviors towards their children changed positively. Fathers reported that they behaved with more tolerance toward their children, started to talk and listen to their children, spent more time together, and showed more affection toward their children. Fathers also chose to use alternative methods to discipline their children, and communication between the child and the father increased after the program (Atmaca Kocak, 2004).

2.8.3. It's Good to Be a Father

This program is a TV series project that strives to help understanding of the Father Support Program. Episodes had interviews and courses that were based on Father Support Program's topics. "It's Good to Be a Father" program was implemented by ACEV and NTV channel. The aim of the project was to increase fathers' awareness about their roles and importance in children's lives. As a result, father participation increased and more fathers were engaged in ACEV's Father Support Program (Mother Child Education Foundation, 2013).

Given the context of father involvement in Turkey and the limited research with this population, the current study sought to shed more light on some of the issues outlined above.

The current study sought to describe the nature and extent of father involvement amongst a group of fathers in one location in Turkey. At the same time, the information gathered was used to try to identify factors that may be related to father involvement. Identifying and understanding factors that influence father involvement could be beneficial to researchers as well as practitioners. Such information could be useful in designing approaches or practices that encourage fathers to engage in positive activities with their children. While several theoretical perspectives may be significant or relevant for the current study; it was determined that Bronfenbrenner's socio-ecological theory was both appropriate and applicable.

2.9. The Theoretical Perspective behind the Study: Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Contexts

The current study sought to understand how Turkish fathers are involved in the lives of their children, how fathers and children spend time together and whether specific socio-demographic factors effect father involvement (e.g., age, education, income, working hours). Multiple factors and increased expectations from fatherhood influence fathers' accessibility, responsibility, and engagement. In this study, fathers are individuals that are affected by changes in their families, work, social lives and cultures, and those changes most likely affect their fathering behaviors. Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Models of Human Development (1979) explains how environments are important for human development and how they influence people's behaviors.

According to Bronfenbrenner (1979), human development is a result of progressive and mutual interactions between the person and environments that the person has relations with. The ecology of human development theory defines those ecological environments as a set of

structures that are nested within each other. During the 1970's, Bronfenbrenner introduced contexts classified as the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem and macrosystem. He later added fifth context to his theoretical model: the chronosystem.

The microsystem is the first immediate environment of the person where mostly face-to-face interactions take place (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The microsystem is an environment consisting of a pattern of activities, social roles and interpersonal relations directly affecting the development of the individual. The child's family, day care center and playground are examples of microsystems according to Bronfenbrenner's (1974) ecological theory. Two or more microsystems form a mesosystem, which consists of interactions among those contexts that a person actively participates in. The relations among the family, school and friends are examples of a child's mesosystem. The third context is the exosystem, which includes one or more settings that a person is not actively involved in. However, a person is somehow influenced by what happens in those settings. For a child, it might be the parents' workplace, older sibling's class, or a community of parents' friends. The macrosystem is a product of all three systems (the microsystem, mesosystem and exosystem), where culture or subculture, beliefs and ideology have components in (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The final context is the chronosystem. This consists of change or stability over time not only in characteristics of the person, but also of the environment that the person resides in. Changes in family structure, employment or socio-economical statuses over time are possible examples of the chronosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

*Figure 1: Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Contexts in the Current Study
(Based on Bronfenbrenner's works; 1979, 1994)*

In this study, a child's father is considered as an individual inside all contexts of Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory. All the settings that fathers have been around and have interactions with are possible environments of fathers in the study. As presented in Figure 1, the family, work and friends (social life) are first immediate environments that directly affect fathers and their behaviors, and so the family, work and friends are possible microsystems around the father. The father has particular interactions between his family and work, work and friends, or friends and family. Those interactions form a second layer of the model, the mesosystem. Father's extended family, children's schools and wife's workplace are examples of the exosystem where events or changes in those settings have indirect effects on the father's life.

Using Turkey as an example, cultural values, customs, laws and religion might be seen in the macrosystem level. Furthermore, changes in family structures, increases in the number of women in the workforce, better employment and educational opportunities than in the past are elements of chronosystem for Turkish fathers.

To sum up, early childhood is an important period in children's lives. What happens in the family can have a direct effect on children; and children bring all the experiences they have from their families when they enter schools. For this reason, understanding and supporting families is important if we are to understand and support children. As parents, fathers are as important as mothers in their children's lives and their involvement affect children's development, well-being, and education, especially during the early years. Because father involvement makes a difference in children's lives, numerous research studies have been conducted mostly in North America.

In recent years, Turkey has been engaged in a effort to improve early education. Yet, despite improved programs for young children and their families, father involvement has not received the attention of researchers and policymakers. A limited number of studies have been conducted with fathers to investigate the extent of father involvement during the early childhood years. Given the importance of father involvement as well as the limited number of studies addressing Turkish father involvement, the current study was conducted. The primary purpose of the study was to determine the involvement of Turkish fathers in the lives of preschool aged children.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The study's design and methodology are in this chapter. Included is a description of the participants, the procedure, research instruments, methods of data collection and methods of data analyses. The primary purpose of the current study was to determine and to describe the nature and extent of the involvement of Turkish fathers in the lives of their preschool aged children. It is important to study Turkish fathers' involvement because educators and researchers believe that fathers can make an important and significant contribution to the development and well-being of their children. Furthermore, little is known about the ways Turkish fathers engage with their preschool aged children.

Participating in the study were sample of fathers of 3-6 year old children enrolled in four public early childhood education settings in Istanbul, Turkey. An instrument titled "Father Involvement Questionnaire" was used in the study to measure father involvement. This instrument was distributed to fathers by the preschool teachers in each of the participating schools. A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed and 87 were completed and returned to the researcher. This return rate of approximately 30%, though disappointing, was considered adequate for the purposes of this study.

3.1. Population and Participants

The target population of the study was all fathers who had preschool aged children in public schools in a specific neighborhood of Istanbul, Turkey. Because it would not be possible to reach all fathers in that area, the accessible population was defined as fathers whose preschool

aged children were enrolled in four public schools. Residents of the neighborhood where the research was conducted include families from different socio-economical statuses (SES). Since this neighborhood is adjacent to the poor (“gecekondü”) and rich neighborhoods of Istanbul, children from both “high” and “low” SES groups enrolled the four public schools participated in the study. The initial intent of the study was to use a convenient sample of fathers from six public schools. Specific limitations meant that only four of the six schools could be used in the present study.

3.2. Protection of Human Subjects

As with any research endeavor, the researcher strived to be sensitive to ethical issues concerning the protection of human subjects. For example, all of the data were kept in a secure location by the researcher. The researcher also informed the participants about all aspects of the study. A consent form, along with a letter from the researcher was given to the parents (see Appendix A). The consent form explained the purposes of the study and how the respondents’ identities and the data would be kept confidential.

3.3. Instruments

There were no suitable instruments available for this study and therefore a questionnaire was developed by the researcher. The “*Father Involvement Questionnaire*,” (see Appendix B) was developed by combining elements of two different instruments. The researcher used the “*Father Interview Form*” developed by Ogut (1998) and “*The Inventory of Father Involvement*”

created by Hawkins et al. (2002). The “*Father Involvement Questionnaire*” developed for the current study included three parts: the first part (Part A) included items designed to provide demographic information about the fathers. Then, the second and third parts (parts B and C) included questions and items designed to investigate the levels of Turkish father involvement in the lives of their preschool aged children.

The first part of the instrument (Part A) consisted of 20 questions that were based on the demographic information section of Ogut’s (1998) “Father Interview Form.” The researcher took the same questions related to fathers' age, education, years of marriage, occupation, and type of the workplace. Because Ogut (1998) sought to assess the accessibility of fathers by asking detailed questions about working hours of both fathers and mothers, questions related to working hours of both parents were also adopted from that instrument. Questions about fathers’ marital statuses, income levels, number of children in the family, age and gender of the child in early childhood education were developed by the researcher.

The second part of the questionnaire (Part B) included 14 questions designed to measure fathers' responsibilities in the lives of their children. All of the questions were taken from Ogut’s (1998) study. The main purpose of these items was to obtain information about the extent of family members’ responsibilities in caring for the development, education, and well-being of their children. In Ogut’s (1998) research, the answer options for those 14 questions were designated as “Mother”, “Father”, “Both parents together” and “Other” (the child itself, the grandmother of the child, etc). However, for the newly developed survey the researcher opted to use “Mother”, “Father”, “Both Parents Together”, “Child” and “Other” as answer options for those questions in Part B.

The final part (Part C) of the questionnaire included 31 sentence-type items (total 40 items) that investigated the nature and extent of the engagement of Turkish fathers in the lives of their children. Drawing on the work of Ogut (1998) and Hawkins et al. (2002) the researcher developed a series of statements. Several of the statements were based on questions from the second section of Ogut (1998)'s "Father Interview Form". The questions were modified as sentences or statements that would be appropriate for Likert type of scoring. Similarly, several items were adopted from the "The Inventory of Father Involvement (IFI)". Three or more items from the dimensions of discipline and teaching responsibility, school encouragement, mother support, providing, time and talking together, praise and affection, developing talents and future concerns, and attentiveness were included in the final part of the questionnaire.

When presented with this section the participants were invited to read the statements and respond using a Likert type scale as follows: always, frequently, sometimes, rarely, and never. In doing so, the respondents could choose one level of the scale that most accurately describes the extent of their involvement in various activities.

3.4. Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

In the present study, the "Father Involvement Questionnaire" was developed by combining elements of two different instruments: the "Father Interview Form" and "The Inventory of Father Involvement." Validity and reliability analyses of both those instruments were established by the researchers who developed the instruments. Ogut (1998) conducted a pilot study with 15 subjects and "Father Interview Form" instrument was judged reliable on the basis of a reported .7648 Cronbach alpha coefficient. For the second instrument, "Inventory of

Father Involvement” by Hawkins et al. (2002), each dimension was analyzed separately. With the exception of providing ($\alpha = .69$) and attentiveness ($\alpha = .69$) dimensions, six other dimensions were found to be highly reliable. For this instrument the overall reliability was high ($\alpha = .94$).

Since the intent of the research was to collect data in study in Turkey, translations of informed consent form and “Father Involvement Questionnaire” were necessary. Other than the researcher, two additional individuals, both with educational and practical experiences in early childhood education translated the instruments from English to Turkish. After all three translations were compared word for word; ready-to-use Turkish informed consent form and “Father Involvement Questionnaire” were finalized by the researcher. Then, the “Father Involvement Questionnaire” was administered to three different individuals. The researcher obtained feedback from those individuals and made necessary changes to the wording of the instrument. Finally, the researcher conducted a reliability analysis of the instrument. This analysis of the pilot data yielded a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .911. Based on this information it was determined that the reliability of the instrument was within an acceptable range.

3.5. Procedures

Prior to conducting the study, approval was obtained from the Florida State University Institutional Review Board for research involving human subjects. The Institutional Review Board insured the ethical treatment of all the research participants. Participants were selected from fathers of preschool aged children in four public schools in Istanbul, Turkey.

Having obtained permission to conduct the study in each of the four schools, the researcher met with each of the preschool teachers. During the meetings the researcher

explained the purpose of the study and explained the requirements and expectation. In doing so, the researcher emphasized the importance of the study; primarily in an effort to increase participation. Then, the teachers were provided with a set of surveys and consent forms so that they could distribute them to the parents. The expectation was that the fathers would read, and sign the informed consent form and then complete the “Father Involvement Questionnaire.” Then, having completed the survey, the fathers were to return it in a timely manner to their child’s preschool teacher.

A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed to fathers of preschool aged children. Of these, 87 were returned to the preschool teachers. However, 3 of the returned surveys could not be used. Therefore a total of 84 were subsequently analyzed, representing a total return rate of 28%. Although such a response rate could be considered low, it was deemed adequate for the purposes of the current study. This is because the study was exploratory in that it was an initial attempt to describe fathers’ involvement in the lives of their preschool aged children in one location in Turkey.

3.6. Data Analyses

Several approaches were used to analyze the data including computing descriptive analyses, independent samples T-tests, and analyses of variance (ANOVA). Data analyses were conducted independently for each of the three parts of the survey. Socio-demographic variables in Part A were analyzed by computing means, frequencies and percentages. The subsequent findings were summarized in tables in an effort to better understand the characteristics of the study’s participants. A similar approach was used to analyze the responses to questions and

items in Parts B and C. The answer options for Part B were coded from 1 to 5 (mother=1, father=2, both parents=3, child=4, other=5). Then, the subsequent data were analyzed by computing descriptive statistics. For Part C, frequencies were coded from 1 to 5 (always=5, frequently=4, sometimes=3, rarely=2, never=1) and fathers' responses for each item were analyzed by computing descriptive statistics. Also, given responses for each item was calculated and a total score was computed for each father to investigate levels of father engagement in Part C.

The final set of analyzes were conducted in an effort to identify factors that could affect or be related to father involvement. For this purpose, independent variables were determined by the researcher as follows: fathers' age, education, occupation type, income, marital statuses, marriage years, number of child, child's age and gender, fathers' work days and hours, the time fathers and child spend together, people who care for children when fathers were at work, and having a working wife. These independent variables and total scores of engagement levels of fathers were calculated and subsequently analyzed using a series of independent sample T-tests and analyses of variances (ANOVA). The results of the statistical analyses are reported in chapter 4.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In this chapter the results of the study are presented. As described in previous chapters, this study examined the nature and extent of father involvement in the lives of their preschool aged children. All of the data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) release 20.0. The first part of this chapter reports descriptive statistics for the various sections of the survey instrument. Next, a summary of the statistical analyses and results for the relevant research questions are presented. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings. The study was guided by the following three research questions:

1. What is the nature and extent of Turkish father involvement in the lives of preschool aged children?
2. How do Turkish fathers and their children spend time together, and what kind of activities do they do?
3. What are the effects of various socio-demographic factors on father involvement?

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

The Father Involvement Questionnaire consisted of three sections designed to measure three components of father involvement: accessibility, responsibility and engagement. The first part of the questionnaire responses (Part A) yielded detailed demographic information concerning the participants. That is, demographic information concerning the 84 fathers of preschool aged children in Istanbul, Turkey. The same section of the survey was used to measure the fathers' accessibility. Then, in the second and third

sections of the instrument (Part B and Part C) the responsibility and engagement components of father involvement were measured. Descriptive statistics were computed to analyze all three sections of the instrument. The findings are reported and discussed under three separate yet related categories as follows: sample characteristics and demographics, responsibility of fathers, and father engagement.

4.1.1. Sample Characteristics and Demographics (Part A)

Participating in the study were fathers of preschool aged children in public preschool classrooms in one area of Istanbul, Turkey. The survey titled “Father Involvement Questionnaire” was distributed to 300 fathers who had children in four public schools. Of these, a total of 87 fathers completed the survey and returned them to their child’s classroom teacher. Of the 87 returned surveys, it was found that 3 were incomplete. As a result, the researcher had 84 complete surveys with which to work. This represents a response rate of 28 % which was somewhat lower than expected. The initial research plan entailed selecting participants from 6 public schools. However, due to recent changes in the Turkish educational system, the researcher had to limit the study to participants who have children in 4 public schools. Consequently, the numbers of surveys distributed and subsequently return was significantly lower than had been initially anticipated.

Table 4 reports the distribution of participants’ ages. The participants ages ranged from 21 to 41 years and, as reported in Table 4, almost 36 % of the participants were between 31 and 35, 32 % were between the ages of 36 and 40, and 28% were 41 years old or older.

Table 4

Distribution of the fathers according to age groups

Age of the father	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
21-25 years old	1	1.2	1.2
26-30 years old	2	2.4	3.6
31-35 years old	30	35.7	39.3
36-40 years old	27	32.1	71.4
41 +	24	28.6	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Table 5

Distribution of the fathers according to educational levels

Education level	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
Elementary school	16	19.0	19.0
High school	35	41.7	60.7
College education	25	29.8	90.5
Master education	7	8.3	98.8
PhD education	1	1.2	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

The educational levels of the fathers were also identified by way of the demographics section of the instrument. Here the categories were elementary school, high school, college, and master's and doctorate education. As reported in Table 5, almost 42 % of the fathers were high school graduates and 30 % had college degrees. A slightly smaller proportion,

19% were elementary school graduates, and only 9.5 % of the participants had participated in graduate school education (8.3 % of had a master's degree, 1.2 % had a Ph.D. degree).

The same section on the instrument asked respondents to note their occupation. For this section, only 61.9 % of the participants (n=52) answered the occupation question and 38.1 % of (n=32) chose to not respond by leaving the question blank. Of those who responded to the question, 9.6 % (n=5) were teachers, while others (n=47) were listed as architect, army member, engineer, journalist, manager, policeman, technician (automobile, computer, phone), etc. According to Table 6, 62 % of the fathers in the study (n= 52) worked in private companies, 19 % of fathers (n=16) had a government or state job, and 19 % (n=16) were self-employed or had their own businesses.

Table 6

Distribution of the fathers according to occupation types

Occupation type	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
Government/State job	16	19.0	19.0
Self-employed/own business	16	19.0	38.0
Private company	52	61.9	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

The participants were also asked to report their monthly income according to categories within the range less than 1000 TL to 4000 TL and more. Table 7 shows that most of the fathers (28.6 % of the fathers) earned 1000-1999 TL in a month and 26.2 % earned between 2000-2999 TL. 38.1 % of fathers reported that their monthly income was higher than 2999 TL, and 7.1 % of the fathers reported earning less than 1000 TL per month.

Table 7

Distribution of the fathers according to monthly incomes

Income	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
Less than 1000 TL	6	7.1	7.1
1000-1999 TL	24	28.6	35.7
2000-2999 TL	22	26.2	61.9
3000-3999 TL	19	22.6	84.5
4000 TL +	13	15.5	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Note: \$ 1= 2 TL (TL= Turkish Lira) Retrieved from <http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/kurlar/today.html> on 10/06/2013.

Table 8

Distribution of the fathers according to marital statuses

Marital status	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
Married	79	94.0	94.0
Divorced	4	4.8	98.8
Widowed	1	1.2	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Table 8 indicates that 94 % of the fathers (n=79) were married, 4.8 % (n=4) were divorced and 1.2 % (n=1) were widowed. All the married fathers answered the question about marriage years (n=79), and it was found that 53.2 % of the fathers (n=42) had been married for between 6-10 years, and 26.6% had been married for between 11 and 15 years (n=21). As

reported in Table 9, 5.1 % of the fathers had been married for fewer than 5 years, and 15.1 % had been married for at least 16 years.

Table 9

Distribution of the fathers according to years of marriage

Marriage Years	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
0-5 years	4	5.1	5.1
6-10 years	42	53.2	58.3
11-15 years	21	26.6	84.9
16-20 years	10	12.7	97.6
21 years +	2	2.4	100.0
Total	79	100.0	100.0

Family size was determined by asking respondents to indicate the number of children they had. In this case, the number of children ranged from a minimum of one to a maximum of four ($M=1.71$, $SD=.669$). As indicated in Table 10, 38.1 % of the fathers ($n=32$) had one child and 54.8 % had two children ($n=46$), and only 6 fathers had more than two children in their families. According to Table 11, children's ages ranged from 3 to 6, and most of the children in the study were 6 years old (40.5 %, $n=34$), 32.1 % of the children ($n=27$) were 5 years old, 26.2 % of them ($n=22$) were 4 years old, and only 1 child was 3 years old. In the study, 45.2 % of those children were girls, and the remaining 54.8 % were boys (38 girls, 46 boys).

Table 10

Distribution of the fathers according to the number of children

Number of child	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
1 child	32	38.1	38.1
2 children	46	54.8	92.9
3 children	4	4.8	97.6
4 children	2	2.4	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Table 11

Distribution of the fathers according to the age of children they have in early childhood education

Age of child	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
3 years old	1	1.2	1.2
4 years old	22	26.2	27.4
5 years old	27	32.1	59.5
6 years old	34	40.5	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Table 12 presents fathers' work days and work hours in a week. In this study, 41.7 % of fathers worked 5 days, while 48.8 % of them worked 6 days in a week. It was found that fathers work at least 4 and a maximum of 7 days per week ($M=5.61$, $SD=.659$). The number of hours the fathers worked per week were mostly between 41-50 hours (40.5 %, $n=34$) and 33.3 % ($n=28$) worked more than 50 hours in a week. Some fathers started work early in the day while others

worked late into the evening. 68 % of the fathers (n=52) left home between 7.00 am and 9.00 am in the morning, and 67.3 % arrived home (n=53) between 5.00 pm and 8.30 pm in the evening.

Table 12

Distribution of the fathers according to work hours and days in a week

(In a Week)	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
<i>Number of Work Days</i>			
4 days	2	2.4	2.4
5 days	35	41.7	44.0
6 days	41	48.8	92.9
7 days	6	7.1	100.0
<i>Number of Work Hours</i>			
Less than 20 hours	5	6.0	6.0
21-30 hours	6	7.1	13.1
31-40 hours	11	13.1	26.2
41-50 hours	34	40.5	66.7
50 hours +	28	33.3	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Additionally, Table 13 shows the approximate time fathers and their children spent together in a day. 34.5 % of the fathers (n=29) spent 2-3 hours with their preschool aged children, while 29.8 % (n= 25) spent 1-2 hours together. Also, a total of 28.6 % of the fathers (n=24) reported that they typically spent more than 3 hours with their children in a day.

Table 13

Distribution of approximate time fathers and children spend together in a day

Approximate time	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
Less than 1 hour	6	7.1	7.1
1-2 hours	25	29.8	36.9
2-3 hours	29	34.5	71.4
3-4 hours	15	17.9	89.3
4 hours +	9	10.7	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Table 14

Distribution of people care children when fathers are at work

People	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
Mother	45	53.6	53.6
Mother and other person together (Caregiver, grandmother, brother, etc.)	27	32.1	85.7
Other person (Caregiver, grandmother, brother, etc.)	12	14.3	100.0
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Fathers were also asked about child care arrangements in their home. As reported in Table 14, the mother, caregiver, grandmother, aunt, brother or grandparents cared for children when they were at home and not attending school. In the study, 53.6 % of the fathers (n=45) reported that mothers were the caregivers of their children when they were at work. According to 32.1 % of the fathers' responses (n=27), both mother and one other person cared for the child

while the father worked. Then, 14.3 % of the fathers (n=12) answered that another person (caregiver, grandmother, brother, etc.) cared for their children when they were at work.

In the study, it was found that 48.8 % of the mothers (n= 41) worked outside of the home and 47.6 % of the mothers (n=40) were housewives or homemakers, there was no information concerning the remaining 3 mothers. Most of the working mothers worked 5 days (65.9 %, n=27) and more than 30 hours per week (80.5 %, n=33) as reported in Table 15. Working mothers left home between 6.45 am and 9.30 am in the mornings, but their arrival hours were different from each other. As reported by fathers, 23.1 % of the working mothers (n= 9) arrived home before 5.00 pm and 76.9 % (n=31) arrived home between 5.00 pm and 8.30 pm in the evening.

Table 15

Distribution of the mothers according to work hours and days in a week

(In a Week)	Frequency	Percentage	Cum. Percentage
<i>Number of Work Days</i>			
3 days	1	2.4	2.4
4 days	2	4.9	7.3
5 days	27	65.9	73.2
6 days	9	22.0	95.1
7 days	2	4.9	100.0
Total	41	100.0	100.0
<i>Number of Work Hours</i>			
Less than 20 hours	2	4.9	4.9
21-30 hours	6	14.6	19.5
31-40 hours	13	31.7	51.2
41-50 hours	13	31.7	82.9
50 hours +	7	17.1	100.0
Total	41	100.0	100.0

4.1.2. Data Analysis of Responsibility of Fathers (Part B)

The second part of the instrument (Part B) examined the responsibility taking behaviors of the fathers. Here, there were a total of 14 questions and 5 answer options (father, mother, both parents, child and other). Fathers were asked to choose one of the answers for each question. In respect to fathers' responses, percentages and frequencies were calculated for each question and answer options. These findings are reported in Table 16.

Table 16

Distribution of responsibility taking behaviors

Items	Father		Mother		Both parents		Child		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Arranging the sleeping hours	4	4.8	42	50	37	44	-	-	1	1.2
2. Arranging meal times and type of food the child eats	2	2.4	55	65.5	24	28.6	-	-	3	3.6
3. Helping the child to choose and wear clothes	1	1.2	57	67.9	20	23.8	5	6	1	1.2
4. Assisting the child with toileting	2	2.4	39	46.4	37	44	4	4.8	2	2.4
5. Keeping the child clean and neat-looking.	2	2.4	41	48.8	39	46.4	-	-	2	2.4
6. Taking the child to a health center for regular health checks	11	13.1	27	32.1	46	54.8	-	-	-	-
7. Assuming more responsibility of care giving, taking to the doctor and giving medication when the child is sick	8	9.5	27	32.1	49	58.3	-	-	-	-
8. Arranging the conditions of the child's room	4	4.8	63	75	14	16.7	-	-	3	3.6

Table 16-Continued

Items	Father		Mother		Both parents		Child		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
9. Deciding how the child spends his/her time	7	8.3	27	32.1	44	52.4	3	3.6	3	3.6
10. Assessing the child's needs and buying/supplying them	13	15.5	19	22.6	52	61.9	-	-	-	-
11. Deciding the type of education the child will receive and where s/he will receive it.	4	4.8	9	10.7	71	84.5	-	-	-	-
12. Keeping in contact with the child's school teachers and administrators.	11	13.1	38	45.2	34	40.5	-	-	1	1.2
13. Deciding whether the child will attend any activities/courses in /out of school.	5	6.0	11	13.1	67	79.8	1	1.2	-	-
14. Deciding and arranging for the child's contacts with relatives, friends /neighbors	5	6.0	25	29.8	51	60.7	1	1.2	2	2.4

4.1.3. Data Analysis of Engagement of Fathers (Part C)

The final part of the questionnaire was designed to identify how fathers and children spend time together and what kind of activities they engage in. In this section there were 31 items (a total of 40 items), and fathers were asked to choose one of the options (always, frequently, sometimes, rarely, never) for each sentence to describe their situation the most accurately. Frequencies were coded from 1 to 5 (always=5, frequently=4, sometimes=3, rarely=2, never=1) and fathers' responses for each item were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Also, given responses for each item was calculated and a total score was computed for each father to investigate engagement of fathers in the study. Table 17 reports means and standard deviation scores for each item.

Table 17

Descriptive statistics of items in Part C

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I provide my child's basic needs (food, clothing, shelter and health care).	4.67	.683
2. I accept responsibility for the financial support of my child.	4.80	.673
3. I am involved in the daily/regular routine of taking care of my child's basic needs or activities (feeding, driving them to places).	3.76	1.082
4. I look after my child when he/she is sick.	4.26	1.007
5. I get up and take care of my child when he/she awakens at night.	3.82	1.163
6. I respond to and take care of my child at times of emergency (like when s/he falls down, cries, wets his/her pants, or has a runny nose, etc.).	4.31	.905
7. I take care of my child during my own leisure time.	4.33	.766
8. I play with my child.	4.23	.936
9. I read to my child.	3.52	1.197
10. I tell stories, ask riddles or sing songs together with my child.	3.61	1.182
11. I watch television with my child.	4.01	.938
12. I listen to music with my child.	3.57	1.225
13. I pay attention to the music she/he listens to, or TV shows she/he watches.	4.52	.611
14. I eat meals with my child.	4.27	.797
15. a. I play active games such as ball games or chasing with my child when we are outside.	3.94	1.057
b. I take my child to the park.	4.12	.974
c. I take my child to a place like cinema, theatre, circus, museum /exhibition.	3.27	1.045
16. I spend time just talking with my child when she/he wants to talk about something.	4.55	.767
17. I like spending time with my child doing things she/he likes to do	4.11	.850
18. I am a friend to my child	4.55	.782
19. I share chores around the house with my child.	3.89	1.109
20. I listen to my child's views or concerns.	4.61	.712
21. a. I teach a new game or a song to my child.	3.51	1.177

Table 17- Continued

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
21. b. I teach as letters, numbers, names of colors and items to my child.	4.01	.951
c. I teach my child self-care skills such as how to dress, eat, go to the toilet and clean himself/herself.	4.23	.896
d. I teach appropriate/acceptable behaviors to my child according to context.	4.64	.614
22. I discipline my child by setting rules and limits for his/her behaviors.	4.12	1.023
23. I enforce family rules.	4.23	.883
24. a. I encourage my child to succeed in school.	4.65	.570
b. I encourage my child to do their homework.	4.55	.718
c. I teach my child to follow rules at school.	4.38	.835
25. I praise my child for being good or doing the right thing.	4.60	.696
26. I tell my child that I love her/him.	4.82	.495
27. I show physical affection to my child (hugging, kissing).	4.77	.588
28. I encourage my child to develop their talents.	4.65	.630
29. a. I give my child's mother encouragement and emotional support.	4.43	.811
b. I let my child know that his/her mother is an important and special person.	4.46	.783
c. I cooperate with my child's mother in the rearing of the child.	4.48	.736
30. I plan my child's future (education, training, etc.).	4.55	.735
31. I attend events my child participates in (school, sports, etc.).	3.69	1.182

4.2. Analysis of Research Questions

The following three research questions were investigated in the study:

- What is the nature and extent of Turkish father involvement in the lives of their preschool-aged (ages 3 to 6) children?
- How do Turkish fathers and their children spend time together, and what kind of activities do they do?
- What are the effects of various socio-demographic factors on father involvement?

4.2.1. Research Questions 1 and 2

“What is the nature and extent of Turkish father involvement in the lives of their preschool-aged (ages 3 to 6) children?” and “How do Turkish fathers and their children spend time together, and what kind of activities do they do?”

In the current study, accessibility, responsibility and engagement of fathers were investigated to identify Turkish father involvement. The results showed that fathers worked at least 4, and a maximum 7 days in a week ($M=5.61$, $SD=.659$); 41.7 % of them ($n=35$) worked 5 days and 48.8 % of them ($n=41$) worked 6 days in a week. The number of working hours of the fathers were mostly between 41-50 hours (40.5 %, $n=34$) and 33.3 % ($n=28$) worked more than 50 hours in a week. Moreover, most of the fathers ($n=52$) left home between 7.00 am and 9.00 am in the morning, and arrived home between 5.00 pm and 8.30 pm in the evening. 34.5 % of the fathers ($n=29$) spent 2-3 hours with their preschool aged children, while 29.8 % of them ($n=25$) spent 1-2 hours together. Also, a total of 28.6 % of the fathers ($n=24$) answered that they spent more than 3 hours with their children in a day. According to these findings, it was realized that fathers worked at least 5 days per week and many worked long hours every day. As a result, they spend just a few hours with their children in a day and their accessibility might be limited for their children.

The responsibility taking behaviors of fathers were measured in Part B, and fathers generally chose “father, mother and both parents” options as answers to the questions on that part. The results showed that some items were found under “mostly mother responsibility”, “somehow mother responsibility” or “responsibility of both parents”.

Table 18

Distribution and percentages of tasks in Part B

Responsibility	Items	Mother	Both Parents
Items identify as primarily mother's responsibility	Arranging the conditions of the child's room	75 %	16.7 %
	Helping the child to choose and wear clothes	67.9 %	23.8 %
	Arranging meal times and type of food the child eats	65.5 %	28.6 %
	Arranging sleeping hours of the child	50 %	44 %
Items split between mother and both parents	Keeping the child clean and neat-looking	48.8 %	46.4 %
	Assisting the child with toileting	46.4 %	44 %
	Keeping in contact with the child's school teachers and administrators.	45.2 %	40.5 %
	Deciding the type of education the child will receive and where s/he will receive it.	10.7 %	84.5 %
Items identify as both parents' responsibility	Deciding whether the child will attend any activities/courses in /out of school.	13.1 %	79.8 %
	Assessing the child's needs and buying/supplying them	22.6 %	61.9 %
	Deciding and arranging for the child's contacts with relatives, friends /neighbors	29.8 %	60.7 %
	Assuming more responsibility of care giving, taking to the doctor and giving medication when the child is sick	32.1 %	58.3 %
	Taking the child to a health center for regular health checks	32.1 %	54.8 %
	Deciding how the child spends his/her time	32.1 %	52.4 %

As reported in Table 18, fathers thought that mostly mothers were responsible for arranging conditions of the child's room, meals, sleeping times and the clothes that child wears. The results showed that mothers were mostly responsible for keeping the child clean, assisting the child with toileting and keeping in contact with child's school besides both parents. It was found that deciding the type of education the child receives, activities child attends in/out of the school, assessing child's needs and supplying them, deciding child's contacts and how he/she spends time in a day were under the responsibility of both parents. Also, caring for the child when he/she is sick and taking the child to health care center for regular health checks were responsibilities adopted by both parents.

To determine the engagement level of fathers, items were initially analyzed using descriptive statistics. Here, the results varied with some items receiving the highest mean scores while others were at the lower end of the scale. Table 19 presents items which were ranked highest according to fathers' responses. Findings reported in Table 19 indicates that Turkish fathers frequently/always show their love and affection to their children, support their education and talents, provide needs of them, praise them, listen to them, and talk to their children.

Table 20 includes the items that were ranked lowest in the study. These findings indicate that Turkish fathers sometimes/frequently take their child to the cinema, theatre, teach something new to their children, read to their child, and listen to music with them. Also, fathers noted that they sometimes/frequently attend events their children participate in, and were sometimes/frequently involved in the daily routines of taking care of children's needs. Tables 18, 19 and 20 illustrate the nature and extent of Turkish father involvement and the kinds of activities they engage in with their children.

Table 19

Distribution of items fathers ranked highest based on the data (Part C)

Items
I tell my child that I love her/him.
I accept responsibility for the financial support of my child.
I show physical affection to my child (hugging, kissing).
I provide my child's basic needs (food, clothing, shelter and health care).
I encourage my child to succeed in school.
I encourage my child to develop their talents.
I teach appropriate/acceptable behaviors to my child according to context.
I listen to my child's views or concerns.
I praise my child for being good or doing the right thing.
I encourage my child to do their homework.
I plan my child's future (education, training, etc.).
I spend time just talking with my child when she/he wants to talk about something.
I am a friend to my child
I pay attention to the music she/he listens to, or TV shows she/he watches.

Table 20

Distribution of items fathers ranked lowest based on the data (Part C)

Items
I take my child to a place like cinema, theatre, circus, museum, and exhibition.
I teach a new game or a song to my child.
I read to my child.
I listen to music with my child.
I tell stories, ask riddles or sing songs together with my child.
I attend events my child participates in (school, sports, etc.).
I am involved in the daily/regular routine of taking care of my child's basic needs or activities (feeding, driving them to places).
I get up and take care of my child when he/she awakens at night.
I share chores around the house with my child.
I play active games such as ball games or chasing with my child when we are outside.

4.2.2. Research Question 3

“What are the effects of various socio-demographic factors on father involvement?”

Fathers' age, education, occupation type, income, marital statuses, marriage years, number of child they have, child's age and gender, fathers' work days and hours, the time fathers and child spend together, people care children when fathers were at work, having a working wife or not were identified as possible contributing factors that could affect father involvement. All of these factors were defined as independent variables. Also, a total score of items (Part C) that fathers responded to were calculated for each father and used for the subsequent data analyses. Independent sample T-tests and analyses of variances (ANOVA) were used to analyze independent variables and total scores of engagement levels of fathers.

Age of the fathers were defined as fathers who were younger than 36 years old ($n=33$) and fathers who were 36 years old or older ($n=51$). An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare mean scores of engagement levels of fathers. It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between ages of fathers and their level of engagement in lives of their children ($t(82) = .209$, $p = .834$). Also, engagement level of fathers who had less than college education ($n=51$) and fathers who had at least college degree ($n=33$) were analyzed. Results showed that education level of fathers did not affect father involvement ($t(82) = 1.724$, $p = .089$).

Occupation type of fathers was another independent variable used in the study. Fathers classified as working for a private company ($n=52$) and working in a government occupation or self-employed ($n=32$). Mean scores of fathers in those two groups were compared and it was found that fathers' occupation types had an effect on their levels of involvement ($t(82) = -2.248$, $p < .05$). There was a significant difference in father involvement levels of fathers who worked

for a private company ($M=172.79$) and fathers who worked in other occupation types ($M=164.16$). Besides occupation type, monthly income of fathers seems to affect father involvement. Fathers who earned less than 3000 TL were found to be more involved in the lives of their children ($M=173.88$) as compared to fathers earned 3000 TL or more in a month ($M=162.38$) ($t(82) = 3.071, p < .05$).

Most of the fathers were married ($n=79$), and there were only five fathers who responded that they were divorced/widowed. Although there was a difference between mean scores of married fathers ($M=169.81$) and divorced/widowed fathers ($M=164.60$), it was not possible to run a T-test to examine this variable. However, the number of marriage years seemed to be related to father involvement in the current study. It was found that fathers who were married less than 11 years ($n= 51, M=172.82$) were more actively involved in the lives of their children in comparison to fathers who were married for 11 years or more ($n=33, M=164.36; t(82) = 2.081, p < .05$).

The number of children in the family was considered another possible factor that could affect the extent of father involvement. Mean scores of fathers who had only children ($n=32, M=174.28$) were higher than the scores of fathers who had two children or more ($n=52, M=166.56$). Here the mean differences were judged statistically significant ($t(82) = 1.999, p < .05$). Another possible factor influencing father involvement was the ages of the children. Although mean scores of fathers who had 6 year olds ($n=34, M=171.85$) was higher than fathers who had 5 years olds ($n=27, M=169.85$) and 3-4 years olds ($n=23, M=165.61$), there was no statistically significant difference between father involvement and age of the child ($F(2) = .878, p = .419$). Also, mean scores of fathers who had girls ($n=38, M=169.50$) and fathers who had boys ($n=46, M=169.50$) were the same.

Fathers work days and hours were other independent variables considered in the current study. There was no statistically significant difference between scores for involvement by fathers who worked 5 days or less in a week ($n=37$, $M=171.00$) and fathers who worked 6 days or more ($n=47$, $M=168.32$) ($t(82) = .695$, $p=.478$). Yet, mean scores of fathers who worked fewer than 41 hours ($n=22$, $M=174.64$) per week and those who worked between 41-50 hours ($n=34$, $M=162.79$) and more than 50 hours in a week ($n=28$, $M=169.50$) differed. In this case, the mean differences were judged statistically significant ($F(2) = 4.575$, $p < .05$).

The approximate time that father and child spent together in a day was analyzed for three groups of fathers: fathers who spend less than 2 hours with their children ($n=31$, $M=166.87$), fathers who spend 2-3 hours in a day ($n=29$, $M=169.41$), and fathers who spend more than 3 hours ($n=24$, $M=173.00$). The results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between mean scores of fathers and the approximate time they spend with their children ($F(2) = .826$, $p=.441$). Although there was a difference between mean scores of fathers whose children were cared by only mothers ($n=45$, $M=166.73$) and fathers whose children were cared by other caregivers ($n=39$, $M=172.69$), it was not a statically significant difference ($t(82) = -1.570$, $p=.120$). Although there were differences between mean scores of fathers whose wives were working ($n=41$, $M=171.41$), whose wives were not working ($n=43$, $M=167.67$), having a working wife, or a wife who stayed at home, they did not seem to have an effect on father involvement ($t(82) = .979$, $p= .331$). Mean differences here were judged non-significant.

In conclusion, it was found that father's occupation, monthly income, number of marriage years, and numbers of children in the family, and fathers' work hours were contributing factors affecting Turkish father involvement (see Table 21). In contrast, factors including fathers' age, education level, marital status, number of days fathers work, the time fathers and children

spend together, age and gender of the child, child care arrangements, and working status of the mother did not seem to be related to the nature and extent of father involvement.

Table 21

Factors affecting father involvement in the current study

Factors Affecting Father Involvement	Findings
<i>Occupation Type</i>	
working in a private company	(M=172.79)
working in government job or self-employed	(M=164.16)
	t (82)= -2.248, p < .05)
<i>Income</i>	
earned less than 3000 TL	(M=173.88)
earned 3000 TL or more in a month	(M=162.38)
	t (82) = 3.071, p< .05)
<i>Marriage Years</i>	
were married less than 11 years	(M=172.82)
were married for 11 years or more	(M=164.36)
	t (82) =2.081, p<.05)
<i>Number of Child/Children</i>	
had only child	(M=174.28)
had two children and more	(M=166.56).
	t (82) =1.999, p<.05)
<i>Work Hours</i>	
worked fewer than 41 hours per week	(M=174.64)
worked between 41-50 hours	(M=162.79)
worked more than 50 hours in a week	(M=169.50)
	F(2) =4.575, p< .05)

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

In recent years educators, researchers, and policymakers have become interested in the roles that fathers play in the care, education, and well-being of their children. This interest in father involvement is probably a result of the rapid changes in family structures, such as decreased numbers of families that rely on a single breadwinner, and increases in the number of dual-earner families, etc. (Flouri, 2005). Thus, the image of fathers has changed from that of invisible parents to involved fathers (Saracho & Spodek, 2005). Research findings from studies dating back to the 1970s highlight and validate the importance of father involvement. Most of these studies however, were conducted in North America. In contrast, there have been limited studies of father involvement in other countries and other cultures. Prior to the 1990's, father involvement was not a topic of study in Turkey. Changing demographics, including increasing numbers of mothers in the workforce, resulted in an interest in how Turkish fathers engage with their children. Yet, despite an emerging interest in father involvement studies in Turkey, few researchers have conducted studies of fathers of preschool aged children. The current study sought to examine the ways a sample of Turkish fathers interact and engage with preschool children who are enrolled in and attend a public preschool.

The study is seen as an initial attempt to examine the current situation with regard to father involvement in Istanbul, Turkey. While the primary purpose was to describe the fathers' involvement, a related goal was to identify factors that may be related to or contribute to the extent to which fathers are involved with their children. Fathers' accessibility, responsibility and engagement were investigated by seeking answers to three research broad questions.

This chapter discusses the results and outlines some broad conclusions. In addition limitations of the study are highlighted. Finally, the chapter discusses the significance of the findings and suggests recommendations for future research and for practice.

5.1. Discussion of Research Questions

“What is the nature and extent of Turkish father involvement in the lives of their preschool-aged (ages 3 to 6) children?”

“How do Turkish fathers and their children spend time together, and what kind of activities do they do?”

In the current study, the findings showed that most of the fathers work 6 days (48.8 %, n=41) and at least 40 hours (73.8 %, n=62) in a week. Fathers mostly leave home between 7.00 am and 9.00 am in the morning, and arrive home between 5.00 pm and 8.30 pm in the evening. A majority of fathers and their children spend less than 3 hours together (64.3 %, n=54) in a day.

As reported in Chapter 4, mothers were mostly responsible for caring for their children in the family. This includes tasks such as arranging the conditions of the child’s room, preparing children’s meals, managing bedtime routines, and choosing the clothes that children wear. The findings also indicate that mothers who take on the task of making sure that their children are clean and tidy, and assisting the child with toileting. Besides such domestic tasks, the mothers seem to be the ones who keep in contact with the child’s school. Fathers thought that caring for the child when he/she is sick and taking the child to health care center for regular health checks were responsibilities of both parents. Other tasks and responsibilities adopted by both parents are deciding the type of education the child receives, making decisions concerning out of school activities, assessing the child’s needs and supplying them, and deciding the child’s contacts and

how he/she spends time in a day. According to those findings, it can be summarized that fathers care for children's health and they are involved in caregiving practices when the child is sick or not feeling well. It seems that in this case, the fathers feel that they are responsible for providing for their children and also for making decisions concerning their education.

As expected, the fathers in the current study frequently express their love and affection toward their children. They also support their children's education and talents, provide for their daily needs, praise them, and talk and listen to them. However, their responses showed that they were not actively involved in the lives of their children in more concrete ways. The fathers surveyed for the study occasionally took their children to the cinema or to the theatre. It was also only on occasion that they would teach something new to their children, read to their children, and listen to music with them. A surprising finding was that the fathers did not regularly attend events their children participate in and that it was only occasionally that they would and help with the daily routine of taking care of their children's needs.

The extent to which fathers are involved with such activities could be related to their other demands and responsibilities. The availability of fathers in this study (being available less than 3 hours in a day) was consistent with findings of related studies. Researchers note that when fathers spend more hours at work, they tend to spend less time with their children on weekdays (Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean & Hofferth, 2001). Also, working in a full time or part time job directly affected fathers' availability to interact with their children (Ivrendi & Isikoglu, 2010). Longer work hours may be one of the reasons affecting the accessibility of fathers to their children in the present study. For many of the fathers, work responsibilities, along with perhaps a long commute means that they are not regularly available to engage in daily child rearing tasks.

Fathers' responsibility and engagement results of this study were similar to findings of studies conducted by Evans (1997) and Ogut (1998) in Turkey. In both studies, mothers were mainly responsible for caregiving the child, while fathers were financial providers in their families; and fathers shared responsibilities with mothers in making decisions about their child's education. In a related study, fathers were found to be the children's playmates whereas the mothers were seen as their child's primary caregivers (Ozgun & Honig, 2005). The researchers also reported that the fathers distanced themselves from the childcare activities that mothers were primarily responsible for (Ozgun & Honig, 2005). In Turkish culture, men are still seen as the main breadwinner in the household, and their primary responsibilities are working and meeting the financial needs of their families. Yet, there are increasing numbers of women in the workforce and, relatedly, an increasing number of children in non-parental care. At the same time, some women still prefer to stay at home, care their children even if they have jobs or college degrees. This could explain why the mothers in the current study assumed the primary responsibility of caring for their children. Also, having a child is an important characteristic of being a family in Turkey, and families are expected to meet all needs of their children and support their education. For this reason, generally both parents share responsibilities for children's health, education and future. Yet, even if fathers care for and are involved in decision making concerning their children's education and future, they are not actively engaged with their children. Fathers' work hours and expected fathering and mothering roles in the society could help explain the limited nature of fathers' responsibility and engagement with their children in the current study.

“What are the effects of various socio-demographic factors on father involvement?”

It was found that father's occupation type, monthly income, number of marriage years, and number of children in the family, and fathers' work hours were contributing factors affecting Turkish fathers' involvement. In contrast, factors including fathers' age, education level, marital status, number of days fathers work, the time fathers and children spend together, age and gender of the child, child care arrangements, and working status of the mother did not seem to be related to the nature and extent of father involvement.

There are some similarities and differences between results of the current study and previously conducted studies in this field. Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean and Hofferth (2001) found that fathers' income and work hours had a significant negative effect on their involvement. Coltrane (1996) also indicated that fathers who work fewer hours are more involved with their children as compared to fathers who work more hours. However, it was surprising to see that fathers who worked less than 40 hours and more than 50 hours were more engaged in their children's lives than fathers worked between 40-50 hours in a week. Fathers who worked in private companies were more involved than fathers who worked in government jobs or those who had their own businesses. Also, fathers who earned less than 3000 TL (approximately \$ 1500) showed more engagement than fathers who earned more than 3000 TL in a month. According to these findings, fathers who worked in private companies and fathers with less income were more engaged with their children (see Table 21). Fathers who earned high incomes, and worked in state jobs or their own businesses may experience more stress in their work environments, and it may play a role in their engagement with children in this study.

Fathers' education and age are other possible predictors of their involvement. Typically, fathers who are better educated are more involved in activities with their children

(Ahmeduzzaman & Roopnarine, 1992; Bailey, 1993). In contrast, the current study found that fathers who had less than a college education were more engaged with their children than fathers who had a college education. These findings are similar to those of Haas's (1988) study that found that higher educated fathers were less involved. Unlike educational levels, the fathers' ages did not seem to have an effect on father involvement. These findings are consistent with studies conducted by other fathering scholars (e.g., Ahmeduzzaman & Roopnarine, 1992; Marsiglio, 1991). In the current study, fathers' working hours may be more significant than the fathers' age or educational level. For example, fathers may have the desire to be more actively engaged with their children, but their work hours may limit their availability.

The type of family was another possible factor affecting fathers' engagement with children. Fathers in two-parent families were more involved in childcare activities and they were more likely to play with their children (Ivrendi & Isikoglu, 2010). Other researchers note that fathers tend to be more involved when they are in two parent families where mothers are employed (McBride & Mills, 1993; Lamb, 2000). Examining this aspect, however, was beyond the scope of the current study. Also, since 5 of the fathers (out of 84 fathers) were not married, it was not possible to determine the effect of marital statuses on father involvement.

In this study, the data suggest that father involvement was affected by number of marriage years as well as family size (number of children in the household). It was found that fathers who had been married for fewer than 11 years were more actively involved in the lives of their children in comparison to fathers who were married for 11 years or more. In addition, fathers who had one child showed more engagement than did the fathers who had two children or more. This finding seems to be consistent with those of other researchers (e.g., Rustia & Abbott (1993). It was found that fathers are more engaged with first-born children than they were with

later children in their families. Also, when families are larger, there seems to be less engagement with older children and almost no association with younger children (Marsiglio, 1991). Fathers who had more than one child and fathers of second children had fewer interactions with their children (McBride, 1990). Fathers may gradually lose interest in childcare or in the education of children during years or they might believe that these are the mothers' responsibilities. On the other hand, such findings could simply be the result of demographics such as fathers' work hours, or having a working wife.

Mother's occupation is another important factor mostly found in studies. According to Barnett and Baruch (1987), fathers are more actively involved when they have working wives. Also, fathers spend more time with their children by engaging in activities and being accessible if they have working wives (Lamb et al., 1985). In contrast to those studies, another study examined both mother and father involvement in 3-5 years old children's lives, and it was found that mother's employment status did not have any influence on father involvement in Turkey (Ari Gulec, 1998). Findings of the present study were consistent with results of Ari Gulec (1998)'s study, and father involvement was not affected by the wife's working status. Yet, given the small sample size caution is necessary when interpreting the findings.

According to previously conducted studies, children's gender was another possible factor affecting father involvement. Fathers were more involved with their sons, they had more communication, play and activities with their sons than they had with their daughters (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Lamb, 2000; Pleck, 1997). Similar results were found in Ogut's study (1998) where fathers who had sons took more responsibility for childcare. In the current study, the child's gender did not seem to be related to the extent of the fathers' involvement. This finding seems to confirm those of several other studies (Marsiglio, 1991; Palkovitz, 1984). The lack of

differences in father involvement with sons and daughters could be a result of changes in Turkish culture (not as much emphasis placed on sons/boys).

Although fathers' levels of engagement and accessibility are higher for younger children (McBride & Mills, 1993), the opposite was found in the present study. Although there were no statistically significant difference among fathers who had children younger than 5, children 5 years old or children older than 5, fathers' engagement level increased related to child's age. Fathers may have limited knowledge about child development in early years, but their knowledge may increase in years related to number of years a child spend in school.

Also, the approximate time that fathers and children spent together was less than 3 hours per day in this study. Because the researcher did not ask separate questions concerning the time spent with children during the weekend and on weekdays, only the approximate time that fathers and children spent together was found. Findings were pretty close to results of previously conducted studies where engagement of fathers was found to be 2.8 hours per day (Ahmeduzzaman & Roopnarine, 1992), 1.9 hours during the week and 6.5 hours on the weekend (McBride & Mills, 1993). As previously noted, the fathers' work hours may affect their availability and interaction with their children.

5.2. Limitations of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to gain insight into Turkish father involvement and possible factors behind their involvement. By using "The Father Involvement Questionnaire", the researcher was able to learn fathers' accessibility, responsibility and engagement levels in their preschool aged children's lives. However, taking this approach

resulted in several limitations including no direct contact with the participants, small sample size and length of the instrument.

As a first limitation, there was no direct contact between the participants and the researcher. The researcher explained the purpose and importance of the study to classroom teachers, and they distributed the questionnaires to the students' fathers. Distributing questionnaires on time and collecting back were the responsibility of those teachers. Forgetting to distribute questionnaires or losing returned questionnaires directly affected sample size and response rate of the study. Because one of the teachers forgot to distribute the questionnaires, the researcher did not get any questionnaires back and did not reach any of the participants in that teacher's class (25 fathers).

The second limitation of the study was sample size. The researcher sought to reach at least 100 participants who had children in six public schools in the research location. Because of some recent changes in the Turkish education system (4+4+4 education policy), the researcher was not able to reach two schools in that neighborhood. Hence, only four schools could participate in the study instead of six. Clearly, this fact had a direct effect on the number of questionnaires distributed and returned to the researcher. The resulting small sample size makes it difficult to generalize the results of the study. Clearly, for generalizability, similar studies should be conducted in different parts of Turkey with a large sample size. Besides these limitations, the instrument had approximately 70 items/questions for fathers to response. The lengthy survey instrument could have limited fathers' willingness to fully complete questionnaire and answer all of the questions.

5.3. Implications of the Study

This study demonstrates the current involvement of a sample of Turkish fathers in their preschool aged children's lives. It highlights the demographics (working hours, income, etc.) that play important roles in the accessibility, responsibility and engagement levels of the fathers. Although today's fathers are involved in children's lives more than were fathers of 30-40 years ago (Unuvar, 2011), it was found that fathers were still reluctant to be actively involved in the daily lives of their children. Further research is needed to understand father involvement practices in different parts of Turkey, and appropriate programs should be prepared to increase awareness and education among fathers.

Additionally, preschool teachers may provide fathers with opportunities to increase their involvement in children's lives. Because it is difficult to reach children without reaching parents, teachers are ideally placed to reach their students' fathers to offer advice and perhaps motivate them to be involved both at home and at school. Besides that, teachers may cooperate with Mother Child Education Foundation (ACEV) or other foundations, and guide fathers to join in present father support and education programs that those institutions offer.

5.4. Recommendations for Future Research

The present study was conducted with limited participants in a certain neighborhood in Istanbul, Turkey. The primary goal of the study was to gain an understanding about the nature and extent of Turkish fathers' involvement, and examine factors affecting fathers' availability, responsibility and engagement in children's lives. Findings of the study were similar to previous studies conducted in Turkey (Evans, 1997; Ogut, 1998; Ari Gulec, 1998; Aydin, 2003; Ivrendi & Isikoglu, 2010; Unuvar, 2011) and it reveals several areas for future research and researchers.

First, it would be beneficial to involve mothers in the data collection process. Future researchers should consider interviewing mothers of the children. This is because there could be some differences among mothers' and fathers' responses. Examining both parents' opinions should enable researchers to gain a more accurate picture of father involvement practices. Secondly, future researchers should consider conducting similar descriptive studies in different parts of Turkey and with fathers who have different characteristics than those of the participants of the current study (e.g., with fathers from different ethnic groups, SES etc.). Also, future studies would be valuable and generalizable when more fathers are involved in the research effort.

5.5. Conclusion

Family structure has changed in Turkey, and expectations of fathers have increased related to changes in the community. Today's fathers are expected to be more involved in children's lives, especially during the early childhood years. However, father involvement depends on three components (availability, responsibility and engagement), and those components are affected by multiple factors. In the current study, father's occupation type, monthly income, number of marriage years, numbers of children in the family, and fathers' work hours affected their involvement. Future studies may find similar or different results than this study, but the current study provides them an understanding about current father involvement in certain area of Istanbul, Turkey. Additionally, this study has been an attempt to shed light on how Turkish fathers are involved in the care, education, and well-being of their children in 2013.

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH INFORMED CONSENT FORM

An Exploratory Study of Turkish Father Involvement in the Lives of Their Preschool Aged (Ages 3 to 6) Children

You are invited to participate in a research study of involvement of Turkish fathers in their preschool aged (ages 3 to 6) children's lives. You were selected as a possible participant, because you are a father of a preschool-aged child in a public preschool in Turkey. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

The purposes of this study are to learn more about how Turkish fathers are involved in their preschool-aged children's lives, how they spend time with their children and what kind of activities they do together, and what the possible factors lay behind the involvement of fathers in Turkey.

If you agree to participate in this study, we would ask you to answer all questions as honestly as possible and return the completed forms promptly to the teacher of your child in the preschool. Completing all attached forms takes approximately 10-15 minutes of your time.

There are no known risks to you if you decide to participate in this study. There are no direct benefits to you for participating in the research study; however, the study may help us understand the paternal involvement of fathers in Turkey. Also, results of the study may be shared in future publications, so your participation in this study is extremely valuable for our research.

The records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to your records. In order to ensure that all information will remain confidential, please do not include your name.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the university. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

The researcher conducting this study is Burcu Izci, a graduate student in the department of Early Childhood Education at Florida State University. If you have a question, you are encouraged to contact her at * *** ** or *****. Also, you can contact at Burcu Izci's academic advisor, Dr. Ithel Jones at * *** ** or *****. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact the FSU IRB at 2010 Levy Avenue, Research Building B, Suite 276, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2742, or 850-644-8673, or by email at humansubjects@magnet.fsu.edu.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature

Date

APPENDIX B

FATHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

A) The following questions are meant to obtain demographic information about you (father of the child), so please answer Questions 1-15 for yourself as honestly as possible.

1. Age:	☐ Less than 21 ☐ 21-25 ☐ 26-30 ☐ 31-35 ☐ 36-40 ☐ More than 40
2. Education:	☐ Elementary school ☐ High school ☐ College/University ☐ Graduate school ☐ PhD, post-doctoral study
3. Occupation:	
4. Workplace Type:	☐ Government work ☐ Private company ☐ Self-employed
5. Income (monthly): (TL= Turkish Lira)	☐ Less than 1,000 TL ☐ 1,000-1,999 TL ☐ 2,000-2,999 TL ☐ 3,000- 3,999 TL ☐ 4,000 TL and more
6. Marital status:	☐ Married ☐ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ Widower
7. If you are married, number of years of the marriage:	☐ 0-5 years ☐ 6-10 years ☐ 11-15 years ☐ 16-20 years ☐ More than 21 years

8. Number of children you have:	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 and more
9. Age and gender of your child in early childhood education:	☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ Male ☐ Female
10. Number of days you work (in a week):	☐ 1 day ☐ 2 days ☐ 3 days ☐ 4 days ☐ 5 days ☐ 6 days ☐ 7 days
11. Number of hours you work (in a week):	☐ Less than 20 hours ☐ 21-30 hours ☐ 31-40 years ☐ 41-50 hours ☐ More than 50 hour
12. Time you leave home for work:	
13. Time you arrive home after work:	
14. Number of hours (approximately) you and your child spend together in a day:	☐ Less than an hour ☐ 1-2 hours ☐ 2-3 hours ☐ 3-4 hours ☐ 4 hours and more
15. Person/people who take(s) care of your child when you are not at home:	

The following questions are meant to obtain brief information about your wife's occupation and working hours. If your wife works, answer Questions 16-20 as honestly as possible.

16. (If she works) Your wife's occupation:	
17. Number of days your wife works (in a week):	☐ 1 day ☐ 2 days ☐ 3 days ☐ 4 days ☐ 5 days ☐ 6 days ☐ 7 days
18. Number of hours your wife works (in a week):	☐ Less than 20 hours ☐ 21-30 hours ☐ 31-40 years ☐ 41-50 hours ☐ More than 50 hours
19. Time your wife leaves home for work:	
20. Time your wife arrives home after work:	

B) This section is meant to obtain brief knowledge about which family member(s) is/are responsible for the care, the development and the education of your child. Please choose one of the options (father, mother, both parents, child, other) as the answer for each question.

	Father	Mother	Both parents	Child	Other
1. Who usually arranges the sleeping hours of your child in your family?					
2. Who arranges meal times and type of food your child eats during meals?					
3. Who helps your child choose and wear clothes on various occasions?					
4. Who is usually in charge of assisting your child with toileting?					
5. Who is usually responsible for keeping your child clean and neat-looking (like taking a bath, brushing teeth, washing hand and face, cutting nails, etc.) in your family?					
6. Who usually takes your child to a health center for regular health checks?					
7. Who assumes more responsibility of care giving, taking to the doctor and giving medication when the child is sick?					
8. Who is usually concerned with arranging the conditions of your child's room (like tidying up, letting in some fresh air, etc.)?					
9. Who usually decides how the child spends his/her time (like the amount of time to watch TV, spend in the park, etc.)?					
10. Who is usually responsible for assessing your child's needs and buying/supplying them (like toys, hygiene products, etc.)?					
11. Who usually decides the type of education your child will receive and where s/he will receive it?					
12. Who usually keeps in contact with the child's school teachers and administrators?					
13. Who usually decides whether your child will attend any activities/courses (such as music, sports, art, computer, etc.) in or out of school?					
14. Who usually decides and arranges for the child's contacts with relatives, friends or neighbors?					

C) This last section is meant to determine how you and your child spend time together. There are no correct or incorrect answers to these sentences. Please read the sentences carefully and choose one of them (always, often, sometimes, rarely, never) for each sentence to describe your situation the most accurately.

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1. I provide my child's basic needs (food, clothing, shelter and health care).					
2. I accept responsibility for the financial support of my child.					
3. I am involved in the daily/regular routine of taking care of my child's basic needs or activities (feeding, driving them to places).					
4. I look after my child when he/she is sick.					
5. I get up and take care of my child when he/she awakens at night.					
6. I respond to and take care of my child at times of emergency (like when s/he falls down, cries, wets his/her pants, or has a runny nose, etc.).					
7. I take care of my child during my own leisure time.					
8. I play with my child.					
9. I read to my child.					
10. I tell stories, ask riddles or sing songs together with my child.					
11. I watch television with my child.					
12. I listen to music with my child.					
13. I pay attention to the music she/he listens to, or TV shows she/he watches.					

14. I eat meals with my child.					
15. a. I play active games such as ball games or chasing with my child when we are outside.					
b. I take my child to the park.					
c. I take my child to a place like cinema, theatre, circus, museum or exhibition.					
16. I spend time just talking with my child when she/he wants to talk about something.					
17. I like spending time with my child doing things she/he likes to do.					
18. I am a friend to my child.					
19. I share chores around the house with my child.					
20. I listen to my child's views or concerns.					
21.a. I teach a new game or a song to my child.					
b. I teach as letters, numbers, names of colors and items to my child.					
c. I teach my child self-care skills such as how to dress, eat, go to the toilet and clean himself/herself.					
d. I teach appropriate/acceptable behaviors to my child according to context.					
22. I discipline my child by setting rules and limits for his/her behaviors.					
23. I enforce family rules.					

24. a. I encourage my child to succeed in school.					
b. I encourage my child to do their homework.					
c. I teach my child to follow rules at school.					
25. I praise my child for being good or doing the right thing.					
26. I tell my child that I love her/him.					
27. I show physical affection to my child (hugging, kissing).					
28. I encourage my child to develop their talents.					
29. a. I give my child's mother encouragement and emotional support.					
b. I let my child know that his/her mother is an important and special person.					
c. I cooperate with my child's mother in the rearing of the child.					
30. I plan my child's future (education, training, etc.).					
31. I attend events my child participates in (school, sports, etc.).					

APPENDIX C

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

Office of the Vice President for Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 07/24/2013

To: Burcu Izci <*****>

Address: *****

Dept.: CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
An Exploratory Study of Turkish Father Involvement in the Lives of Their Preschool Aged (Ages 3 to 6) Children

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 07/22/2014 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Ithel Jones <*****>, Advisor
HSC No. 2013.10423

REFERENCES

- Ahmeduzzaman, M., & Roopnaine, J. L. (1992). Sociodemographic factors, functioning style, social support, and fathers' involvement with preschoolers in African-American families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 699-707.
- Ari Gulec, N. (1998). *The effect of maternal role satisfaction, father involvement and maternal working status on maternal involvement*. Unpublished master thesis. Bogazici University.
- Ataca, B. (2006). Turkey. In J. Georgas, J. W. Berry, Fons J. R. van de Vijver, C. Kağıtçıbaşı & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *Families across cultures: A 30-nation psychological study* (467-475). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Atmaca Kocak, A. (2004). *Evaluation report of the father support program*. Mother Child Education Foundation.
- Aydın, A. (2003). *The effect of father involvement training on the fathers' involvement level and perceptions of their fathering roles*. Unpublished master thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Bailey, W. T. (1993). Fathers' knowledge of development and involvement with preschool children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 77, 1032-1034.
- Barnett, R.C., & Baruch, G.K. (1987). Determinants of fathers' participation in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 29-40.
- Bekman, S. (1998) *A fair chance: An evaluation of the mother-child education program*. Istanbul: Mother-Child Education Foundation Publications.
- Bekman, S. (2005). Early childhood education in Turkey: An overview. In B. Spodek & O. N. Saracho (Eds.), *International perspectives on research in early childhood education* (335-355). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd ed., vol. 3, 1643-1647). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Cabrera, N.J., Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Bradley, R.H., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M.E. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development*, 71, 127-136.
- Cabrera, N. J., Shannon, J. D., & Tamis-Le Monda, C. (2007). Fathers' influence on their children's cognitive and emotional development: From toddlers to pre-K. *Applied Development Science*, 11(4), 208-213.

- Chapin Metz, H. (1995). *Turkey: A country study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress.
- Cindoglu, D., Cemrek, M., Toktas, S. & Zencirci, G. (2008). The family in Turkey: The battleground of the modern and the traditional. In C. B. Hennon & S. M. Wilson (Eds.), *Families in a Global Context* (235-265). NY: Routledge.
- Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Couchenour, D. & Chrisman, K. (2008). *Families, schools and communities: Together for young children* (3rd ed.). Clifton Park, NY: Thomson Delmar Learning.
- Early childhood education. (2013). In *Encyclopedia of Children's Health*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthofchildren.com/E-F/Early-Childhood-Education.html#b>
- Evans, C. (1997). *Turkish fathers' attitudes to and involvement in their fathering role: a low socio-economic sample*. Unpublished master thesis. Bogazici University,
- Family. (October 30, 2009). *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/201237/family>
- Flouri, E. (2005). *Fathering and child outcomes*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Gordon, A. & Williams-Browne, K. (1995). *Beginnings & beyond* (4th ed.). Albany, NY: Delmar Publishers.
- Gorey, K. M. (2001). Early childhood education: A meta-analytic affirmation of the short- and long-term benefits of educational opportunity. *School Psychology Quarterly* (16)1, 9-30.
- Haas, L. (1988). *Understanding fathers' participation in childcare: A social constructivist perspective*. Paper presented to the National Council on Family Relations, Philadelphia.
- Hawkins, A.J., Bradford, K.P., Palkovitz, R., Christiansen, S.L., Day, R.D., & Call, V.R.A. (2002). The inventory of father involvement: A pilot study of a new measure of father involvement. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 10(2), 183-196.
- Ivrendi, A. & Isikokoglu, N. (2010). A Turkish view on fathers' involvement in children's play. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37(6), 519-526.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Kagitcibasi, C., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three-decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(3), 317-337.
- Kalmijn, M. (1999). Father involvement in childrearing and the perceived stability of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(2) , 409-421

- Lamb, M. E. (1975). Fathers: Forgotten contributors to child development. *Human Development*, 4, 245-266.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1985). Paternal behaviors in human. *American Zoologist*, 25(3), 883-894.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1987). A biosocial perspective on paternal behavior and involvement. In J. B. Lancaster, J. Altaman, A. Rossi, & R. L. Sherrod (Eds.). *Parenting across the lifespan: Biosocial perspectives* (11-42). New York: Academic
- Lamb, M. E. (1987). *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lamb, M. E. (1997). Fathers and child development. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (1-18). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lamb, M. E. (2000). The history of research on father involvement: An overview. *Marriage and Family Review*, 29, 23-42.
- Lamb, M. E. (Ed.). (2010). *The role of the father in child development* (5th ed.). Hoboken NJ: Wiley.
- Lynch, R. G. (2004). *Exceptional returns: Economic, fiscal, and social benefits of investment in early childhood development*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53(4), 973-986.
- Marsiglio, W., Amato, P., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Scholarship on fatherhood in the 1990s and beyond. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(4), 1173-1191.
- McBride, B. A. (1990). The effects of a parent education/play group program on father involvement in child rearing. *Family Relations* (39)3, 250-256.
- McBride, B.A. (1991). Parent education and support programs for fathers: Outcome effects on paternal involvement. *Early Child Development and Care*, 67, 73-85.
- McBride, B. A., & Mills, G. (1993). A comparison of mothers' and fathers' involvement with their preschool age children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 8, 457-477.
- Morrison, G. S. (2000). *Fundamentals of early childhood education* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, Prentice-Hall.
- Morrissey, T. W. & Warner, M. E. (2007). Why early care and education deserves as much attention, or more, than prekindergarten alone. *Applied Development Science* (11)2, 57-70.

- Mother Child Education Foundation (ACEV). (2013). *Father support program*. Retrieved from <http://www.acev.org/en/en/ne-yapiyoruz/anne-babalar-icin>
- Nauck, B. & Klaus, D. (2005). Families in Turkey. In B. Adams , & J. Trost (Eds.). *Handbook of world families* (364-390). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Nauck, B. & Klaus, D. (2008). Family Change in Turkey: Peasant society, Islam, and the revolution “from above”. In R. Jayakody, A. Thornton & W. Axinn (Eds.), *International Family Change: Ideational Perspectives* (281-313). NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ogut, U. (1998). *Father involvement with respect to the age and gender of preschool children and the employment status of the mother in a sample of upper and middle socio-economic status Turkish father*. Unpublished master thesis, Bogazici University.
- Oktay, A. (1983). Okulöncesi eğitimin dün ve bugünü. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi* (42).
- Oktay, A. (1989). *Türkiye’de okulöncesi eğitim*. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi. Eğitim Bilimleri Sempozyumu Bildiriler.
- Oktay, A. & Zembat, R. (1995). Development of pre-school education and training of teachers and administrators in Turkey. *International Journal of Early Childhood* (27)1, 62-67.
- Ozeke Kocabas, E. (2006). Eğitim sürecinde aile katılımı: Dünyada ve Türkiye’deki çalışmalar. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi* (26)3,143-153. Retrieved from <https://www.pdr.org.tr/dergi/index.php/PDRD/article/view/202/162>
- Ozgun, O. & Sterling Honig, A. (2005). Parental involvement and spousal satisfaction with division of early childcare in Turkish families with normal children and children with special needs. *Early Child Development and Care*, 175 (3), 259-270.
- Palkovitz, R. (1984). Parental attitudes and fathers’ interactions with their five-month-old infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 20, 1054-1060.
- Pleck, J. H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources and consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd ed., 66-104). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education (MONE). (2013). <http://www.meb.gov.tr/english/indexeng.htm>
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education. (2012). *12 yıl zorunlu eğitim sorular – cevaplar* (Twelve year compulsory education questions and answers). Retrieved from http://www.meb.gov.tr/duyurular/duyurular2012/12Yil_Soru_Cevaplar.pdf
- Roberts-Holmes, G. P. (2009) 'People are suspicious of us: a critical examination of father primary carers and English early childhood services. *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development*, 29(3), 281-291.

- Rustia, J. G. & Abbott, D. (1993). Father involvement in infant care: Two longitudinal studies. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 30, 467-476.
- Saracho, O. N. & Spodek, B. (2008): Fathers: The ‘invisible’ parents. *Early Child Development and Care* (178)7-8, 821-836.
- Turkey. (May 7, 2013). In *The World Factbook*. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tu.html>
- Turkish Statistical Institute (Turkstat). (2012, 2013). <http://www.tuik.gov.tr>
- United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), (February 15, 2012). *Why early childhood development?* Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/earlychildhood/index_40748.html
- United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), (February 16, 2012). *Early learning*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/earlychildhood/index_40747.html
- United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), (2012). *Inequities in early childhood development: What the data say*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/Inequities_in_Early_Childhood_Development_LoRes_PDF_EN_02082012.pdf
- Unuvar, P. (2011). The changing role of fathers. In C. H. Leyton (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Roles, responsibilities & reward* (125-146). New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Woodhead, Martin (2006). Changing perspectives on early childhood: theory, research and policy. *International Journal of Equity and Innovation in Early Childhood*, 4(2), 5-48.
- Yavuzer, H. (2005). *Çocuğu tanımak ve anlamak*. Remzi Kitabevi.
- Yeung, W. J., Sandberg, J. F., Davis-Kean, P. E. and Hofferth, S. L. (2001), Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 136–154.
doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00136.x

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Burcu Izci was born in Balıkesir, Turkey. She completed Early Childhood Education bachelor degree in Bogazici University, Turkey in 2010. Immediately afterwards, she worked in both private and public preschools in Istanbul, Turkey. In 2010, she got a scholarship from the Ministry of National Education of Turkey for graduate education in the U.S. Then, she started Early Childhood Education master program in 2012 at Florida State University.

She aims to continue her education in Curriculum and Instruction program at the same university, and to provide benefits for early childhood education field both nationally and internationally.