MEDWELL PUBLISHING
Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences 6 (2): 84-90, 2009
ISSN: 1683-8831

The Influence of Allocation Unit and Demographic Characteristics on Fathers' Attitudes Towards Their Children

[1]Fatma Tezel Sahin and [2]Arzu Ozyurek
[1]Department of Child Development Education, Faculty of Vocational Education,
Gazi University, Ankara, 06500, Turkey
[2]Safranbolu Anatolian Vocational and Girls' Vocational High School, Karabuk, 78100, Turkey

Abstract: In this study, we aim to analyze, the attitudes of fathers living in urban and rural areas towards their preschool period children of 5-6 years old age groups. The 381 fathers, who were chosen thorough random sampling method, 117 of whom lived in rural regions and 264 of whom lived in urban were taken as our sample set. Family Attitude Inventory developed by Oner and Torun was used in data acquisition. In the analysis of data, frequencies and percentages were graphically determined. Two dimensional and double-way variance analysis and in some cases one way variance analysis were used to determine inter-variable differential. In cases, where the results of ANOVA (Analyses of Variance) were meaningful, Scheffe test with a significance level of 0.05 was used to differentiate between groups. Our results suggest that attitudes of the fathers are significantly influenced by allocation unit, father's age and learning level as well as child's birth sequence and gender ($p<0.05$).

Key words: Allocation unit, preschool period, father attitudes, characteristics, influence children

INTRODUCTION

To give a birth to a child, a father and a mother are needed. However, both of the parents have a role in children's care and keeping the child away from danger (Erdogan, 2004). Parents are primary teachers and trainers of their children. They help their children to develop values and skills that are needed to be successful in life and grow as healthy adults (Bridge, 2001; Dinatale, 2002).

As in many other countries, mother is responsible for child's care and education; whereas father is responsible for providing economical needs of the household in Turkey (Evans, 1997; Riley *et al*., 2000; PTA, 2005). However, nowadays, it is not possible to separate duties between parents by definite lines due to changes of current living conditions and modified roles of man and woman. It was realized that the only person looking after children should not only be the mother herself. Both of the parents should share the responsibility for child care and development (Myers, 1996; Cagdas, 2003; Sahin, 2003). It is observed that the father's responsibilities are not only limitied to supporting his children economically but also, extends in a variety of subjects such as being a good friend, being protective, maintaning the discipline, supporting the mother emotionally and taking responsibility in daily housework.

Various researches have indicated that as a result of change in society's anticipation related to the paternity under the modifying circumstances, fathers now taking an active share in bringing up children. This as a result, has favorable influences on the development of children (Mcbride and Lutz, 2003; Mcbride *et al*., 2004; Allen and Daly, 2002). Although, close and well-qualified relationship between father and child has constructive impact on child's personality and cognitive development, permissive attitude of father increases the probability of child's behaviour disorder (Yildiz, 2006). While, the children, whose fathers exhibit an interest and love for them are more successful in social relations, the children having poor relations with their fathers may develop the concept of adverse ego. Adverse personality traits such as bashfullness and diffidence can arise in child if father is very authoritative and rarely pays attention to the child (Sahin, 2003).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, we aim to analyze fathers attitudes towards their children with their demographic characteristics in accordance with allocation unit. For this aim 381 fathers, chosen thorough the method of random sampling, 117 of whom lived in rural and 264 of whom

Corresponding Author: Fatma Tezel Sahin, Department of Child Development Education, Faculty of Vocational Education, Gazi University, Ankara, 06500, Turkey

lived in urban areas, were taken as sample set with children at 5-6 age group. The study was done in Karabuk, Turkey.

Family Attitude Inventory (FAI) consisting of 45 articles and subdimensions such as Democratic/ authorative Child Rearing Methods (DECRE), Identification with Child (IDCHI), Compatibility Behaviour (COBE) and Social Mobility (SOMO) was applied as data gathering means. Scale was made up of four options of likert type in the form of 'I do not agree', 'I agree slightly', 'I agree to some extent' and 'I agree completely'. The high points of FAI are considered as an identification of democratic parental attitude that sets up better relationships with child, complies with social norms more and holds the characteristics of a compatible social mobility (Ozdemir, 1991; Oner, 1996). In the analysis of data, frequencies and percentages were graphically determined. Two dimensional and double-way variance analyses were applied to determine inter-variable differential. In cases that the results of ANOVA were meaningful, Scheffe test was used to differentiate between groups. A significance level of 0.05 was used in statistical studies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, the findings related to the demographical characteristics and attitudes of fathers living in rural and urban areas.

In Table 1, 71.1% of fathers participating in research are in 30-38 age group. 39.3% of fathers living in rural regions are primary school graduate and 40.2% of fathers living in the urban are university graduates. By analyzing the Table 1, it can be concluded that the education level of fathers living in the urban is higher than of those living in rural areas.

As Table 2, it is seen that 50.1% of children are male and 49.9% are female. Additionally, 55.1% of children are first borns while, 54.6% of them are second siblings.

As Table 3, difference between total points and subdimensions except for fathers' FAI DECRE subdimension point and allocation unit is meaningful ($p<0.05$). Points of fathers living in rural areas are higher than of those living in the urban areas. Fathers living in the rural areas communicate well with their children, display more compatibility behaviour and social mobility than those living in the urban areas. The difference between fathers' age and FAI total point and COBE

Table 1: Distribution of fathers according to their age and academic background

	Rural region		Urban		Total	
Characteristics	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Father's ages						
29 and younger	22	18.8	25	9.5	47	12.4
30-38 ages	83	70.9	188	71.2	271	71.1
39 and older	12	10.3	51	19.3	63	16.5
Total	117	100.0	264	100.0	381	100.0
Father's learning levels						
Primary School graduate	46	39.3	32	12.1	78	20.5
Junior high school graduate	21	17.9	30	11.4	51	13.4
High school graduate	40	34.2	96	36.4	136	35.7
University graduate	10	8.5	106	40.2	116	30.4
Total	117	100.0	264	100.0	381	100.0

Table 2: Distribution of children according to their gender. birth sequence (seniority) and the number of sibling

	Rural region		Urban		Total	
Characteristics	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Gender						
Male	59	50.4	132	50.0	191	50.1
Female	58	49.6	132	50.0	190	49.9
Total	117	100.0	264	100.0	381	100.0
Birth sequence						
1	62	53.0	148	56.1	210	55.1
2	27	23.1	93	35.2	120	31.5
3 and more	28	23.9	23	8.7	51	13.4
Total	117	100.0	264	100.0	381	100.0
Number of sibling						
1	21	17.9	78	39.5	99	26.0
2	60	51.3	148	56.1	208	54.6
3 and more	36	30.8	38	14.4	74	19.4
Total	117	100.0	264	100.0	381	100.0

Table 3: Variance analysis results of fathers' family attitude inventory points according to allocation unit and father's age

		Rural region			Urban			Total			ANOVA test		
FAI	Father age group	N	X	S	N	X	S	N	X	S	Father age	Allocation unit	F.A. x A.U.
Total	29 and younger	22	143.59	16.13	25	139.64	15.26	47	141.49	15.63	F (2:374) = 4.40	F (1:374) = 9.00	F (2:374) = 1.07
	30-38 ages	83	139.44	20.36	188	134.19	15.17	270	135.79	17.05	p = 0.013*	p = 0.003*	p = 0.341
	39 and older	12	150.83	15.84	51	137.65	14.57	63	140.16	15.59			
	Total	117	141.41	19.47	264	135.38	15.13	380	137.22	16.76			
DECRE	29 and younger	22	28.05	3.03	25	27.84	2.15	47	27.94	2.57	F (2:375) = 2.03	F (1:375) = 0.49	F (2:375) = 0.34
	30-38 ages	83	26.75	4.36	188	27.44	3.11	271	27.23	3.55	p = 0.132	p = 0.483	p = 0.708
	39 and older	12	27.67	3.65	51	28.25	2.87	63	28.14	3.01			
	Total	117	27.09	4.08	264	27.63	3.00	381	27.46	3.37			
IDCHI	29 and younger	22	47.05	5.50	25	44.16	6.36	47	45.51	6.09	F (2:375) = 2.51	F (1:375) = 12.26	F (2:375) = 0.23
	30-38 ages	83	45.87	7.64	188	42.83	6.20	271	43.76	6.81	p = 0.82	p = 0.001*	p = 0.787
	39 and older	12	49.00	5.46	51	44.43	6.96	63	45.30	6.90			
	Total	117	46.41	7.11	264	43.27	6.38	381	44.23	6.76			
COBE	29 and younger	22	23.32	3.69	25	23.32	3.11	47	23.32	3.36	F (2:375) = 4.52	F (1:375) = 7.76	F (2:375) = 2.65
	30-38 ages	83	22.94	3.89	188	21.92	3.26	271	22.23	3.49	p = 0.011*	p = 0.006*	p = 0.072
	39 and older	12	25.75	2.73	51	22.41	3.51	63	23.05	3.60			
	Total	117	23.30	3.82	264	22.15	3.31	381	22.50	3.51			
SOMO	29 and younger	22	45.18	7.71	25	44.32	7.01	47	44.72	7.28	F (2:374) = 2.78	F (1:374) = 7.78)	F (2:374) = 1.55
	30-38 ages	83	44.09	8.18	188	42.01	6.59	270	42.64	7.16	p = 0.063	p = 0.006*	p = 0.213
	39 and older	12	48.42	6.55	51	42.55	5.72	63	43.67	6.28			
	Total	117	44.74	7.99	264	42.33	6.48	380	43.07	7.06			

*p<0.05

Table 4: Variance analysis results of fathers' family attitude inventory points according to allocation unit and academic background

		Rural region			Urban			Total			ANOVA test		
FAI	Father learning group	N	X	S	N	X	S	N	X	S	Father learning level	Allocation unit	F.L. x A.U.
Total	Primary school G.	46	142.67	22.48	32	138.56	15.14	77	140.96	19.75	F (3:372) = 3.62	F (1:372) = 1.73	F (3:372) = 0.23
	Junior high school G.	21	143.81	9.84	30	140.00	16.07	51	141.57	13.86	p = 0.013*	p = 0.189	p = 0.869
	High school G.	40	141.40	18.75	96	137.16	15.92	136	138.40	16.84			
	University G.	10	130.70	21.27	106	131.49	13.35	116	131.42	14.07			
	Total	117	141.41	19.40	264	135.38	15.13	380	137.22	16.76			
DECRE	Primary school G.	46	26.35	4.71	32	26.41	3.16	78	26.37	4.12	F (3:373) = 3.22	F (1:373) = 0.49	F (3:373) = 0.85
	Junior high school G.	21	27.76	3.00	30	28.43	2.97	51	28.16	2.97	p = 0.023*	p = 0.481	p = 0.968
	High school G.	40	27.50	3.89	96	27.74	3.08	136	27.67	3.33			
	University G.	10	27.40	3.69	106	27.68	2.82	116	27.66	2.88			
	Total	117	27.09	4.08	264	27.63	3.00	381	27.46	3.37			
IDCHI	Primary school G.	46	47.17	7.48	32	44.66	6.71	78	46.14	7.24	F (3:373) = 5.39	F (1:373) = 3.07	F (3:373) = 0.83
	Junior high school G.	21	47.14	4.55	30	45.23	6.76	51	46.02	5.97	p = 0.001*	p = 0.080	p = 0.478
	High school G.	40	46.60	6.91	96	43.93	6.34	136	44.71	6.60			
	University G.	10	40.60	8.83	106	41.69	5.94	116	41.59	6.20			
	Total	117	46.41	7.11	264	43.27	6.39	381	44.23	6.77			
COBE	Primary school G.	46	24.17	3.68	32	23.00	3.30	78	23.69	3.55	F (3:373) = 2.77	F (1:373) = 5.39	F (3:373)=.0.28
	Junior high school G.	21	22.90	2.86	30	22.10	3.78	51	22.43	3.42	p = 0.041*	p = 0.001*	p = 0.840
	High school G.	40	22.88	4.30	96	22.56	3.34	136	22.65	3.64			
	University G.	10	21.80	3.79	106	21.53	3.08	116	21.55	3.13			
	Total	117	23.30	3.82	264	22.15	3.32	381	22.50	3.51			
SOMO	Primary school G.	46	45.29	9.44	32	44.50	6.32	77	44.96	8.25	F (3:372) = 3.63	F (1:372) = 1.43	F (3:372) = 3.63
	Junior high school G.	21	46.00	5.22	30	44.23	5.89	51	44.96	5.64	p = 0.013*	p = 0.231	p = 0.949
	High school G.	40	44.43	7.32	96	42.93	6.90	136	43.37	7.03			
	University G.	10	40.90	8.18	106	40.59	5.93	116	40.62	6.12			
	Total	117	44.74	8.00	264	42.33	6.49	380	43.07	7.06			

*p<0.05

subdimension point was found meaningful (p<0.05). COBE points of fathers at the age of 30 or over living in rural regions and of those at the age of 29 or below living in the urban are higher than that of the others. COBE subdimension points of fathers at the age of 39 or over living in rural regions and of those at the the age of 29 or below living in the urban are higher and these fathers display more compatible behaviours to social norms. Considering all fathers together, according to Scheffe test, it was found out that compatibility behaviours of fathers at the age of 29 or below were better than that of fathers at 30-38 age group. This result can be due to reasons such as having a child for the first time and affected by modified life conditions which as a result contribute to the increased responsibility for child rearing.

In Table 4, difference between fathers' academic background and FAI total point and all subdimension points results in meaningful findings (p<0.05).

Table 5: Variance analysis results of fathers' family attitude inventory points according to allocation unit and child's gender

		Rural region			Urban			Total			ANOVA test		
FAI	Child's gender	N	X	S	N	X	S	N	X	S	Gender	Allocation unit	G. x A.U.
TOPLAM	Male	59	142.19	20.16	132	136.20	15.09	190	136.03	16.97	F (1:376) = 0.76	F (1:376) = 10.66	F (1.376) = 0.00
	Female	58	140.62	18.76	132	134.55	15.19	190	136.40	16.55	p = 0.383	p = 0.001*	p = 0.981
	Total	117	141.41	19.40	264	135.38	15.13	380	137.22	16.76			
DECRE	Male	59	27.73	3.63	132	27.72	3.07	191	27.72	3.24	F (1:377) = 3.89	F (1:377) = 2.19	F (1:377) = 2.26
	Female	58	26.43	4.43	132	27.55	2.94	190	27.21	3.49	p = 0.049*	p = 0.139	p = 0.133
	Total	117	27.09	4.08	264	27.63	3.00	381	27.46	3.37			
IDCHI	Male	59	46.68	7.42	132	43.63	6.25	191	44.57	6.77	F (1:377) = 0.74	F (1.377) = 18.23	F (1:377) = 0.01
	Female	58	46.14	6.84	132	42.90	6.52	190	43.89	6.77	p = 0.390	p = 0.000*	p = 0.899
	Total	117	46.41	7.11	264	43.27	6.39	381	44.23	6.77			
COBE	Male	59	23.07	3.97	132	22.24	3.22	191	22.50	3.48	F (1:37) = 0.12	F (1:377) = 8.88	F (1:377) = 0.71
	Female	58	23.53	3.68	132	22.05	3.42	190	22.51	3.55	p = 0.720	p = 0.003*	p = 0.397
	Total	117	23.30	3.82	264	22.15	3.32	381	22.50	3.51			
SOMO	Male	59	44.97	8.59	132	42.61	6.66	190	43.33	7.36	F (1:376) = 0.42	F (1:376) = 9.57	F (1:376) = 0.00
	Female	58	44.52	7.42	132	42.05	6.33	190	42.80	6.76	p = 0.515	p = 0.002*	p = 0.939
	Total	117	44.74	8.00	264	42.33	6.49	380	43.07	7.06			

*p<0.05

Considering all fathers together, according to Scheffe test, it is observed that primary school graduate fathers were less democratic than secondary school graduate, high school graduate, or university graduate fathers. It was also observed that university graduate fathers had fewer attitudes of compatibility behaviour, social mobility and identification with child than primary school graduate, secondary school graduate, or high school graduate fathers. As a result, it can be concluded that democratic attitudes changes with educational background. The case that university graduate fathers hold fewer attitudes of compatibility to social norms, a compatible social mobility and identification with their child may result from the fact that a life style removed from society is adopted with modifying social environment. Impact of allocation unit on COBE behaviour was also resulted in meaningful findings ($p<0.05$). It is observed that as the education level of fathers incease in rural and urban areas, points of COBE subdivision decline. It may be concluded that primary school graduate fathers display more compatibility behaviours to social norms.

The results of the research on this topics indicate that as parents education level rise, their democratic attitudes and behaviors of exhibiting love increase. In contrast, parents adopt more pressurized discipline as the education level declines (Guneysu, 1982; Mizrakci, 1994; Yalkin, 1994; Ari *et al*., 1995; Sendogdu, 2000). These findings support the research findings about DECRE subdimension of FAI.

In Table 5, we can see that the difference between children's gender and DECRE subdimension point of fathers' FAI is meaningful (F (1:377) = $p<0.05$). DECRE total point (X = 27.72) of fathers' having sons is higher than that (X = 27. 21) of fathers having daughters. Fathers behave towards their sons more democratic than towards their daughters. Based on the average points, it is confronted most widely in especially rural regions that fathers behave towards their daughters very authoritatively. It may be arising from the fact that Turkish society has still tendency to behave more indulgently towards boys in consideration of traditional construction.

Regarding the discussion above, various researches have indicated that gender of the child affects the relations between parents and child and that parents' reactions change according to the gender of the child (Guneysu, 1982; Mizrakci, 1984; Argun, 1995; Fincham *et al*., 1998; Ildes, 1990; Ozyurek, 2004). However, some other researches show that gender of child does not have a significant influence on fathers' attitudes and behaviors (Evans, 1997).

In Table 6, we can see that the difference between child's birth sequence and COBE subdimension point of fathers' Family Attitude Inventory was found meaningful. (F (2:375) =3.85, $p<0.05$. Generally, COBE behaviour of fathers having a child born in the third or later than this sequence is more constructive than that of fathers having a child born in the first rate or second rate.

Considering the impact of allocation unit in Table 5 and 6, it is realized that difference between allocation unit and IDCHI, COBE and SOMO subdivision points of Fathers' FAI is meaningful ($p<0.05$). The points of fathers living in the rural regions were found higher than those of the fathers living in the urban areas. Fathers living in the rural areas set up more identification, display more compatibility behaviours to society and more social mobility than those living in the urban areas.

In Table 7, we conclude that difference between child's sibling number and total and subdimension points of Fathers' FAI results in meaningless values ($p>0.05$). Joint impact of Fathers' FAI total point and subdivision points of IDCHI and SOMO and children's sibling numbers and allocation unit is meaningful ($p<0.05$).

Table 6: Variance analyses results of fathers' family attitude inventory points according to allocation unit and child's birth sequence (seniority)

	Child's birth	Rural region			Urban			Total			ANOVA test		
FAI	sequence	N	X	S	N	X	S	N	X	S	Birth sequence	Allocation unit	B.S. x A.U.
Total	1	62	139.16	16.90	148	135.72	15.38	210	136.73	15.88	F (2:374) = 1.71	F (1:374) = 10.85	F (2:374) = 1.69
	2	27	139.37	25.83	93	134.81	14.00	120	135.83	17.34	p = 0.182	p = 0.001*	p = 0.186
	3 and more	28	148.59	16.07	23	135.48	18.35	50	142.56	18.21			
	Total	116	141.41	19.40	264	135.38	15.13	380	137.22	16.76			
DECRE	1	62	27.03	3.61	148	27.76	2.89	210	27.55	3.13	F (2:375) = 0.09	F (1:375) = 0.65	F (2:375) = 0.52
	2	27	26.89	5.39	93	27.57	3.03	120	27.42	3.68	p = 0.906	p = 0.417	p = 0.592
	3 and more	28	27.39	3.75	23	27.04	3.61	51	27.24	3.65			
	Total	117	27.09	4.08	264	27.63	3.00	381	27.46	3.37			
IDCHI	1	62	45.76	6.64	148	43.18	6.26	210	43.94	6.60	F (2:375) = 0.78	F (1:375) = 17.99	F (2:375) = 2.62
	2	27	45.15	9.05	93	43.62	5.85	120	43.97	6.69	p = 0.457	p = 0.000*	p = 0.074
	3 and more	28	49.07	5.38	23	42.35	8.01	51	46.04	7.44			
	Total	117	46.41	7.11	264	43.27	6.39	381	44.23	6.77			
COBE	1	62	22.81	3.56	148	22.01	3.35	210	22.25	3.42	F (2:375) = 3.85	F (1:375) = 6.02	F (2:375) = 0.41
	2	27	22.89	5.08	93	22.14	3.15	120	22.31	3.66	p = 0.022*	p = 0.015*	p = 0.663
	3 and more	28	24.79	2.50	23	23.04	3.74	51	24.00	3.21			
	Total	117	23.30	3.82	264	22.15	3.32	381	22.50	3.51			
SOMO	1	62	43.58	7.18	148	42.76	6.56	210	43.00	6.74	F (2:374) = 2.30	F (1:374) = 9.87	F (2:374) = 10.78
	2	27	44.44	9.63	93	41.47	6.35	120	42.14	7.28	p = 0.101	p = 0.002*	p = 0.168
	3 and more	28	47.74	7.53	23	43.40	6.53	50	45.58	7.40			
	Total	116	44.74	8.00	264	42.33	6.49	380	43.07	7.06			

*p<0.05

Table 7: Variance analysis results of fathers' family attitude inventory points according to the allocation unit and child's sibling number

		Rural region			Urban			Total			ANOVA test		
FAI	Child's	N	X	S	N	X	S	N	X	S	Sibling	Allocation unit	S. N. x A.U.
Total	1	21	135.76	17.77	78	136.64	15.20	99	136.45	15.69	F (2:374) = 1.20	F (1:374) = 8.20	F (2:374) = 3.47
	2	60	140.02	21.29	148	135.17	15.03	208	136.57	17.16	p = 0.301	p = 0.004*	p = 0.032*
	3 and more	36	147.17	15.62	38	133.58	15.56	73	140.10	16.93			
	Total	117	141.41	19.40	264	135.38	15.13	380	137.22	16.76			
DECRE	1	21	26.43	2.87	78	27.99	3.00	99	27.66	3.03	F (2:375) = 0.09	F (1:375) = 3.30	F (2:375) = 1.19
	2	60	27.38	4.48	148	27.45	2.94	208	27.43	3.44	p = 0.908	p = 0.070	p = 0.305
	3 and more	36	26.97	4.03	38	27.63	3.21	74	27.31	3.62			
	Total	117	27.09	4.08	264	27.63	3.00	381	27.46	3.37			
IDCHI	1	21	44.33	7.77	78	43.46	6.45	99	43.65	6.72	F (2:375) = 0.70	F (1:375) = 16.82	F (2:375) = 4.41
	2	60	45.78	7.59	148	43.55	6.22	208	44.19	6.70	p = 0.494	p = 0.000*	p = 0.013*
	3 and more	36	48.67	5.23	38	41.76	6.82	74	45.12	6.98			
	Total	117	46.41	7.11	264	43.27	6.38	381	44.23	6.76			
COBE	1	21	22.62	3.77	78	22.15	3.26	99	22.25	3.36	F (2:375) = 2.90	F (1:375) = 6.71	F (2:375) = 1.47
	2	60	22.75	4.24	148	22.07	3.32	208	22.27	3.61	p = 0.056	p = 0.010*	p = 0.229
	3 and more	36	24.61	2.69	38	22.42	3.46	74	23.49	3.26			
	Total	117	23.30	3.82	264	22.15	3.31	381	22.50	3.51			
SOMO	1	21	42.38	6.62	78	43.04	6.35	99	42.90	6.38	F (2:374) = 1.41	F (1:374) = 6.99	F (2:374) = 3.47
	2	60	44.10	8.66	148	42.10	6.65	208	42.60	7.32	p = 0.245	p = 0.009*	p = 0.032*
	3 and more	36	47.26	7.05	38	41.78	6.13	73	44.40	7.10			
	Total	117	44.74	7.99	264	42.33	6.48	380	43.07	7.06			

*p<0.05

IDCHI, COBE and SOMO subdimension points of fathers living in rural regions and having 3 or more children were found higher than that of fathers living in urban areas. Society, but not individuals, dominate child rearing in rural regions by allocating responsibility to children very early (Oktay, 1987). Moreover, while the high number of children poses no problem in rural regions, it can probably decline the domestic interaction because of reasons such as fathers' working in yielding second jobs in the urban areas.

Karadeniz (1994) analysed the relations between parental attitudes perceived as democratic and authoritative and various professional values. As a result, he found that families with fewer children are more inclined to display democratic attitudes. This finding varies according to the research findings.

CONCLUSION

Fathers, who have a crucial responsibility in childrearing are expected to develop positive behaviours for childrearing attitudes. In the light of this discussion, we suggest to give priority for family education regarding the importance of democratic attitude in childrearing

without considering allocation unit. Especially, primary school gradate fathers must have the priority for this kind of education. Also, there may be some informational studies for university graduate fathers to teach them how to spend more qualified time by having more identification with their children. For this purpose, the public television that may call the attention of fathers can be used. Moreover, educational programs to which fathers or both of the parents can attend in mass education institutions can be established. Father can be given the chance to share the responsibility for the education of the child, i.e, planning some activities for fathers to attend to family collaboration studies at schools. It may also, be appropriate to inform mothers about the fact that fathers should share the childrearing responsibility. In this respect, mothers should help fathers about this subject. Also, there may be educational programs about childrearing and parenthood for young people or for those expecting to be parents.

A similar study can be implemented on fathers of high and low household income. By increasing the sample numbers, similar kind of studies can be conducted especially with young and old fathers, primary school graduate and university graduate fathers.

SUGGESTIONS

Because of the changing life conditions, childcare and childrearing is not the responsibility of mother only; on the contrary mother and father should share the responsibility. The attitude of father is as important as the attitude of the mother in child's well development in every field.

In this study, we aimed to analyze the democraphic features of fathers having 5-6 years old children and their attitudes towards their children according to the allocation unit. According to the research results, we observed that, the age and educational background of father, gender and birth sequence of the child, rural or urban residential life have important affects on the attitude of father towards their children.

It has been observed that fathers living in rural areas compared to the fathers in urban areas set up more identification with their children; show more social compatibility behaviour and social mobility. It has been found that the living environment does not have any effect on the democratic behaviour of fathers towards their children.

When we compare their educational background, we see that primary school graduate fathers are less democratic than high school and university graduate fathers. On the other hand, it has been observed that university graduate fathers have less identification with their children and show less compatibility behaviour and social mobility. Furthermore, it has been found that fathers are more democratic to their sons than to their daughters and these fathers, having children who are third children or over, show more social behaviour than those having children who are first or secondborns. It has been revealed that the number of children does not necessarily affect the attitude of fathers.

REFERENCES

Allen, S. and K. Daly, 2002. The effects of father involvement: A summary of the reseach evidence. Newsletter of the Father Involvement Initative, Ontario Network Fall, 1: 2-8.

Argun, Y., 1995. The effects of parents conduct of bringing up children on the locus of control of secondary school students, Thesis of Master, Izmir, Institute of Soc. Sci., of 9 Eylu University, pp: 1-42. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Ari, M.P. Bayhan and I. Artan, 1995. A study into the effect of different attitudes of parents on the problem cases of children at 4-11 age group. Tenth Ya-Pa Preschool Training and Expansion Seminar, Istanbul: Ya-Pa Publications, pp: 23-38.

Bridge, H., 2001. Increasing parental involvement in the preschool curriculum: What an action research case study revealed. Int. J. Early Years Edu., 9 (1): 5-21. http://www.ingentaconnect.com.

Cagdas, A., 2003. Parents-Child Comunications. 2nd Edn. Konya: Education Publications, pp: 35. ISBN: 975-92656-8-0.

Dinatale, L., 2002. Developing high-quality family involvement programs in early childhood settings. Young Children NAECY, 57 (5): 90-97.

Erdogan, A., 2004. The role of father on child psycho-social development. New Symposium, 42 (4): 147-153.

Evans, C., 1997. Turkish Fathers'Attitudes to and Involvement in Their Fathering Role: A Low Socio-economic Sample, Thesis of Master, Istanbul: Education Sciences Institute of Bogazici University, pp: 1-210. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Fincham, D.F., S.R.H. Beach, I. Arias and G. Brody, 1998. Children's attributions in the family: The children's relationship attribution measure. J. Family Psychol., 12 (4): 481-493.

Guneysu, S., 1982. Parents attitudes for their children and children's problematic behaviours, thesis of master, ankara. Soc. Sci. Institute of Hacettepe University, pp: 1-104.

Ildes, N., 1990. A study into the believes and practices of parents of preschoolers (3-6 ages) over sexuality and sex education and their general attitudes, behaviors and responses to the curiosity of children concerning sexuality, thesis of master, Ankara: Healthy Sciences Institute of Hacettepe University, pp: 1-130. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Karadeniz, A., 1994. A study into the relation between parent attitudes perceived as democratic and authoritative over last grade students of high school and different professional values, Thesis of Master, Trabzon: Soc. Sci. Institute of Blacksea Technical University, pp: 1-78. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Mcbride, B.A. and M.A. Lutz, 2003. Intervention: Changing the Nature and Extend of Father Involvement. 4th Edn. In: Lamb, M.E. (Ed.). The Role of the Father in Child Dev., pp: 446-458. Published New York, Wiley. ISBN: 0471231614. ISBN-13:9780471 231615. http://search.barnesandnoble.com.

Mcbride, B.A., S.J. Schoppe, M. Ho and T. Rane, 2004. Conceptualizing and Measuring Father Involvement. In: Day, R.D. and M.E. Lamb (Eds.). Publisher Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp: 321-325. ISBN: 978-0-8058-4359-0(hardback),978-1-4106-09380 (electronic). http://www.informaworld.com.

Mizrakci, S., 1994. Factors affecting the attitudes of growing children: Demographic features, their own method of being grown, their level of information over how to grow a child and their perception of child's mood. Thesis of Master, Izmir: Social Sciences Institute of Ege University, pp: 1-152. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Myers, R., 1996. Enforcement of surviving 12 early childhood education program. In: R. Agis Bakay and E. Unlu (Eds.). Istanbul: ACEV, 5: 5-18.

Oktay, A., 1987. Game, the basic business of child in early childhood period. J. Pembe Bagcik, 4: 8-10. http://aef.marmara.edu.tr.

Oner, N., 1996. Psyholocical Tests Used in Turkey, Istanbul: Bogazici University Publications, pp: 1-628. ISBN: 975-518-044-3.

Ozdemir, A., 1991. A study on the effectiveness of mother training on mothers, master of arts in educational sciences. Istanbul: Bogazici University, pp: 1-128. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Ozyurek, A., 2004. Researching the attitudes of parents that has 5-6 years children group in city-center and country-side. Thesis of Master, Ankara: Educaiton Sciences Institute of Gazi University, pp: 1-130. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Riley, R.W., T.K. Peterson, M.G. Moreno and W.W. Goode, 2000. Strengthening participation of fathers in children's learning and development. Fathers Mother Involving Fathers in Children's Learning. A Kit for Educators and Other Professionals, pp: 442-580.

PTA, 2005. Father Involment-Encoouraning Dads to be Involvend. http://www.capta.org.

Sendogdu, M.C., 2000. The relation between the perception of their parents of children at the age of 5-6 attending to a kindergarten and parents' own perception of their attitudes, Thesis of Master, Ankara: Educaiton Sciences Institute of Gazi University, pp: 1-154. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Sahin, T.F., 2003. The Role of Father at the Development and Education of Child. In: Sevinc, M. (Ed.). Development at Early Childhood and Approaches at Education, Istanbul: Morpa Kultur Publishing, pp: 460-461. ISBN:975-8587-35-8.

Yalkin, S., 1994. Parental expectancies of developmental time-tables, child-rearing attitudes and actual child development. Istanbul: Educational Science Intitute of Bogazici University, pp: 1-71. http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/tez.htm.

Yildiz, B.R., 2006. Father and Child. www.yuvareh berim.com.