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ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the determinants of the motivators of mother’s engagement decisions into their children’s education in relation to motherhood related variables. Specifically, the purpose of the study is to examine the association of mothers’, with children attending a preschool institution, media exposures and belief systems with the motivators of their engagement decisions. Another purpose is to assess the operation of the mechanisms of media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information and maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive motherhood through which investigating the prediction ability of media exposures in maternal belief systems and assessing intensive motherhood ideology’s possible predictors. In this quantitative study, data were collected by the scales developed, and adapted, by Chae (2015) for media exposures and maternal belief systems of the interest and Ertan (2017) for the motivators of mother’s engagement decisions within the first level of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s parent involvement model. The sample of the study
consisted of 1027 mothers of preschoolers in five districts of Manisa. Canonical Correlation Analyses and Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis were conducted to analyze the data.

The findings of the study revealed that mass media and maternal belief systems, especially intensive motherhood, determined the motivators of why mothers engage in their children’s education, especially motivational beliefs; however, they reinforced the disregarding of experts in early childhood education environment, i.e. teachers. Moreover, among the media exposures, celebrity mothers and interpersonal communications explained the maternal comparison and competition beliefs. Also, celebrity mothers and the maternal comparison and competition beliefs explained the intensive motherhood beliefs.

**Keywords:** Family Engagement, Motivators to Mother’s Engagement Decisions, Media Exposure, Competitive Attitudes, Intensive Motherhood
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Arapışmanın bulguları şu sonuçları ortaya çıkarmıştır: Kitle iletişim araçları ve annelik inanç sistemleri, özellikle de yoğun annelik ideolojisi, annelerin çocuklarının eğitimine katılım nedenlerini, özellikle de motivasyonel inançlarını, belirlerken; aynı zamanda da okul öncesi eğitim sistemindeki uzmanları görmelden gelme eğilimini güdülemektedir. Ayrıca, kitle iletişim araçları arasında ünlü anneler ve kişilerarası iletişim, annelerin sosyal karşılaştırma ve rekabetçi inanışlarını açıklamaktadır. Son olarak, ünlü anneler ve annelerin karşılaştırma ve rekabetçi inanışları yoğun annelik ideolojisini yordamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Aile Bağlılığı, Annenin Katılımını Belirleyici Faktörler, Medya Maruziyeti, Rekabetçilik Tutumları, Yoğun Annelik
To the light of my life,

Murat UYANIK

&

To my parents,

Şükran and Rahmi FİLİK
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I could not complete without support and encouragement of many people to whom I am very greatful.

I would like to express my greatest appreciations and thanks to my perfect supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasibe Özlen Demircan who always fed my inspiration with her great support, invaluable suggestions and criticisms. She always allocated time not just for my academic, but also for my personal life. Whenever I need, she has always been there for me. She is more than a supervisor to me. Her positive energy and devotion to the field has always been an inspiration for me. Thus, I feel very lucky to have the chance to study with her.

I am very greatful to my thesis committee members; Prof. Dr. Sibel Çiğdem Güneysu, Prof. Dr. Ceren Öztekin, Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağla Öneren Şendil, Assist. Prof. Dr. Serap Sevimli Çelik for their valuable suggestions and comments. Their comments and guidance contributed to the quality of the study.

Moreover, I would like to offer my thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Volkan Şahin, Prof. Dr. Serap Sevimli Çelik who made valuable suggestions during the adaptation of the scale.

I wish to express my thanks to Prof. Dr. Semra Sungur for her helps on the data analysis procedure. She made me feel comfortable to ask my questions on the data analysis.

I also want to thank Hatice Ünlü. She has always been by my side. While preparing my thesis, she always provided me emotional support. Also, she contributed the scale adaptation process with her valuable suggestions.

I am also grateful to ILBANK personel Turgay Çelikten, Mahmut Karacan, Selçuk Karaoğlan, Burak Can Horzum, Murat Yarımoğlu, Tuğba Kaya, Handan Urhan for
voluntarily helping me while data entry process without even asking. It was like a life saving support, which making me feel being not alone.

I wish to express all my gratitude to my parents in law, Gülay and Ahmet Uyanık. They were so helpful in my busiest times while writing the thesis even when they were far away from where I live. With their great virtue, they always reminded me that the world has not corrupted that much.

Lastly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my husband, Murat Uyanık. In each process of my thesis, he always worked with me. With his endless patience, he always provided his valuable suggestions and support. I could not have achieved this without him. With her presence in my life, he always makes me feel I am the luckiest person in the world.
# TABLE OF CONTENT

PLAGIARISM ........................................................................................................ iii
ABSTRACT .......................................................................................................... iv
ÖZ ..................................................................................................................... vi
DEDICATION .................................................................................................... viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .................................................................................. ix
TABLE OF CONTENT ................................................................................... xi
LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................................. xvii
LIST OF FIGURES ............................................................................................ xx
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ................................................................................ xxii

## CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................. 1
   1.1. Purpose of the Study .................................................................................. 7
   1.2. Hypotheses of the Study ......................................................................... 10
   1.3. Significance of the Study ...................................................................... 10
   1.4. Definition of Key Terms ....................................................................... 13

2. LITERATURE REVIEW .................................................................................. 15
   2.1. A Brief Look at the History: Evolution of Parental Involvement .......... 15
       2.1.1. Background on Parent Involvement in the USA ....................... 16
       2.1.2. Background on Parent Involvement in Turkey ......................... 17
   2.2. Definition of Parent Involvement: Moving Toward Family Engagement 19
       2.2.1. Studies in Literature Regarding Family Engagement ............... 23
   2.3. Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s Parent Involvement Model ............ 25
       2.3.1. The Motivators of Parents’ Engagement in their Children’s Education from the Perspective of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s Model .. 28
       2.3.1.1. Parents’ Motivational Beliefs in Relation to Their Engagement .................................................................................................................................................. 30
       2.3.1.1.1. Parental Role Construction for Engagement in Children’s Education .................................................................................................................................................. 30
2.3.1.1.2. Parental Self-Efficacy for Helping the Child to Succeed in School

2.3.1.2. Parental Perceptions of Invitations for Engagement from Others
   2.3.1.2.1. Parents’ Perceptions of General School Invitations for Engagement
   2.3.1.2.2. Parents’ Perceptions of Specific Child Invitations for Involvement
   2.3.1.2.3. Parent’s Perceptions of Specific Teacher Invitations for Involvement

2.3.1.3. Parents’ Self-Perceived Life Context
   2.3.1.3.1. Self-Perceived Time, Energy and Desire for Parent Involvement
   2.3.1.3.2. Self-Perceived Skills and Knowledge on Parent Engagement

2.4. Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory

2.5. Mass Media and the Ideal Motherhood
   2.5.1. Cultivation Theory
      2.5.1.1. Exposure to Celebrity Mothers on Media
      2.5.1.2. Exposure to Childrearing Information

   2.6.1. Social Comparison Theory
      2.6.1.1. Social Comparison Theory and Mothers
   2.6.2. Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness and Intensive Mothering
      2.6.2.1. Maternal Social Comparison Orientation
      2.6.2.2. Maternal Competitive Attitudes
      2.6.2.3. Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Ideology

2.7. Motherhood and Media in Turkey

2.8. Summary of the Literature Review
3. METHOD

3.1. Preparatory Phase ........................................................................................................ 67

3.1.1. Design of the project ................................................................................................. 67

3.1.2. Instrumentation ......................................................................................................... 70

3.1.2.1. Demographic Information Form ........................................................................... 70

3.1.2.2. Media Exposure Scales ......................................................................................... 70

3.1.2.3. Maternal Belief Systems’ Scales .......................................................................... 71

3.1.2.4. Motivators of Maternal Engagement Decisions Toward Their Children’s Education .................................................................................................................... 72

3.1.3 Translation and Adaptation of the Instruments ........................................................ 76

3.2. Phase I: Pilot Study ..................................................................................................... 77

3.2.1. Sample and Procedure ............................................................................................ 77

3.2.2. Analysis for Exploratory Pre-Studies ...................................................................... 78

3.2.2.1. Factor Analyses for Media Exposure Scales ......................................................... 79

3.2.2.1.1. Media Exposure to Childrearing Information Scale ........................................... 79

3.2.2.1.2. Media Exposure to Celebrity Mothers .............................................................. 84

3.2.2.2. Factor analyses for Maternal Belief System Scales ........................................... 87

3.2.2.2.1. Social Comparison Orientation Scale .................................................................. 87

3.2.2.2.2. Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes Scale .............................................................. 90

3.2.2.2.3. Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Ideology ............................................ 93

3.2.3. Validity .................................................................................................................... 97

3.2.4. Reliability ................................................................................................................ 98

3.3. Phase II: Main Study .................................................................................................. 99

3.3.1. Population and Sample ........................................................................................... 99

3.3.2. Data Collection Procedure ..................................................................................... 100

3.3.3. Internal Validity Threats ......................................................................................... 101

3.3.4. Ethical Issues .......................................................................................................... 103

3.3.5. Data Analysis Procedure ......................................................................................... 104

4. RESULTS ....................................................................................................................... 106

4.1. Assumptions ............................................................................................................... 106

4.1.1. For Canonical Correlation Analysis ........................................................................ 106
4.1.1.1. Sample size ................................................................. 106
4.1.1.2. Multivariate Normality ............................................... 107
4.1.1.3. Linearity and Homoscedasticity .................................... 108
4.1.1.4. Multicollinearity ...................................................... 108
4.1.2. For Hierarchical Multiple Regression ................................ 108
4.1.2.1. Sample Size .............................................................. 108
4.1.2.2. Normality of Errors .................................................... 109
4.1.2.3. Linearity and Homoscedasticity .................................... 109
4.1.2.4. Multicollinearity and singularity ................................... 109
4.1.2.5. Independence of Residuals ........................................... 110
4.2. Descriptive Results .......................................................... 110
4.2.1. Demographic Information about the Participants ............... 110
4.2.2. General Patterns of the Scales ......................................... 111
4.2.2.1. The Motivators of Engagement Decisions ..................... 112
4.2.2.2. Media Exposure ........................................................ 113
4.2.2.3. Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness, And Intensive Motherhood ........................................ 115
4.3. Inferential Statistics .......................................................... 115
4.3.1. Association of Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness Intensive Mothering with Motivators of Parental Engagement ....................................................... 115
4.3.1.1. Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness Intensive Mothering with Overarching Motivators ................................................................. 116
4.3.1.1.1. Assessing Overall Model Fit ..................................... 116
4.3.1.1.2. Interpreting Canonical Weights ................................. 119
4.3.1.1.3. Follow-up Univariate Regressions ............................. 121
4.3.1.1.4. Validation and Diagnosis ........................................ 122
4.3.1.2. Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness Intensive Mothering with Constitutive Motivators ................................................................. 123
4.3.1.2.1. Assessing Overall Model Fit ..................................................123
4.3.1.2.2. Interpreting Canonical Weights .............................................126
4.3.1.2.3. Follow-up Univariate Regressions ...........................................128
4.3.1.2.4. Validation and Diagnosis ........................................................132

4.3.2. Association of Media Exposures with Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness, Intensive Mothering .........................133
   4.3.2.1. Assessing Overall Model Fit ....................................................133
   4.3.2.2. Interpreting Canonical Weights .................................................134
   4.3.2.3. Follow-up Univariate Regressions .............................................136
   4.3.2.4. Validation and Diagnosis ........................................................139

4.3.3. Prediction of Media Exposures, Social Comparisons, and Competitiveness to Intensive Mothering .............................................................141

5. DISCUSSION .......................................................................................143
   5.1. Discussion of the Findings ..............................................................143
      5.1.1. The General Patterns of Mothers’ Engagement Motivators, Belief Systems, and Media Exposures .........................................................143
      5.1.2. Association of Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems of Interest with Motivators of Mother’s Engagement Decisions .......... 144
         5.1.2.1. Overarching Motivators of Mother’s Engagement Decisions .... 145
         5.1.2.2. Constitutive Motivators of Mother’s Engagement Decisions .... 148
      5.1.3. Association of Media Exposures with Maternal Belief Systems of Interest ..........................................................151
      5.1.4. Predictors of Intensive Motherhood Ideology ...........................155
   5.2. General Discussion ........................................................................157
   5.3. Educational Implications for Practice ............................................159
   5.4. Recommendations for Future Studies ............................................162
   5.5. Limitations of the Study ..................................................................164

REFERENCES .......................................................................................166

APPENDICES
   A: ORIGINAL VERSIONS OF MATERNAL BELIEF SYSTEM SCALES ... 189
   B: ORIGINAL VERSIONS OF FAMILY ENGAGEMENT SCALES ....... 190
C: TURKISH VERSIONS OF THE SCALES ................................................................. 196
D: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR PILOT STUDY
   SAMPLE ........................................................................................................ 201
E: FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS OF PILOT DATASET................................. 202
F: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS............................................................. 203
G: TABLES AND FIGURES REGARDING ASSUMPTIONS .......................... 209
H: THE ITEM-BASED FREQUENCIES OF MEDIA EXPOSURE
   VARIABLES ............................................................................................... 218
I: CONSENT FORM ....................................................................................... 220
J: MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ETHIC COMMITTEE
   PERMISSION FORM.................................................................................... 221
K: MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION PERMISSION FORM .......... 222
L: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET ................................................... 224
M: THESIS PERMISSION FORM/TEZ İZİN FORMU ..................................... 241
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Information regarding Data Collection Tool ........................................74
Table 3.2. The items of Mothers’ Media Exposure to Childrearing Information ......80
Table 3.3. Pattern and Structure Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of
Mothers’ Media Exposure to Childrearing Information .......................................81
Table 3.4. Pattern and Structure Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Media
Exposure to Childrearing Information ..................................................................82
Table 3.5. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish version of
Media Exposure to Childrearing Information .......................................................83
Table 3.6. Pattern and Structure Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of
Celebrity Mother Exposure ..................................................................................85
Table 3.7. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish Version of
Celebrity Mother Media Exposure Scale ...........................................................87
Table 3.8. Pattern and Structure Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of SCO ....87
Table 3.9. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish version of
SCO Scale ..........................................................................................................90
Table 3.10. The items of Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes Scale .........................91
Table 3.11. Pattern And Structure Matrix For Exploratory Factor Analysis of
Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes ...........................................................................92
Table 3.12. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish version of
Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes Scale ..................................................................93
Table 3.13. The items of Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Ideology Scale ....94
Table 3.14. Component Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Endorsement
of Intensive Motherhood Ideology .......................................................................96
Table 3.15. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish Version of
the Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Ideology Scale ................................97
Table 4.1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participants .....................111
Table 4.2. Descriptive Statistics for the Scales regarding the Motivators of
Engagement Decisions .........................................................................................112
Table 4.3. Descriptive Statistics for the Scales regarding the Mothers’ Media Exposures ................................................................. 113
Table 4.4. Descriptive Statistics for the Scales regarding Maternal Belief Systems of Competition, Intensive Mothering and Social Comparisons ................................................. 115
Table 4.5. Canonical Correlations of the Functions ......................................................... 117
Table 4.6. Dimension Reduction Analysis for RQ 3.1 ..................................................... 117
Table 4.7. Canonical Solutions for Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems Predicting Overarching Motivators of Engagement ............................................................ 120
Table 4.8. Follow-up Univariate Regressions for RQ 3.1 .................................................. 122
Table 4.9. Sensitivity Analysis of the Canonical Correlation Results to Removal of a Predictor Variable for RQ 3 ................................................................. 123
Table 4.10. Canonical Correlations of the Functions for RQ 3.2 ...................................... 124
Table 4.11. Dimension Reduction Analysis for RQ 3.2 ..................................................... 126
Table 4.12. Canonical Solutions for Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems Predicting Constitutive Motivators of Engagement ......................................................... 127
Table 4.13. Follow-up Univariate Regressions for RQ 3.2 ................................................ 131
Table 4.14. Sensitivity Analysis of the Canonical Correlation Results to Removal of a Predictor Variable for RQ 3.2 ............................................................. 132
Table 4.15. Canonical Correlations of the Functions ...................................................... 133
Table 4.16. Dimension Reduction Analysis for RQ 4 ..................................................... 134
Table 4.17. Canonical Solutions for Media Exposures Predicting Maternal Belief Systems ............................................................................................................. 135
Table 4.18. Follow-Up Univariate Regressions for RQ 4 ................................................ 138
Table 4.19. Sensitivity Analysis of the Canonical Correlation Results to Removal of a Predictor Variable for RQ 4 ................................................................. 139
Table 4.20. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis .................................................... 141
Table A.1. Socio-Demographic Information For Pilot Study Sample ................................ 201
Table A.2. EFA Results for Media Exposure to Childrearing Information ......................... 202
Table A.3. EFA Results for Competitive Attitudes Scale ................................................ 202
Table A.4. EFA for Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Scale ..................................... 202
Table A.5. Childrearing Information Exposure Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study) ................................................................. 203
Table A.6. Celebrity Mother Exposure Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study) ................................................................. 203
Table A.7. Mother’s Social Comparison Orientation Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study) ................................................................. 204
Table A.8. Mother’s Competitive Attitudes Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study) ................................................................. 204
Table A.9. Intensive Motherhood Ideology Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study) ................................................................. 205
Table A.10. Childrearing Information Exposure Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study) ................................................................. 205
Table A.11. Celebrity Mother Exposure Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study) ................................................................. 206
Table A.12. Mother’s Social Comparison Orientation Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study) ................................................................. 206
Table A.13. Mother’s Competitiveness Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study) ................................................................. 207
Table A.14. Intensive Motherhood Ideology Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study) ................................................................. 207
Table A.15. Motivators of Family Engagement Scales’ Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study) ................................................................. 208
Table A.16. Bivariate Correlations for RQ 3.1 ......................................................... 215
Table A.17. Bivariate Correlations for RQ 3.2 ......................................................... 216
Table A.18. Bivariate Correlations for RQ 4 ......................................................... 216
Table A.19. Bivariate Correlations for RQ 5 ......................................................... 217
Table A.20. Item Frequencies of Childrearing Information Exposure on Media .......... 218
Table A.21. Item Frequencies of Celebrity Exposure on Media ............................. 219
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. The first level of the Family Engagement Model of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler ................................................................. 4
Figure 2.1. The multidimensionality of family engagement ........................................ 23
Figure 2.2. Parent Engagement model of McKenna and Millen (2013) ............... 25
Figure 2.3. Revised Parent Involvement Model of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler ..., 27
Figure 2.4. First level of the Parent Engagement Model of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler ....................................................................................................... 29
Figure 2.5. Embedded systems of children’s environment .................................... 41
Figure 3.1. Research process ........................................................................... 69
Figure 3.2. Scree plot for media childrearing information .................................. 81
Figure 3.3. Hypothesized model for media exposure to childrearing information ..., 83
Figure 3.4. Scree plot for celebrity exposure .................................................... 84
Figure 3.5. Hypothesized model for Celebrity Mother Exposure Scale .......... 86
Figure 3.6. Scree plot for SCO Scale ................................................................ 87
Figure 3.7. Hypothesized model for the SCO Scale ........................................... 89
Figure 3.8. Scree plot for Mothers’ Competitiveness Scale ............................. 91
Figure 3.9. Hypothesized model for Mothers’ Competitiveness Scale .......... 92
Figure 3.10. Scree plot for endorsement of intensive motherhood ideology .... 95
Figure 3.11. Hypothesized model for intensive motherhood ideology .......... 97
Figure 4.1. Descriptive statistics for genre-based childrearing information exposure .......................................................................................114
Figure 4.2. Descriptive statistics for genre-based celebrity mother exposure .... 114
Figure 4.3. Canonical Correlation Model for RQ3.1 ......................................... 118
Figure 4.4. Canonical Correlation Model for RQ3.2 ......................................... 125
Figure 4.5. Canonical Correlation Model for RQ 4 ........................................... 140
Figure A. 1. Histograms and normal probability plots of the media exposure variables .......................................................................................209
Figure A.2. Histograms and normal probability plots of the maternal belief system variables ........................................................................210
Figure A.3. Histograms and normal probability plots of the family engagement variables .......................................................... 213
Figure A.4. Bivariate plots for RQ 3.1 .............................................. 214
Figure A.5. Bivariate plots for RQ 3.2 .............................................. 214
Figure A.6. Bivariate plots for RQ 4 ................................................ 215
Figure A.7. Histogram, probability plot and scatterplot for RQ 5 .............. 217
## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>Adjusted Goodness-Of-Fit Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Comparative Fit Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Perceived Invitations from Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Exploratory Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>Goodness-of-Fit Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td>Intensive Motherhood Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>Perceptions of Invitations from Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO</td>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Perceptions of Knowledge and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Self-Perceived Life Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>Motivational Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNFI</td>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Role Activity Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>Mothers’ Social Comparison Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Perceived Self-Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Perceived Invitations from School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>Standardized Root Mean Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED</td>
<td>Perceptions of Time/Energy Desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>Perceived Invitations from Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Whoever controls the media, controls the mind." said Jim Morrison (1971) in an interview. In 21st century, people are bombarded by the hundreds of media messages every day online, on TV, in magazines, on the radio, etc. The media representations are instruments in the socialization process (Knobloch-Westerwick, Kennard, Westerwick, Willis, & Gong, 2014), where individuals establish a dynamic relationship in which they “introject and elaborate the specific norms, values and symbolic systems of construction and organization of knowledge” referring to “the dominant cultural paradigm in a given context” (Maturo & Paone, 2012, p. 4887). Socialization in organizations is an important form of the socialization process (Yüksel & Tosun, 2015).

Schools are social organizations (Willower & Carr, 1965), whose educational processes are influenced by social structure (Dornbusch, Glasgow, & Lin, 1996). Social structure is defined as “a relatively enduring pattern of social arrangements or interrelations within a particular society”; it possesses different forms with respect to the level of social organization (Dornbusch et. al., 1996, p. 402). Larger societies’ social structure, including the “integrated pattern of social ideology, norms, and roles”, and schools’ organizational social structure, composed of both external context and internal mechanisms, are interconnected with each other (Dornbusch et. al., 1996, p. 402). Thus, mass media as a driving force shaping societies’ social structure might be associated with schools’ social structure, whose essential part could be best referred with the term of family engagement, which was recently evolved and differentiated from parental involvement.

Parent involvement has been defined in variety of ways in literature. Some of the definitions were concentrated on parents’ participation (No Child Left Behind Act [NCLB], 2002; Feuerstein, 2000; Jeynes, 2005). In detail, NCLB (2002) framed the participation with parents’ regular, two-way communication regarding school
activities and student’s learning. Feuerstein (2000) and Jeynes (2005) structured parents’ participations within any experience, or development, and education of their children. Moreover, other definitions stressed the term of partnership (e.g. Bryan & Henry, 2011; Griffin & Steen, 2010; Stefanski, Valli, & Jacobson, 2016), referring collaborative initiatives of school stakeholders, i.e. mothers and fathers, grandparents, foster parents, stepparents, other caregivers and relatives, business leaders and community groups (National Education Association, 2008), to work together to achieve children’s success (Henry, Bryan, and Zalaquett, 2017). However, since partnership corresponds to equitable positions to the stakeholders which is so hard to reach in school organization (Pushor, 2012), engagement has recently been brought into context. As a result, family engagement is defined as a shared responsibility of school stakeholders are committed to work actively together in meaningful ways to reinforce children’s learning and development (Harvard Family Research Project, 2014).

When the development of individuals is the case, early childhood education is a critical period for one’s whole development in terms of cognitive, physical, socio-emotional, moral aspects (O’Neil, 2011; Berk, 2008). To achieve educational goals, family engagement is critical in this period. According to Dufur, Parcel, & Troutman’s (2013) study results, it is even more significant factor than school quality for children’s academic achievement. Bigner (2010) supported parents’ importance in providing opportunities for their preschoolers to reach their developmental potential. Family engagement increased children’s motivation and engagement with learning (Fan & Williams, 2010; Fan, Williams, & Wolters, 2012). Additional to the child’s outcomes, its contributions to parents, schools, and teachers was presented by variety of scholars (eg., Anderson & Minke, 2007; Epstein, 2001; Hornby, 2011; Keyser, 2006; Sheldon, 2007; Morrison, 2013).

Being a model for parent involvement, in 1995 and 1997, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler suggested a clarification of the reasons of parents to become involved, their involvement forms and the way of their influencing the student outcomes as a result of involvement (Walker, Wilkins, Dallaire, Sandler & Hoover-Dempsey, 2005). The
model included consideration to “parents’ motivations for involvement, parents’ choice of involvement forms, the mechanisms that parents enact during involvement activities, the student attributes influenced by mechanisms engaged during involvement, and students’ school learning and achievement” within five sequential levels starting from the motivators of parents’ involvement decisions and moving toward students’ achievement (Hoover-Dempsey, Wilkins, Sandler, & O’Connor, 2004, p.3).

In the first level of the model, Hoover-Dempsey and her colleagues examined the socially determined sources, or motivators, of families’ engagement decisions given with respect to their beliefs and perceptions, specifically on the motivational beliefs constituted by role construction process and their self-efficacies regarding children’s education process, on invitational perceptions from others – i.e. school, child, and teacher, and on perceptions of their own life context constituted by available time, energy and desire, and skills and knowledge with respect to their children’s education (Walker et al, 2005; Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2007). The first level of the model is illustrated in the Figure 1.1.

In the model, it was theoretically proposed that the motivators strongly determined socially by school community, whose members considered in the model was mainly families, school staff and community members at school surroundings (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2004). However, school community members, or stakeholders, corresponds to wide range of individuals or collective entities who are interested in the welfare and success of children (The Glossary of Education Reform, 2014). To

1 In the original model, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler used parent involvement term. The family engagement, which was constructed after the model evolved, could be more suitable than the term involvement especially for the first level of the model. The issue is discussed in detail in Section 2.3.1.

2 The desire component was included in addition to the original version of time and energy perceptions of parents by Ertan (2017).
illustrate, they can be a family member like a parent, a grandparent or they can be a media portrayal at the same time. The notion was derived from Bronfenbrenner in his Ecological Systems Theory (1979, 1986, 2005), proposing that children develop in the nested, interrelated system of relationships forming the child’s surrounding. In other words, children’s education and learning are not associated solely with school experience, but also with interactions of wider systems of families, schools, community, politics, media, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Motivational Beliefs</th>
<th>Perceptions of Invitations for Engagement from Others</th>
<th>Self-Perceived Life Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental Role Construction for Engagement (Composed of Role Activity Beliefs and Valence toward School)</td>
<td>Parental Self-Efficacy for Helping Student Succeed in School</td>
<td>General Invitations from School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Walker et al. (2005); Ertan (2017).

Figure 1.1. The first Level of the Family Engagement Model of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler

As it was discussed at the beginning of the current chapter that media representations shape behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes addressing practices of social roles; on the other hand, social structures of the larger society include pattern of social ideology, norms, and roles. Taken together, it might be reasonable to verbalize that media has a power to create social structures. In fact, individuals’ experiences with media construct knowledges about the dynamics of the world, which later turning out to be a powerful base of the one’s attitudes and behaviors (Harris & Sanborn, 2014).
It might be advantageous to have a statistical frame regarding general media experiences of individuals before stressing which attitudes, or behaviors, the media cultivates in a society. Target Group Index Research (2015) aimed to assess media consumption trends in Turkey and it was conducted with 15000 participants in different regions. According to the findings, almost 77% of women watched televisions at least one hour a day. 56% of them read newspapers at least one time in a week or magazines at least one times a month. Almost 49% of them reported having Internet access. Lastly, almost 15% of them listened to radio at least one hour a day. Overall, these statistics suggests how frequently Turkish women exposed to media representations.

Looking at the content of the current mass media, obsession of motherhood could be observed (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). The obsession has reinforced contemporary ideal motherhood beliefs named as intensive motherhood ideology (Hays, 1996), or new momism (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Women with intensive ideology believes in the necessity of having a child for the requirement of being complete as a female and in the importance of expert level knowledge, high-intensity labor, and high costs to raise a child (Hays, 1996). Moreover, they believe that the mother should be the primary caregiver allocating all her time and energy into mothering; that is, a complete devotion of mothers for their children is necessitated (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). All these beliefs are reinforced by mass media representations (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Supporting this notion, ideal women in Turkish media have been represented frequently as devoted mothers, good wives (Akbulut, 2004; Uğur Tannöver, Vitrinel, & Sözeri, 2009). How the reinforcement of mass media performs is investigated by Gerbner’s Cultivation Theory.

According to The Cultivation Theory, individuals’ standpoint and perceived social reality aligns with the viewpoints of media representations (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). The contagiousness of media increases with individuals’ repeated exposure to the representations (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). With this impact, homogenization of the heterogenic perceptions of the members of the society manifests to reinforce dominant norms of the culture (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). In studies framed with the
theory, content-based media exposures explained the content related behaviors, or perceptions (e.g. Oliver & Armstrong, 1995; Martins & Jensen, 2014). In conclusion, supported by cultivation theory literature, the media portrayals might cultivate the dominant motherhood belief of culture.

Chae (2015) proposed two kinds of media portrayals playing a role in mothers’ experience with dominant mothering practices in society; celebrity mothers and childrearing information in any media genre. First of all, celebrities are considered as respected power resources by ordinary people (Driessens, 2013), which make them involve and engage in their messages. Thus, celebrities predict alterations in their attitudes and behaviors (Brown, Basil, & Bocarnea, 2003). Regarding motherhood, celebrity exposures have been perceived as powerful genres to experience current definition of mothering (Glenn, 1994; Douglass & Michaels, 2004). Secondly, parenthood currently associated with consumption of a multiplicity of information (Montesi & Bornstein, 2017). Parents, particularly mothers, search childrearing information from any kind of media genres like internet, (Rothbaum, Martland, & Janssen, 2008; Friedman, 2010), print media (O’Connor & Joffe, 2012), television (Ex, Janssens, & Korzilius, 2002). In sum, both kinds of media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information is associated with the mothers’ beliefs regarding their maternal identities and practices.

The rationale behind mothers’ belief formation based on their exposure to media images can be considered in framework of Social Comparison Theory by Festinger. Indeed, Festinger's (1954) Social Comparison Theory nominates that human beings have an instinct to evaluate their opinions and abilities. Festinger (1954) thought that in order to best fulfill this need for self-evaluation, people measure their attributes against direct, physical standards. At the point when target principles are inaccessible, nonetheless, people contrast themselves and other individuals, being especially the ones similar others. Being exposed to mothering images and information on media, mothers assess themselves by comparing those on media (Chae, 2015). That is why, while making such assessment they require information
about others to utilize them as reference points (Corcoran, Crusius, & Musweiler, 2011).

Social comparison produce competition (Festinger, 1954; Garcia, Tor, & Schiff, 2013). That is why, comparison turns out to be a kind of motivator for individuals to compensate their own weaknesses (Kruglanski & Mayseless, 1990). The notion brings to mind the intensive mothering ideology since it includes the mothers’ responsibility to be better (Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004). That is, mothers’ tendency in perfection might be performed in socialization process by comparing their own ability on motherhood with others which result in competition. Mass media communication sets the ground for such maternal beliefs in the meantime. To conclude, interrelations of social comparisons, competitiveness, intensive ideologies and media exposures are obvious.

1.1. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to assess the determinants of the motivators of mother’s engagement decisions into their children’s education in relation to motherhood related variables. In detail, the study focused on three main objectives. Firstly, the current study was conducted to adapt the media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information scales into Turkish context. Secondly, it was aimed to investigate the association of mothers’, with 36-72 months old children attending a preschool institution, media exposures and belief systems with the motivators of their engagement decisions. Thirdly, the purpose of the study was to assess the operation of the mechanisms of maternal belief systems of social comparison orientation, competitive attitudes and intensive mothering ideology, and media exposures. In accordance with the aim, the prediction ability of media exposures in maternal belief systems and assessing intensive ideologies’ possible predictors were investigated. Considering the objectives, the research questions of the study are as follows:

RQ 1. What are the underlying factor structures of the Turkish versions of childrearing information exposure on media, celebrity mother exposure on media,
mothers’ social comparision orientation, competitive attitudes, and the endorsement of intensive mothering ideology scales?

RQ 2. What are the general patterns of mothers’ scale scores on overarching and constitutive motivators of engagement, media exposures to childrearing informations and celebrity mothers, maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood?

RQ 3. To what extent does the combination of the media exposures, maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood are correlated with the motivators of the mothers’ engagement decision?

3.1 To what extent does the combination of the media exposures, and maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood correlate with the overarching motivators of the mothers’ engagement decision (motivational beliefs on their involvement, perceptions of invitations from others for the involvement and self-perceived life context on their involvement)?

3.1.1 To what extent does the combination of the media exposures, maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood predict the overarching motivators of the mothers’ engagement decision?

3.1.2. To what extent does the media exposures, maternal belief systems uniquely predicts the overarching motivators of the mothers’ engagement decisions?

3.2. To what extent does the combination of the media exposures, and maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood correlate with the constitutive motivators of the mothers’ engagement decision (role activity beliefs, self-efficacy for helping student succeed in school, perceptions of general school invitations, specific invitations
from teacher(s), and specific invitations from student, perceived parental knowledge and skills, and perceived parental time, energy, and desire)?

3.2.1 To what extent does the combination of the media exposures, maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood predict the constitutive motivators of the mothers’ engagement decision?

3.2.2. To what extent does the media exposures, maternal belief systems uniquely predicts the constitutive motivators of the mothers’ engagement decisions?

RQ 4. To what extent does the combination of maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood is correlated with the combination of mothers’ exposure celebrity mothers at media (television exposure, informal online exposure, formal online exposure, print media exposure) and childrearing information on media (television exposure, informal online exposure, formal online exposure, print media exposure, and interpersonal communications)?

4.1 To what extent does the combination of media exposures predict maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood?

4.2. To what extent does media exposures uniquely predict each maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood?

RQ 5. To what extent does the combination of media exposures of mothers to celebrity mothers and to childrearing information, mothers’ social comparisons, and their competitive attitudes predict intensive mothering ideology, after the effects of demographic characteristics (i.e. age, the number of children they have, the recency of birth, graduation, monthly family income, work status) is controlled for?
1.2. Hypotheses of the Study

Based on a review of literature, three major hypotheses will guide the analysis of data. The first one is that the combination of mothers’ media exposures and their belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive motherhood would be significantly related with their engagement motivators regarding their children’s education process. The positive relationship between intensive motherhood and motivational beliefs, especially role activity beliefs, would dominate the model although competitiveness and social comparison orientation and media exposures would significantly be loaded on the model. Secondly, the combination of media exposure of childrearing information and celebrity mothers would be positively correlated with the three maternal belief systems. Thirdly, intensive motherhood would be positively determined by competition, social comparison and media exposures after controlling for demographic variables.

1.3. Significance of the Study

A great body of studies conducted within the framework of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s model investigated the prediction ability of aforementioned motivators to parent involvement forms, represented in second level of the model (See Figure 2.3.) in order to test what the model have assumed (e.g. Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey, & Sandler, 2007; Reininger & Lopez, 2017; Lavenda, 2011; Walker, Ice, Hoover-Dempsey, & Sandler, 2011). However, there is lack of empirical study testing what contributes to such motivators.

Hoover-Dempsey (2013) suggests in his model that students’, teachers’, schools’ attitudes and expectations toward involvement determine parents’ role beliefs being important aspects for their engagement decisions. The model is restricted with the relationship between school and the family. Although, Walker et al. (2005) supports the idea of Ecological Theory by Bronfenbrenner (1979) that roles include general social expectations and scripts directing members of the groups, it is not clear which formations of society that parents live in is associated with the construction of role beliefs apart from school members. Within this perspective, the current study would
offer an insight into possible contributors of the motivators of family engagement in a broad angle by assessing the relationship between media’s role on identification of ideal motherhood.

Given that family involvement types are the outward manifestation of parents' behaviors in support of their child's education, it is important to understand the mechanisms by which parenting factors have their effect on engagement (Semke, Garbacz, Kwon, Sheridan & Woods, 2010). Numerous parent and family characteristics have previously been identified that contribute to family engagement. Previous research has investigated the influence of parental education, number of children living in the home, child gender (Manz, Fantuzzo, & Power, 2004), single-parent status (Arnold, Zeljo, Doctoroff, & Ortiz, 2008; Manz et al., 2004), and cultural and racial variations (Wong & Hughes, 2006) on family engagement. However, parent’s belief system has been rarely investigated as a factor affecting engagement.

As mentioned above, Social Comparison Theory demonstrates that people tend to compare themselves with others to evaluate abilities and opinions (Festinger, 1954). Via mass media, women have had the chance to communicate about ideal contemporary motherhood in the light of the celebrity mother discourse and childrearing information. According to Chae (2015), the relationship between media exposure and motherhood has rarely been investigated; thus, she conducted a study with mothers with 0-3 years old children. It was concluded by the researcher that as a result of the endorsement of celebrity mother messages and online childrearing information, which were associated with social comparison orientation, women tend to form intensive mothering ideology. This situation increases competition among mothers (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). On the other hand, the current study would illuminate the association between media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information and mothers’ social comparison orientation, competition feelings, endorsement of intensive mothering ideology with children 36-72 months old attending kindergarten.
Although many studies conducted in literature related with the framework of social comparison theory or parent involvement model, their focus was generally not the educational involvement for the ones of former theory and was not sociologically formed belief systems for the ones of latter theory. The study contributes to both theories by combining them in the perspective of parent engagement issue. In other words, it closes a gap in literature for two of the theories by associating social comparison theory with schools and by presenting the media’s influence on parent’s role construction process. With this way, both theories are examined with a broader perspective. Thus, the current study honors the complexity and multidimensionality of human nature.

Also, according to Chae (2015), the relationship between media exposure and motherhood has rarely been investigated. Moreover, Coyne, McDaniel, Stockdale (2017) stated the need of studying social media use and social comparisons with respect to parents. Thus, the current study contributes to the need of the literature.

Moreover, if the study can prove the hypotheses, early childhood professionals might be more aware of possible impacts of contemporary belief systems and media exposures, either positive or negative. Taking into consideration that the media portrayals (O’Connor & Joffe, 2012; Yazıcı & Özel, 2017) and intensive motherhood forces mothers to actively engage in their children’s development (Vancour & Sherman, 2010), the exposures and belief systems might be the determinants of the motivators of mothers to engage, or collaborate with other stakeholders, in education children’s education, which increases the outcomes of children. On the other hand, keeping in mind the unhealthy nature of intensive motherhood and competition (Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004), a barrier might be observed from the results of the analysis that would offer the need to take some precautions for the professionals’ duty on parent’s role construction process. That is why, any obstacles, or barriers, that may restrain parents’ active involvement in their child’s education must be understood and solved in order to build a positive relationship with the school system (Hornby & Rafaele, 2011).
1.4. Definition of Key Terms

**Family Engagement:** Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP) (2014) defined it as “a shared responsibility in which schools and other community agencies and organizations are committed to reaching out to engage families in meaningful ways and in which families are committed to actively supporting their children’s learning and development” (p. 2). On the other hand, Pushor & Ruitenberg (2005b) discussed it as “enabling parents to take their place alongside educators in the schooling of their children, fitting together their knowledge of children, teaching and learning, with teachers’ knowledge” (p. 12). Combining the two, it refers that a shared responsibility of the stakeholders of children’s education to be committed to work with together to support children’s whole development by combining their own knowledges.

**Motivators of Mothers’ Engagement:** It indicates the three major sources of mother’s engagement decisions into their children’s education which are the motivational beliefs, invitation perceptions from others, and perceived life-context as suggested in the first level of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s involvement model (Walker et al, 2005).

**Media:** It refers the main means of collectively regarded mass communication, including print, broadcast, and the Internet forms (Oxford University Press, 2018).

**Media Exposure:** It refers the extent that audiences encounter to specific messages, or media content (Slater, 2004).

**Celebrity Mother:** The term of celebrity defined as the current state of being famous (Holmes & Redmond, 2010). In the current study, celebrity mothers indicate the famous mother portrayals that the society meets in mass media including social media, TV, internet, radio, etc. Thus, the term of celebrity mothers refers the writers, singers, artists, social media influencers, academicians, etc., known by a large group of individuals.
**Childrearing Information:** It refers to any information presented in social media, blogs, official webpages, etc. regarding childrearing, or parenting.

**Belief:** It refers mental constructions which are formed by the combinations of past experiences, being considered as to be true and guiding behavior (Vandenplas-Holper, Roskam, & Pirot, 2006).

**Maternal Belief System:** Belief systems defined as “structures of norms that are interrelated and that vary mainly in the degree in which they are systemic”, in which several beliefs interrelated with each other (Usó-Doménech & Nescolarde-Selva, 2016, p. 147). Applied to motherhood context, it refers mothers’ systematic structures of norms being connected with each other. Among the norms, social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive mothering corresponds to the focus of the current study.

**Mothers’ Social Comparison Orientation (SCO):** Gibbons and Buunk (1999) define SCO as personality trait of individuals being sensitive to what others doing and having tendency to use social comparisons for the evaluation of themselves. Applied to motherhood, it refers to mothers’ sensitive tendency to relate their practices as a mother with other mothers to evaluate themselves.

**Mother’s Competitive Attitudes (CA):** An individual trait of mothers (Smither & Houston, 1992) to act upon to build superiority over other mothers.

**Intensive Motherhood Ideology (IMI):** Hays (1996) explains as “a gendered model advising mothers to expend a tremendous amount of time, money and energy in raising children” (p. 8).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter includes theoretical background and the related literature of the study. Specifically, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s first level of the parent involvement model, Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory, Gerbner’s Cultivation Theory and Festinger’s Social Comparison Theory constitute the framework of the study. In general, all components of the literature are discussed through eight sections. The components start with historical evolution of parent involvement in the first section. In the second section, definition of family engagement evolving from parent involvement is elaborated. The third section includes the analysis and descriptions regarding the parents’ motivators of family engagement in their children’s education within Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s parent involvement model. Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory is presented in a general manner at the fourth section. In the fifth section, information about media and ideal motherhood is provided within Cultivation Theory perspective. Media and the contemporary motherhood in the context of Social Comparison Theory are explained in the seventh section. In the fifth section, Turkish context regarding motherhood and media is presented. As a conclusive section, the summary of the chapter is stated.

2.1. A Brief Look at the History: Evolution of Parental Involvement

Having knowledge about the historical scene of parent involvement both in the United States (US) and Turkey would serve a framework to comprehend today’s philosophy and beliefs regarding parent engagement concept. Thus, this section includes background on parental engagement efforts in two countries to establish a base before embarking on an in-depth analysis of contemporary beliefs of parents of young children regarding their motherhood beliefs and their engagement in their children’s education in Turkey.


2.1.1. Background on Parent Involvement in the USA

Since the formalization of education, the issue of parent involvement (PI) in education (Hiatt, 1994), being a driving force for establishing the National Congress of Mothers in 1897, the precursor of National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) (Watson, Sanders-Lawson, & McNeal, 2012). Countering the exclusion of parents in their children’s education was intended by the group (Watson, Sanders-Lawson, & McNeal, 2012). Following this act, parents started to become involved in the education process in nursery schools at the beginning of 20th century.

PI in nursery schools, being limited to middle-class families, was used to decrease budget costs via parents’ assistance to teachers or to school staff, and to build a bridge between school and parent (Gestwicki, 2007). Similar kinds of involvement continued after the Great Depression and World War II, in 1945, but with broader perspective in which school-based activities like parent conferences, parent-teacher meetings were applied (Martinez, 2004). However, they were limited in number as well as targeting mothers.

After World War II, the government established antipoverty programs like Head Start, aiming to empower children and their families with low socio-economic status to have equal opportunities with the wealthier families and their children (American Psychological Association, 2004). In terms of PI, the project designed in accordance with Bronfenbrenner’s notion that schools should have constructivist impact on children by focusing on the child’s broad environment composed of his/her family, neighborhood, and community instead of considering just the child’s development (Bronfenbrenner, 1972). Similarly, the PI concept expanded federally with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which aroused the idea of using PI as a component of equity, social justice, and quality education (Moles & Fege, 2011). As a result, PI enlarged from being a mother-focused concept to a family and community-based one.
In the following years, PI was mandated federally by several regulations. The first one was Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, in which families with children with disabilities required to be involved in planning process of their children’s education (Gestwicki, 2007). Secondly, The America 2000 Act was signed in 1994, requiring every state to create policies helping schools to increase parent-school partnership especially among disadvantaged families, having children with disabilities, or bilingual children (Moles & Fege, 2011). Thirdly, the more specific one was No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, in which PI was defined for the first time as two-way, meaningful, and regular communication to increase children’s academic success (Moles & Fege, 2011). Indeed, NCLB assigned states and school districts to establish school, community and parent partnership programs, designed to equip teachers and school staff to recognize parents as their partners (Epstein, 2005).

To conclude, looking at the historical evolution of PI, it could be observed that policy-based reform strategies were established in US. The strategies covered mostly disadvantaged families and children to enhance social equity via education. Achieving this, PI discussions were evolved from inclusion of mothers to a broad way including community, school, and parent partnerships. Although the policies were promising at these perspectives, Moles and Fege (2011) criticized the PI programs were as being dependent on the will of the state or the local school districts, which could be considered as a commend-driven nature of PI. This nature debated by researchers (e.g. Pushor & Ruitenber, 2005a; Ferlazzo, 2011), and brought the concept of parent engagement into life, which was discussed in detail in the Section 2.2.

2.1.2. Background on Parent Involvement in Turkey

PI in children’s education lies back in the Sıbyan Schools in Ottoman periods (Tekin, 2011), in which parents included education for their financial supports and for volunteer activities to maintain the schools (Erdem, 2005). The establishment of the Turkish Republic, after the breakdown of Ottoman Empire, required a number of reforms to reach the aims of modernization, in which educational systems was an
important part. Ministry of National Education (MONE) regulated educational programs, settings, and activities, including the control of PI programs (Tekin, 2011). Mandated formation of a Parent-Teacher-Organization (PTO) for every school is the way of MONE to control and establish PI activities through the annual plans of PTO.

MONE (2013) expects the early childhood institutions to follow the National Early Childhood Education Programme (NECEP) in Turkey. The programme requires teachers and schools to establish PI environments. In fact, it gives importance of PI and suggests some ways for teachers to establish relationships with parents. To do this, Family Support Education Guideline Integrated with Early Childhood Education Programme has been published by Ministry of Education at 2013 as an additional guideline to NECEP. The guideline serves as a handbook for teachers, which offers the description of importance of PI and education, activity examples, teachers’ and families’ roles for the process. In this point of view, it can be considered as a tool for strategy guide for both teachers and parents, which can serve as instrument in role construction process for both parties.

In the programme, PI and education are conducted via school and home-based activities, classroom meetings, decision making activities. The curriculum adaptation for the activities are considered as mainly the duty of teachers and schools. In fact, a hierarchical structure in school-parent partnership exists in it. Thus, it can be said that the programme ignores parent engagement issue, which was discussed in the following section.

Alongside of MONE’s regulations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) had a place in related efforts. To begin with, the Mother-Child Education Foundation (MCEF), established in 1993, was one of the NGOs working in the PI field, whose major philosophy has been that accomplishing better outcomes of children’s education would be impossible without working with their parents and creating home-learning environments since the major educators of children are parents (Tekin, 2011). The MCEF has been providing several PI programs targeting both mothers and fathers. Although the MCEF initially focused on mothers, it has been started to apply programs, or projects, for fathers as well. Its projects have been
established in relation with the Turkish government, and with international institutions such as the World Bank and UNICEF (Tekin, 2011).

The Turkish Early Enrichment Project (TEEP) was another effort for PI in Turkey. This project aimed to investigate the whole development of socially disadvantaged children and to support the family in order to enhance children’s development (Kağıtçibaşı, 1997). It centered on the Mother Enrichment Program (MEP) and Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) (Tekin, 2011). The MEP provided information to mothers about a variety of topics, like child development, the importance of the early years, the role of the mother, mother-child interactions, and so on (Kağıtçibaşı, 1991). HIPPY worked with the mothers regarding cognitive development of children regarding how children should be assisted for their cognitive development in home settings by cognitive materials like puzzles, toys, and books to children (Tekin, 2011).

To sum up, the rising awareness regarding the importance of PI has been observed as well as an ongoing development about the concept based on the historical background of it in both the USA and Turkey. Parents have been perceived as partners in their children’s education although there is still lack of the engagement issue related studies, especially in Turkish context. As a result, the philosophy of partnership has been directing policy makers and NGOs to establish programs, or projects, involving parents to accommodate social and developmental benefits of children and society.

2.2. Definition of Parent Involvement: Moving Toward Family Engagement

The definition of PI has evolved throughout the history in a similar way with the aforementioned evolution of PI in the USA. That is, its meaning has been broaden day by day. Georgiou (1997) criticized the absence of a clear definition of PI since the existing literature focused on creating typologies based on different activity types (e.g. Gordon, 1977; Epstein, 1995; Mau, 1997) rather than a holistic viewpoint. Martinez (2004) reported such activities being mostly school based and including mainly mothers. Getting broader, PI definition of NCLB, as mentioned earlier, focused on
parents’ participation in regular, two-way communication regarding school activities and student’s learning (No Child Left Behind Act, 2002). Hill and Taylor (2004) enlarged the definition by stressing interactions of parents with their children and schools to enhance academic success. Moreover, Feuerstein (2000) and Jeynes (2005) related PI with parents’ participations for any experience, or development, and education of their children unlike the prior researchers mentioning mainly academic success.

Alongside of observable behaviors in the scope of PI definitions, the psychological and sociological aspects were investigated in literature. Firstly, psychological components, from the perceptions of parents, such as beliefs, motivations, expectations, attitudes were taken into consideration (Hoover-Dempsey, & Sandler, 1995; Georgiou, 2007). Furthermore, Georgiou (2007) pointed out sociological factors contributing to its development like the demands and expectations of the society, the school climate, or the teachers’ resistance.

Grounding especially Epstein’s PI model (1995) and ecological child development perspectives (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Comer, Haynes, Joyner, & Ben-Avie, 1996), some researchers and associations investigated the concept with a more holistic and inclusive viewpoint by giving attention to family-school-community partnership (e.g. Bryan & Henry, 2011; Griffin & Steen, 2010; Stefanski, Valli, & Jacobson, 2016). To illustrate, Henry, Bryan, and Zalaquett (2017) defined the partnership as “collaborative initiatives in which school personnel, families, and community members and organizations work together to help children succeed” (p.164). National Education Association (NEA) presented stakeholders of the partnership as following: mothers and fathers, grandparents, foster parents, stepparents, other caregivers and relatives, business leaders and community groups, who attend in goal-oriented activities for students’ and schools’ success (NEA, 2008). To sum up, these family-school-community partnership definitions were more comprehensive than the previous ones.

On the other hand, in recent literature, word of partnership was challenged by Pushor (2012). She stated her concerns that partnership is the word giving equitable
positions to teachers and parents which is so hard to reach in school community system. Thus, the concept moved beyond involvement to more inclusive and broader notion of engagement. First of all, Korfmacher, Green, Staerkel, Peterson, Cook, Roggman, Faldowski, and Schiffman (2008) discussed two possibly related, but not necessarily, dimensions of PI, which are participation and engagement. They described the former one as the quantity of intervention a family receives like the frequency of contact between school and family while defining the latter one as “emotional quality of interactions with the program” like the strength of relationship between family and school (p. 173). The two dimensions were separated from each other by some researchers (Pushor & Ruitenberg, 2005a, 2005b; Ferlazzo, 2011; Head Start, 2014; Harvard Family Research Project, 2014; Stefanski et al., 2016).

First of all, Pushor and Ruitenberg (2005a, 2005b) studied the term engagement within their project at Princess Alexandra Community School in Canada:

"Engagement" . . . comes from en, meaning "make," and gage, meaning "pledge" - to make a pledge (Harper, 2002), to make a moral commitment (Sykes, 1976, p. 343). The word engagement is further defined as "contact by fitting together; . . . the meshing of gears" (Engagement). The implication is that the person 'engaged' is an integral and essential part of a process, brought into the act because of care and commitment. By extension, engagement implies enabling parents to take their place alongside educators in the schooling of their children, fitting together their knowledge of children, teaching and learning, with teachers' knowledge. With parent engagement, possibilities are created for the structure of schooling to be flattened, power and authority to be shared by educators and parents, and the agenda being served to be mutually determined and mutually beneficial. (Pushor & Ruitenberg, 2005b, pp. 12-13).

Within this perspective, parental engagement exhibits “the reciprocity and mutual commitment” being crucial in building permanent relations between schools and families” (Pushor & Ruitenberg, 2005b, p. i). Similarly, Ferlazzo (2011) states the difference between the terms the fact that involvement refers “doing to” while engagement refers “doing with”. To illustrate, a school giving place to family involvement has a commend-driven approach by “identifying projects, needs, and goals and then telling parents how they can contribute”; on the other hand, a school working for family engagement (FE) has a demand-driven approach by “listening to what parents think, dream, and worry about” (Ferlazzo, 2011, p.12). In fact, it can be
stated regarding this sense that engagement implies a true partnership of two companies.

The notion was supported by some worldwide projects. Firstly, Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP) (2014) proposed a systemic approach to FE, being “a shared responsibility in which schools and other community agencies and organizations are committed to reaching out to engage families in meaningful ways and in which families are committed to actively supporting their children’s learning and development” (p. 2). Secondly, Head Start (2014) differentiated the two concepts in a way that PI covered the participation in different kinds of activities developed by family services staff while FE concentrated on mutually supportive, and goal-directed relationships between families and staff. To sum up, it was supported that such a broad definition honored “the dynamic, multiple and complementary ways” for children’s development (HFRP, 2014, p. 2).

Aforementioned variations in the definitions, or lack of a common framework, comes from both the multidimensional nature of the concept and the complexity of home–school connections (Patrikakou, Weissberg, Redding, & Walberg, 2005). As presented in Figure 2.1, Child development concerns (Eccles, 1999; Elias, Bryan, Patrikakou, & Weissberg, 2003; Steinberg, 1992), the different roles of the stakeholders in the process play (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997), the beliefs and expectations of the stakeholders of the educational process (Eccles & Harold, 1996; Patrikakou, 1997, 2004; Reynolds & Walberg, 1992), cultural perspectives (Laosa, 1997; Taylor, Casten, & Flickinger, 1993), and the policies all contribute to the partnership (as cited in Patrikakou et al. 2005, p. 2). Since HFRP (2014) suggested using “family engagement” as the most honorable term for such complexity, the current study concentrated on parent (family) engagement term while examining the multidimensional aspects of the determinants of mothers’ engagement decisions to their children’s education with respect to psychological (i.e. maternal belief systems) and sociological, or cultural, (i.e. mass media exposure) context.
2.2.1. Studies in Literature Regarding Family Engagement

Recently, variety of researchers investigated the importance of FE with children’s learning, and perceptions of parents’ and school staff regarding their engagement. Fan and Williams (2010), using longitudinal data, PI motivation and school-initiated communication with parents were beneficial for students’ esteem toward learning; thus, it their intrinsic motivation to engage in learning increased. Later, Fan, Williams, and Wolters (2012) examined how students’ school motivations is

---

3 In the original figure, Patrikakou et al. (2005) used the terms of School-Family Partnership. As it was discussed in Section 2.2, partnership word was challenged by Pushor (2012) and family engagement was suggested instead (Pushor & Ruitenberg, 2005b; Ferlazzo, 2011). Although the terms are slightly different from each other, the multidimensionality remains the same in nature. Thus, family engagement terms utilized in the figure unlike the original source.
associated with different dimensions of PI like participating in school, communicating with staff, aspiration toward education process, etc. across different ethnicities of Caucasian, African American, Asian American, and Hispanic students. They also resulted in increase in students’ self-efficacy and engagement motivations when families engage in education process.

McWayne, Melzi, Limlingan, and Schick (2016) investigated the patterns of FE among low-income Latino parents of 650 Head Start preschool children. They examined the association between FE patterns and preschoolers’ language and social skills. They founded that different patterns of family engagement, named as foundational education, supplemental education, future-oriented teaching, and school participation, were correlated with children’s language and social skills.

With respect to the parents’ perceptions, as an example, Peters, Seeds, Goldstein, and Coleman (2007) conducted a study by a series of telephone surveys and found that they were well aware of their importance of their role of involvement in their children’s learning; however, they had declining assurance in embarking on this role. On the other hand, Harris and Goodall (2008) reported using interviews with staff that schools have still perceived FE as school-centered, with beliefs regarding parents’ role of supporting the school. In conclusion, although the benefits were reported by a great body of research, parents and school staff needed formations of new perceptions in engagement issue.

A comprehensive study in such formation were conducted by McKenna and Millen (2013), developing a holistic family engagement model (See Figure 2.2), in which parent engagement was constituted from two following components: parent voice, referring that parents have ideas and opinions regarding their children and these voices received by the educators, and parent presence, referring the actions derived from the voices. Moreover, they stated that parent engagement, led by voices and presence, covered four conditions; “engagement must develop over time and be active and deliberate, culturally sensitive, and both communally and personally based” (McKenna & Millen, 2013, p. 38).
In the aforementioned studies, the terminologies used by the researchers grasp attention. Fan and Williams (2010), Fan et al. (2012), Peters et al. (2007) used PI term while McWayne et al (2016), Harris and Goodall (2008) and McKenna and Millen (2013) used FE in their studies. Among them Harris and Goodall (2008) utilized engagement and involvement words interchangeably in their article although engagement was the dominantly used one. Within this sense, it could be said that FE term has been used in more recent studies in literature despite the ongoing misusages of them in some studies. Thus, the current study carefully differentiated the terms to contribute the literature with proper usage of the terminology.

2.3. Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s Parent Involvement Model

In 1995 and 1997, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler suggested a theoretical model explaining PI process in their children’s education by reviewing educational, developmental, and social psychology research (see Fig. 1). The model clarifies the reasons of parents to become involved, their involvement forms and the way of influencing the student outcomes as a result of their involvement in a psychological perspective (Walker et al., 2005). In other words, PI in their child's learning can be predicted by parental motivational beliefs, or beliefs and perceptions, fostering a parent's enthusiasm to be involved in their child's education (Semke, Garbacz, Kwon,
In line with this perspective, the model aimed more to describe the process of involvement and its effects than to prescribe parental or educational practice even though it supports the eventual goal of developing PI (Walker, et al., 2005). After three years of empirical testing of the model, it was amended in 2005 (Reininger & Lopez., 2017).

In Figure 2.3., the revised version of the model, encompassing five sequential levels starting from psychological underpinnings of PI and moving toward student achievement by utilizing involvement forms and mechanisms, was presented. The content of these levels was described as following (Walker et al., 2005; Hoover-Dempsey, Walker & Sandler, 2005).

*Level 1* is about the initial decisions of parents to become involved in their children’s educational process based on their motivations, perceptions of invitations from others (teachers, school, and the child), and perceived life-context. *Level 2* includes PI forms, which are home-based and school-based activities, after involvement decision was given. *Level 3* identifies PI mechanisms, applied during the activities, being modeling, reinforcement, and instruction, used to impact children’s school outcomes. *Level 4* proposes the extent of the inferentiality of these mechanisms lying in the suitability of the parents’ behaviors with the school’s expectations for involvement and the children’s developmental needs. *Level 5* contains the conclusion of the model with student outcomes.

Within the levels, the first one, in which psychological underpinnings of the reasons of the parents to become involved in their children’s education, was solely focused in the current study. Therefore, the first level discussed in detail in Section 2.3.1.
Figure 2.3. Revised Parent Involvement Model of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler

* Adapted from Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Walker et al, 2005.
2.3.1. The Motivators of Parents’ Engagement in their Children’s Education from the Perspective of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s Model

Grounded mainly in psychological literature, the first level of the model examines the three major sources of parents’ motivations for involvement, being 1) parents’ motivational beliefs regarding involvement, 2) parents’ perceptions of invitations for involvement from others, and 3) parents perceived personal life context (Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2007). Focusing on motivational nature of the sources for involvement process, it could be stated that the sources, as the determinants of parents’ involvement “decisions”, addresses families’ initial commitments to work with schools or community for their children’s development and success.

As it was discussed in the Section 2.2, family engagement refers the process of goal-directed and committed participation of the stakeholders of children’s education process, who have a shared responsibility to work with together in meaningful ways for the sake of children (Ferlazzo, 2011; HFRP, 2014). The definition and the nature of the first level of the model overlaps with each other. Although Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler used the word ‘involvement’, since family involvement or engagement were not differentiated from each other when the model was generated, especially the first level could be considered under comprehensive family engagement term. Therefore, the sources discussed within the level was subsumed as the motivators of parents’ engagement decisions. In the following section, the sources with their constitutive motivators in the first level was presented in detail (See Figure 2.4).
Figure 2.4. First level of the Parent Engagement Model of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (Walker et al., 2005; Ertan, 2017).
2.3.1.1. Parents’ Motivational Beliefs in Relation to Their Engagement

Parents’ motivational beliefs regarding their involvement, or personal psychological beliefs, encompasses the fact that parents’ engagement decisions were predicted by their beliefs about their responsibilities and capabilities towards their children’s education process. In fact, the overarching determinants, i.e. motivational beliefs, constituted by two belief systems, which are role construction for involvement, which constituted by role activity beliefs and valence toward schools, and perceived self-efficacy for helping the child succeed in school (Hoover-Dempsey et. al., 2005).

2.3.1.1.1. Parental Role Construction for Engagement in Children’s Education

As a clue to form baseline for parental role construction literature, individuals’ role beliefs and their construction process have been investigated (Biddle, 1979; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Forsyth, 1990). In detail, Biddle (1979, 1986, 2001) in his role theory, Bronfenbrenner (1979, 2005) in his ecological theory, and Forsyth (1990) in his group processes studies commonly defended the notion that society, or society’s expectations, shapes its members’ role beliefs. In these studies, roles were defined as “beliefs about one’s own and other group members’ responsibilities, rights, and obligations; they also include social expectations and scripts that guide group members’ behavior in various situations” (Walker et al., 2005, p. 89). Within the scope of the definition, parent’s role beliefs including their responsibilities, rights, and obligations towards childrearing and children’s development constructed by the society that they belong in (i.e. school, culture, community) (Hoover-Dempsey, Wilkins, Sandler, & O’Connor, 2004).

In the theory of Hoover-Dempsey and her colleagues, parental role construction for engagement in children’s education was defined in a way that parents’ beliefs regarding what they are required to do with respect to the child’s education (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995, 1997; Walker et al., 2005). Role construction of parents
is a motivator of PI since it empowers parents to have ideas about the ways of behaviors with respect to children’s educational activities as well as the importance of their engagement in the educational process (Walker et al., 2005). Therefore, it is a strong predictor of FE, corresponding student success (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997; Walker et al., 2005).

This assumption was supported in several studies. Gonzalez and Chrispeels (2004) reported in their study, conducted with Latino parents of elementary and secondary students, that parental role construction was the strongest predictor of the parents’ participation in a parent education intervention program. Similarly, Bramesfeld, Carrick, Lessmeier, Nicoloff, Keiser, and Metter (2013) reported that parental role beliefs were the strongest predictor of parent’s school-based involvement frequencies within the sample of parents of children attending an early childhood childcare center. Moreover, the study by Green et al. (2007) showed that parents’ role activity beliefs were predictors of both home and school-based engagement behaviors of parents. Similarly, Jaspen (2012) founded the significant prediction of role construction of parents in both home and school-based engagement.

On the other hand, some studies revealed insignificance of role construction in FE types focused on home and school activities. Reininger and Lopez (2017) reported non-significance of prediction of parental role construction in at-home and at-school engagement. Similarly, Rivera and Milicic (2006) founded parents’ perceptions of roles regarding their children’s education with respect to just economic means rather than broad supporting activities (as cited in Reininger & Lopez, 2017, p. 8).

Walker et al (2005) and Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2004) suggested two dimensions of parental role construction; role activity beliefs, and valence toward school. The former dimension addresses the beliefs component of role construction while the latter one corresponds to personal past experiences with school as an indicator of predisposition toward behaviors regarding schools. However, the parental valence dimension criticized Ertan (2017) since it is not a concept that can be a subject to change, being inconsistent with the idea that roles constantly evolve and change in time (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2004, 2005). Consistently, Green et al. (2007) did not
include valence construct as a constitutive component for the major structure of parental motivational beliefs. Thus, the valence toward school dimension were safely excluded in the current study, leaving parental role activity beliefs and self-efficacies as the sub-dimensions of parental motivational beliefs concept.

2.3.1.1.2. Parental Self-Efficacy for Helping the Child to Succeed in School

Self-efficacy is defined as a person’s belief regarding his/her own capability to behave so as to generate desired outcomes; it is significantly influential to select certain goals to achieve and persistently work toward achieving the goals (Bandura, 1997). With respect to parental engagement process, parental self-efficacy refers parents’ engagement decisions in association with their beliefs about their engagement activities supporting their children’s outcomes (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997; Walker et al., 2005; Green et al., 2007).

Similar to the role construction, parental self-efficacy is a source being constructed socially (Walker et al., 2005). In self-efficacy theory of Bandura (1997), four sources of individual’s efficacy beliefs were provided as personal mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social, or verbal, persuasion, and psychological, or affective, arousal. Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2005) applied the sources to parent engagement in a way the fact that parental self-efficacy necessitates experiences of achievement in assisting the child’s learning (personal mastery), opportunities to observe other parents successfully in helping process of child’s learning (vicarious experience), reinforcement from others being important (verbal persuasion), and support for the positive emotions that being followed by success or realistic encouragement from others (affective arousal). Accordingly, it is obvious that social surroundings of parents like schools, or important community members have an influential role on parents’ sense of efficacy for assisting their children’s success in educational process (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005).

Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s model assumes that parental self-efficacy helping their child succeed in school is associated, even predicts, parental engagement
(Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). The assumption was accepted in several studies. Shumow and Lomax (2002) conducted a study with a national sample of middle and high school students and reported that parental involvement and parental monitoring of students were predicted by parental efficacy. The other study conducted by Green et al. (2007) showed that parental self-efficacy predicted significantly both home-based and school-based involvement activities of parents. In detail, the results of the study indicated that parental self-efficacy beliefs were strongly predicted home-based involvement in a positive way, but partially predicted school-based involvement in a negative way. Still other study by Reininger and Lopez (2017) supported the previous study that parental sense of efficacy positively predicted at-home involvement; contrarily, negatively predicted at-school involvement.

Additional to the aforementioned studies investigating parental self-efficacy beliefs’ relation to parental involvement, Okagaki and Sternberg (1993) and Soodak, Erwin, Winton, Brotherson, Turnbull, Hanson, and Brault (2002) investigated the concept’s direct relation to children’s outcomes. In detail, Okagaki and Sternberg (1993) suggested positive association between the confidence of parents and their children’s success in schools. Similarly, Soodak et al. (2002) reported that student’s desire and confidence for learning was positively associated with parents’ higher levels of self-efficacy. To sum up, the importance of parental self-efficacy for children’s direct achievement as well as their outcomes predicted by family engagement was reported in literature.

2.3.1.2. Parental Perceptions of Invitations for Engagement from Others

Parental perceptions of invitations to be involved from members of the school community, including the school, the teacher/s, and the child, were the second psychological source for parent’s engagement decisions and it was also labeled as contextual motivators of engagement. Walker, Ice, Hoover-Dempsey, and Sandler (2011) founded significant prediction of the combination of contextual motivators on FE. That is, parents’ perceptions toward the fact that their engagement is required, welcomed, and appreciated by the child, the child’s teacher, and the child’s school
impact on their engagement (Walker et al., 2005). Similar to the role construction concept, the importance of invitations from others for engagement comes from the works of Biddle (1979), Delgado-Gaitan (1992), and Forsyth (1990). The researchers commonly proposed that societies’ expectations strongly affect the responsibility, or role, beliefs of individuals being in the society. Although the expectations are transported in a direct or an indirect way, such expectations pertains to behaviors as well as role beliefs.

Similarly, Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2005a) suggested that such invitations may be more important for the ones with less role construction and weak sense of efficacy. Also, they proposed that the invitations may significantly promote more active parental role activity beliefs and positive beliefs regarding the one’s own effect on education process. This assumption was supported later by Lavenda (2011) that within the sample of 5999 parents in Israel, parental role construction was a mediator between the invitation for engagement constructs and parental engagement.

2.3.1.2.1. Parents’ Perceptions of General School Invitations for Engagement

Walker et al. (2005) claimed that parental perceptions of general invitations for involvement from the school have an impact on parents’ engagement decisions by drawing inspiration from several studies (e.g. Epstein, 1986; Eccles & Harold, 1993). Indeed, it affects not only parents’ decisions to engage but also the effectiveness of the engagement process (Mulligan, 2006). General school invitations encompass broad school characteristics or variety of activities delivering parents the massage that their engagement in their children’s educational process is crucial and required (Walker et al., 2005). A welcoming and responsive school atmosphere, intentionally dealing with in parents’ ideas and concerns, and providing suggestions for parents regarding the support they can provide to their children are some examples of general school invitations, which are critical contributors for the quality of parent engagement process (Walker et al., 2005).
Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005) stated that many parents’ perceptions regarding schools’ invitations and opportunities range in different levels from low to high. To illustrate, Prior and Gerard (2007) reported that some parents evaluated general invitations from the school as being sufficient while others criticized them being either moderate or insufficient. Likewise, parents suggested barriers to engagement due to insufficient communication about engagement process with their child’s school (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

The importance of general school invitations was investigated by several researchers in literature. Simon (2004) conducted a study based on a longitudinal data with a sample of 11348 parents, and reported parents’ tendency to be engaged in parenting, volunteering, and learning-at-home activities if schools supported parents’ engagement. The other researcher reported the invitations from schools for engagement increase FE in two ways both directly and through their impact on parental role construction (Lavenda, 2011). Still other researchers found that school’s invitation was significantly correlated with home and school-based engagement but not a significant predictor of both engagement types (Green et al., 2007). Similarly, Walker et al. (2011) resulted that schools’ invitation was a negative predictor of school-based engagement while being nonsignificant predictor of home-based engagement.

All in all, the perceptions of parents regarding school atmosphere in which they feel that they are welcomed, that their concerns and ideas are signified, and that they are empowered to collaborate for the children’s development, are crucial for the family engagement process. The absence of the school invitations within the parents’ perceptions result in barriers to the collaboration process. On the contrary, the parents’ engagement is likely to be observed in the case of supportive school environment.
2.3.1.2.2. Parents’ Perceptions of Specific Child Invitations for Involvement

Hoover-Dempsey et. al. (2005a) stated the importance of child invitations to prompt parental engagement since they activate parents’ beliefs regarding their responsibility to be responsive to their children’s needs. Specifically, child invitation forms were defined within the context of children’s schooling as child attributes (e.g., age) and distinctive child behaviors (e.g., difficulty with schoolwork, requiring parental assistance). Therefore, such invitation may be both nonverbal and verbal (Walker et al., 2005). In this sense, when they were in the form of nonverbal invitation, it is parents’ duty to observe and recognize them. Alongside of children’s demands and needs for their invitation sources, Walker et al. (2005) and Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2005b) stated that such invitations may be triggered by schools’ and teachers’ encouragement to children in order to invite their parents for engagement. As a result, when parents recognized the invitations, or demands and needs, of children, they tend to reply them (Grusec, 2002).

In literature, child invitations were focused in several studies. Lavenda (2011) reported that, similar to the schools’ invitations, children's invitations for engagement result in a significant increase in parental engagement both directly and through their impact on parental role construction. Moreover, Green et al. (2007) and Reininger and Lopez (2017) revealed in their study that home and school-based involvement of parents were significantly predicted by child invitations. On the other hand, Walker et al. (2011) founded that invitations from children were the most important predictor of home-based involvement but not a significant predictor of school-based involvement. To conclude, the studies supported the fact that parents are motivated to engage in their children’s development and education when their children actively seek their participation in the process.

2.3.1.2.3. Parent’s Perceptions of Specific Teacher Invitations for Involvement

Teachers are primary members in the social organization of the school, and they are often responsible for transmitting norms formed by the school to parents (Whitaker
et al., 2013). Moreover, teachers are main resources for parents with respect to necessary information, like curriculum, students’ development, and behavior, which parents need in the process of constructing their role activities in ways of benefitting their children (Whitaker et al., 2013). Therefore, specific teacher invitations were perceived as an important motivator for parental engagement (Walker et al., 2005); that is why, they stress that the teacher give importance to the contributions of parents in children’s educational process (Patrikakou & Weissberg, 2000). The effects of these invitations considered as being stronger especially when other factors, like parents’ perceived time and energy, are optimal (Walker et al., 2005).

In literature, teacher invitations were investigated in variety of studies. To illustrate, Lavenda (2011) founded a strong and direct path engagement as well as an indirect path of teacher's invitation through role construction which indicates an increase in engagement with a decrease in role construction. On the other hand, Walker et al.’s (2011) study revealed significant prediction of teacher invitations on school-based engagement, but not on home-based engagement. Similarly, Green et al. (2007) founded significant for correlation of teacher invitation with home-based engagement, although finding nonsignificant prediction of it on home engagement, and reported such invitation as a significant predictor for school-based engagement. Contrarily, Reininger and Lopez (2017) founded that teacher’s invitations were not significant determinant of both home and school-based engagement.

In sum, teachers are at the center of the school systems, which gives them so critical place in communicating and collaborating with families. Thus, their invitations within the parents’ perspectives are significant in parents’ engagement behaviors although the existence of studies with clues for the contradicting situations.

2.3.1.3. Parents’ Self-Perceived Life Context

The last major motivator to parental engagement is self-perceived life context of parents, encompassing parents’ perceptions of their available time, energy, and desire -the desire component is added by Ertan (2017)-, and their knowledge and skills for
engagement (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005a; Walker et al., 2005). In other words, it was suggested that parents’ beliefs regarding their adequate time and energy (and desire) to engage in their children education and the worth of their own knowledge and skills on the process have an important role on motivations toward engagement (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005). Moreover, in the revised model, perceived life context was assumed to be moderator between other motivators of Level 1, which are motivational beliefs and perceptions of invitations from others, and parents’ engagement forms.

2.3.1.3.1. Self-Perceived Time, Energy and Desire for Parent Involvement

Parents’ perceptions of their available time and energy are assumed to affect their beliefs about their involvement in their children’s education (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005a). Later, in 2017, Ertan included desire dimension to the concept in line with researches supporting parents’ tendency seek and allocate time for engagement activities even with heavy work conditions and responsibilities (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005a; Weeden, 2001). Particularly, it was stated that parents’ employment related conditions like length of working hours, strict job schedule, result in low levels of parental engagement, particularly for the activities at school Hoover-Dempsey et al. (2005a) as well as the low quality of the process (Trevino, 2004). Moreover, parents’ daily responsibilities apart from the employment related ones, such as preparing dinner, having a younger child needing care, impact negatively the incidence of engagement. Thus, the concept underscored as a barrier to FE (Murray, Carr, Jones, Copeland-Linder, Haynie, & Cheng, 2014).

In literature, parents’ perceived time and energy were investigated in variety of studies. Firstly, Lavenda (2011) reported significant, and weak prediction of it on FE. Secondly, Green et. al. (2007) found significant prediction of it on both type of FE, home, and school. However, Walker et al. (2011) and Reininger and Lopez (2017) concluded their study that it significantly predicted school-based engagement of parents while not significantly predicted home-based engagement.
To conclude, parental self-perceived time-energy-desire for FE is important for engagement actions. They are the possible clues for effective collaboration of families and schools when the parents have tendency to perceive available enough time-energy-desire. In the contrary situation, they are indicators of the barriers for the collaboration.

2.3.1.3.2. Self-Perceived Skills and Knowledge on Parent Engagement

Parents’ perceptions of personal skills and knowledge have influential role on sculpting their ideas about their engagement process toward their children’s education (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 1995, 2005). Indeed, it was suggested that parents are likely to engage in their children’s educational process when they have beliefs regarding adequate knowledge and skills for helping them (Walker et al., 2005). To illustrate, knowing effective ways for communication with the stakeholders of children’s developmental process, being aware of how to be active in decision making activities in schools are some elements of parental knowledge and skills relating to their engagement (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005).

In literature, the concept was investigated in variety of studies. Firstly, similar to parental self-perceived time/energy/desire source, Lavenda (2011) reported significant, and weak prediction of it on FE. However, Walker et al. (2011) and Reininger and Lopez (2017) concluded their study that it significantly predicted neither school-based nor home-based engagement of parents. On the other hand, Green et. al. (2007) found significant correlation of the concept with both home and school-based engagement while they did not find a significant prediction of it on both type of FE, home, and school.

In conclusion, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (2005) 1st level of revised version FE model covers motivators of parents’ engagement decisions in their children’s education, specifically their psychological motivational beliefs, contextual perceptions, and perceived life contexts regarding their engagement. The great body of research in literature concentrated on such motivators’ prediction on parents’
engagement behaviors to test what the model have assumed. However, there is lack of empirical research investigating what correlates with, or predicts, such motivators. As mentioned above, it was proposed theoretically, but not empirically, that the motivators strongly determined socially by school community, whose members considered in the model was mainly families, school staff and community members at school surroundings (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2004).

The defined members could be considered as narrow since stakeholders in education, or school community, refers anyone being invested in the welfare and success of students, i.e. *individuals* such as school staff, students, families, community members, and *elected officials* such as school board members, and state representatives, and *collective entities*, such as media outlets, organizations, and cultural institutions (The Glossary of Education Reform, 2014). Considering the impacts of all stakeholders on children’s education and development, Ecological Systems Theory and the agencies it points out can be an advantageous framework while investigating possible stakeholders of education, mass media representations and mothers as assumed factors correlating with the motivators of mother’s engagement decisions.

### 2.4. Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory

Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1986, 2005) investigated in his ecological theory the fact that child development within the framework of the interrelated system of relationships forming the child’s surrounding. The rationale behind the systems was children’s development is affected by the child’s individual characteristics as well as their family, surroundings, and social, political, biological, and economic factors (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1986). As presented in Figure 2.5., the environmental system arranged with a set of nested structures, i.e. microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem.

*Microsystem* is defined as “a pattern of activities, social roles, and interpersonal relations experienced by the developing person in a given face-to-face setting with particular physical, social, and symbolic features that permit … engagement in …
complex interaction with … the immediate environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1994, p. 39), like family, school, and neighborhood (Berk, 2008). It encompasses three behavior settings, which are home, school, and peer group locations (Bronfenbrenner & Crouter, 1983; Thomas, 2005). The influence of the behavior setting on child results from perception, or interpretation, of the child toward most significant components of a setting; the ‘activities’ of individuals around them, ‘roles’ of them shaped by societies’ expectations, and ‘interpersonal relations’ between them (Thomas, 2005). A change in one of the components may change the whole configuration of the system, forcing the child to form a new meaning (Thomas, 2005). Considering the nature of roles, activities and relationships constantly evolving and changing in time, microsystem could be considered as formed by continuing activities, readjusted roles and relationships.

*Figure 2.5.* Embedded systems of children’s environment (McGraw-Hill Company, 2007).

*Mesosystem* is defined as “the linkage and processes taking place between two or more settings containing the developing person. Special attention is focused on the
synergistic effects created by the interaction of developmentally investigative or inhibitory features and processes present in each setting” (Bronfenbrenner, 1994, p. 22). In brief, it might be reasonable to say that mesosystem indicates to the relationship between microsystems such as school, home, neighborhood, etc. Such relationships have an impact on the child’s behavior or perception (Thomas, 2005). As an example, a child whose teacher shows invitation actions to his/her parents which are received by the parents may be directly positively affected as a result of the feeling of being valued by both parties.

**Exosystem** is described as “linkages and processes taking place between two or more settings, at least one of which does not contain the developing person, but in which events occur that indirectly influence processes within the immediate setting” around the developing person (Bronfenbrenner, 1994, p. 40). Parents’ workplaces, extended family member, religious institutions, and the media are some examples of the settings in the exosystem (Berk, 2008). These components indirectly affect the child’s development (Tekin, 2011). To illustrate, mass media representations regarding motherhood might shape the mothers’ role beliefs toward their engagement in their children’s education, as assumed in the current study, which have positive outcomes on children.

**Macrosystem** is described as “the overarching pattern of micro-, meso-, exosystems characteristic of a given culture … with particular reference to the belief systems, bodies of knowledge, material resources, customs, life-styles, opportunity structures, … that are embedded in each of these broader systems” (Bronfenbrenner, 1994, p. 40). In other words, it can be said that macrosystem comprises attitudes and ideologies of the cultures like morals, customs, and worldviews (Tekin, 2011) as well as laws, and resources. At macrosystem level, the priority given to the children’s needs have an impact on the support they obtained at inner levels of the ecology (Berk, 2008). Thus, in the current study, the association of motherhood attitudes and ideologies assumed to be shaped by cultural values presented by mass media with the mothers’ motivators to engage in their children’s education was investigated.
Lastly, *chronosystem* is defined as a system “encompasses change or consistency over time not only in the characteristics of the person but also of the environment in which that the person lives” (Bronfenbrenner, 1994, p. 40). As a matter of fact, the environment is not static force affecting the child, according to Bronfenbrenner, but dynamic, or ever-changing, through the lifespan of a person. Influential life events such as moving a new neighborhood, birth of a sibling, or beginning of school alter current relationships between children and their environments (Berk, 2008).

To conclude, Bronfenbrenner’s theory is a broad, ground breaking one, which posits children’s education and learning not just solely on school experience, but also on interactions of wider systems of families, schools, community, politics, etc. Moreover, looking closer at the elements, or discussion, of the hypothetical systems of the theory, Bronfenbrenner’s impact on Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s model is so obvious, especially in microsystem and mesosystem levels. Taking a step further, in the current study, exosystem (i.e. mass media exposures of mothers to childrearing information and celebrity mothers) and macrosystem (i.e. maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive mothering) levels were taken into consideration. In the following sections, such issues of the current study’s interest were discussed, respectively.

### 2.5. Mass Media and the Ideal Motherhood

Individuals’ experience with media is a foremost way in knowledge acquisition regarding the world. That is, one’s experiences with media construct knowledges, or mental realities, about the dynamics of the world, which later turning out to be a powerful base of the one’s attitudes and behaviors (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). The paradox here is that it is not the media reflecting some “external reality”; but, becoming “the reality against which the real world is compared”; thus, the media perceptions of the world are mostly “more real than the real world itself!” (Harris & Sanborn, 2014, p.2). One of the subjects whose portrayals perceived as *more real than the real world* is motherhood, which has been obsessively overrepresented by mass media (Douglas & Michaels, 2004).
The concept of motherhood has been socially and historically constructed (Bassin, Honey, & Kaplan, 1994). Throughout the history, affected by some ideological movement like Women’s Liberation Movement, or neo-traditionalism, ideal motherhood ideologies have been changed in a way that some periods dominated married at-home mothers while some did working-outside the home (Chae, 2015). In these changes, media representations set standards of ideal motherhood.

In line with Keller (1994), Douglas and Michaels (2004) argued that the rise of new momism, the media discourse that forces mothers to be more devoted to their children, being similar to the 1980s. According to new momism, a woman could be complete only by having a child. The mother should be the primary caregiver and should put all her time and energy into mothering, which is called by Hays (1996) as intensive mothering that requires expert level knowledge, high-intensity labor, and high costs. At this point, the question is how mass media reinforce such mothering beliefs, which was hypothesized in the current study. Cultivation theory was advantageous in the meantime.

2.5.1. Cultivation Theory

George Gerbner and his colleagues were the pioneers of the cultivation theory, derived from the Cultural Indicators research project, which focusing on television exposure (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002). In the theory, Gerbner and his colleagues investigated cumulative impacts of repeated media exposure on shaping individuals’ worldview and perceived social reality gradually over time (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). In other words, according to the theory, when someone was increasingly exposed to media, his/her perceptions of the world respectively bear a resemblance to how the media views the world. The recent integrated theoretical perspective was proposed by Bilandzic (2006).

Mainstreaming is one of the major concepts of the theory (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). It refers homogenization of individual’s heterogenic and divergent social reality viewpoints into “a convergent mainstream” (p. 39) to reinforce dominant culture’s
norms. The process of construction operates within mainstreaming in a way that media experiences, automatically stored in the memory, are utilized later to create beliefs about the world (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). Moreover, resonance occurs if one’s media-based created beliefs about the world are congruent with his/her real-life experiences, which makes the cultivation effect stronger (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). Thinking about motherhood as an example, a mother may hold believes in mother-focused and labor-intensive childrearing ideals due to portrayals in films, magazines, social media platforms (mainstreaming). If she experiences that one of her friends’, with such believes, child is performing better than her child, the conclusion arrived after social comparisons, her media-spawned intensive beliefs may be reinforced.

Even though the theory generally concentrates on the cumulative impact of many frequently exposed representations, it has been discussed that some of them may more strongly influential than others (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). To illustrate, Greenberg (1988) reported that a highly popular and respected character of television were more powerful than a number of characters less often seen by viewers.

In literature, variety of studies reported social reality forms cultivated through mainstreaming, such as beliefs and practices regarding one’s health (Lee & Niederdeppe, 2011); perceptions toward science and scientists (Dudo, Brossard, Shanahan, Scheufele, Morgan, & Signorielli, 2011); rape myth acceptance (Kahlor & Eastin, 2011), teenagers’ beliefs about teen parenthood (Martins & Jensen, 2014), gender roles (Preston, 1990). However, these theories investigated mostly television impact as the original project of cultivation theory.

Since the nature, or environment, of media has evolved from broadcast television to more digital and technological environment (Morgan, Shanahan, Signorielli, 2015). Actually, it has become more mobile and new media genres have emerged. Thus, it was required in literature to adapt on new digital media environment. As a result, some researchers recently enlarged the scope of cultivation theory from television to internet, and social media (e.g. Williams, 2006; Tsay-Vogel, Shanahan, & Signorielli, 2016; Intravia, Wolff, Paez, & Gibbs, 2017; Cheng, Mitomo, Otsuka, & Jeon, 2016). Although these studies proved the cultivation effect of internet,
specifically social media and online game communities, there have still been a gap in literature pointing out the necessity of observing genre differences in framework of cultivation theory as echoed by some scholars (Williams, 2006).

Moreover, cultivation studies have always sought out the extensive underlying components of content as well as the ways of audiences communicate with these messages (Morgan et. al., 2015). It has been suggested that ‘‘the content of messages is more germane than the technology with which they are delivered’’ (Shanahan & Morgan, 1999, p. 201). As a matter of fact, content-based exposures from specific media genres explained significant amount of the content related outcome like prediction of reality crime shows’ exposures to criminal activities (Oliver & Armstrong, 1995), prediction of exposures of teen mom reality programs to positive beliefs regarding teenage motherhood (Martins & Jensen, 2014). Following this notion, it was aimed to investigate the prediction ability of celebrity mother and childrearing information exposures from different media genres to contemporary motherhood beliefs in the current study. In the following sections, such exposures were presented, respectively.

2.5.1.1. Exposure to Celebrity Mothers on Media

The term of celebrity referred to indicate the current state of being famous (Holmes & Redmond, 2010). Rojek defined it with the equation of ‘celebrity = impact on public consciousness’ (2001, p. 10). Such impact makes people to perceive celebrity as a valued power resource (Driessens, 2013). At this point, media has a crucial role because celebrities are defined as a media production by Giles (2000). In detail, as Rojek (2001) defined celebrity as “the consequence of the attribution of qualities to a particular individual through the mass media” (p. 7). This stress on quality attribution creates Driessens’s (2013) proposal of a hierarchical distinction between media and ordinary people. Thus, individuals involve, even engage, in the messages of powerful and superior media portrayals; as a result, their involvement with celebrities predicts change in their attitudes and behaviors (Brown, Basil, & Bocarnea, 2003).

Popular media representations have a power on current definition of mothering (Glenn, 1994) by being role models for the mothers in the society. In fact, portrayals of celebrities have exemplified contemporary motherhood from the late 20th century. (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Celebrity mother representations have been the most powerful media form selling the new momism. In other words, the intensification of cultural obsession of motherhood exemplified by the representations of celebrities (Douglas & Michaels, 2004).

Looking at the content of the representations, as the writers discussed, the media has viewed them as successful in both their careers and motherhood. They, in the media, say that mothering is the most fulfilling experience in their entire lives (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). They included the images of working mother professedly balancing the work and family lives, which creates the feel of guilt and insecurity among ordinary, particularly middle class, mothers exposed to such images. Additionally, their messages have evolved from how achieving such balance to the idea of quitting the job to spend more time with their children. In sum, it was claimed that this situation reinforced particularly new momism, or intensive motherhood (Douglas & Michaels, 2004).

Also, where people are exposed to celebrities is noteworthy to discuss. Bron and Tiggemann (2016) stated that all forms of contemporary media, from television to internet, are platforms enabling celebrities to reach their audiences. Traditionally, most of the researches included television or print media, especially magazines, in
terms of celebrity exposures (e.g. Boyland et al., 2013). More recently, studies including internet and social media has become popular in the area (e.g. Brown & Tiggemann, 2016; Chae, 2017; Marwick, 2015). That is why, social media plays an important role in the change in media ecology with the digitalization and mobilization. In such evolution, a new type of celebrity, i.e. microcelebrity, has evolved (Senft, 2013).

Microcelebrities displays their self-presentation on social media, meaning that they create online-selves which is used to grasp attention and to reach a large number of followers (Senft, 2013; Marwick, 2015). The term ‘social media influencers’ is used to refer microcelebrities on social media (Chae, 2017). The influencers visually and textually demonstrate their personal daily lives to a number of followers (Abidin, 2016). Among the scenes from their daily lives, some of them focus on specific contents on their posts, such as playing an instrument, sharing their knowledge about make-up or game-playing, childrearing, etc. Recently, some influencers have been posting messages mainly regarding their mothering experiences to provide information for other mothers or to save the moment with their child (Yazıcı & Özel, 2017). A study conducted in Turkey, investigating a microcelebrity account with childrearing information contents, was presented in section 2.7.

To conclude, the impacts of celebrities, both the traditional and contemporary ones, has long been discussed and investigated in literature. However, motherhood has been less signified and there is still a need to investigate such issue (Chae, 2005). Additionally, there is gap in literature to assess the relationship of micro-celebrities of social media in the context of motherhood.

2.5.1.2. Exposure to Childrearing Information

Today’s parenting involves “consuming a great deal of information”; information let individuals to shape their identity (Montesi & Bornstein, 2017, p. 1). Thus, it is necessary to understand how mothers practice their own motherhood identity, specifically intensive motherhood, social comparison and competitiveness. The
media have provided information about childrearing, which is accessed by extensive audiences.

As society is becoming mobile, the Internet has become the main source of parenting information (Rothbaum, Martland, & Jannsen, 2008; Friedman, 2010). According to Pedersen and Smithson (2010), especially women in their 20s and 30s enthusiastically use websites for parenting information. Similarly, Plantin & Daneback (2009) suggested that the majority of parents start information seeking through search engines, and their search yields many types of information including online news and parenting websites. In detail, they reported that parents utilize web to acquire information, experiential advice, and support from other parents by interacting with them to compensate for the declining support from the ones with proximity of interaction.

Alongside of the websites, in today’s world, social media and blogs are tools for mothers to access childrearing information from their peers (Chae, 2015). International studies have found that mothers utilize parenting websites to reach emotional and informational support from their peers (Drentea & Moren-Cross, 2005; Madge & O’Connor, 2006; Sarkadi & Bremberg, 2005;). These support not just comes from parents’ experiences, but also derived from professional sources (Montesi & Bornstein, 2017). Actually, even informal media sources display how they rely on expert ideas regarding parenting (Mchery & Schultz, 2014). Contrary to the positive side of such endorsement, Teke concluded his study conducted in Turkey (2014) that formation of contemporary motherhood ideology via blogges result in mother’s feeling of insufficiency toward child rearing skills.

Idealization of motherhood was claimed to be a subject of capitalism and consumer culture via media (Kyung, 1999; Douglas & Michaels, 2004). That is, one should be good consumer to be a ‘good mother’. On media genres, like TV, radio, billboards, etc., the notion that it was so essential to invest in goods and services for children’s education, or development, was suppressed since its profitability (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Such representations somehow include childrearing information by transferring mothers, or consumers, the necessities of children in their developmental
process. In this perspective, mothers do not have to actively seek for such information, but they unintentionally exposed to them in a subliminal way. As an example, toy industries created a market for educational toys, since mothers’ perfection seek in childrearing, and they stressed educational terms like “word cognition”, verbal skill”, etc. in toy adds to grasp the attention of mothers wanted to be a child-development expert, a home schooler, and goes on (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Within the scope of the current study, the core question was that whether such perfection for building super children applied to the educational institutions or not.

The internet and other new media platforms make mothers all over the world communicate with each other easily (Diquinzio, 2010), which enables them to learn more about childrearing, in larger content about mothering. Considering such penetration of mass media representations in ones’ lives, imposing the ideals of motherhood, the question is whether the mass media images intersect with amelioration in real lives of families, children, and the mother herself (Diquinzio, 2010). Going deeper into the question, whether media representations would be correlated with the motivators of parents’ engagement, resulting in improvements in children’s education, was investigated in the current study.

Huisman and Joy (2014) conducted a qualitative study with twenty-one mothers with middle and lower classes and reported that majority of them have read parenting books as well as seeking parenting information via internet, specifically on Google, WebMD, Facebook, mommy blogs, and video blogs, among them social media platforms and motherhood blogs had the greatest percentage. The participants of the study revealed heavily IMI. Contradictorily to its core element of relying on expert opinions (See Section 2.6.2.3), they stated their disregarding of experts, which corresponds to formal childrearing information exposure within the current study although their tendency toward referring experts’ messages and using them as a way of self-judgement.

O’Connor and Joffe (2012) conducted a thematic analysis on 505 newspaper articles discussing brain development and reported that parents, particularly mothers,
intensively given responsibility to ensure children’s brain development beginning from pregnancy to middle childhood.

Among the topics of childrearing information in media portraits, like breastfeeding (Boon & Pentney, 2015), childrearing (Yazıcı & Özel, 2017), Wall (2013) reported in the qualitative study, conducted to analyze the articles, mostly informal, posted on a site, called *Today’s Parent* in Canada, with a largest discourse on mothering and childhood, discourses regarding preschools. In detail, the articles in 80s mainly gave messages to parents it was safe to work and sent the children to preschool since it was beneficial for children’s socialization while in 2000s participating the school experiences of children to ensure they were supported well in there. Also, in recent portrayals, alerting parents with risks they can face in the institutions to stay vigilant and plan the best choice for their children were alluded, which reinforced IMI (See Section 2.6.2.3).

Radey & Randolph (2009) investigated which demographic factors differentiated the use of childrearing information sources with 1081 parents. They reported that age, education levels, and marital status differentiated the use of different information sources of books, family and friends, the internet, newspapers, television, teachers, parenting courses. Better educated, the youngest and unmarried parents was higher information users.


In 21st century middle class society, a mother is required to be central caregiver to the child and have beliefs that “a mother has to devote all her entire physical, psychological, emotional, and intellectual being, 24/7, to her children time and energy (Douglas and Michaels, 2004, p.4). Douglas and Michaels (2004) named to dominant beliefs as new momism referring “a set of ideals, norms, and practices, most frequently and powerfully presented in the media, that seem on the surface to celebrate motherhood, but which in reality promulgate standards of perfection that are beyond your reach” (p. 4). This contemporary, unrealistically perfection seeking,
and gendered beliefs were discussed within the framework of Social Comparison Theory (SCT) in the following sections.

2.6.1. Social Comparison Theory

SCT claims that people have a constant tendency toward evaluating themselves by comparisons with others (Festinger, 1954). Downward and upward comparisons are provided as the two types of comparisons. Downward comparisons occur in cases of comparisons after that the person gives final decisions about the other person to be lacking. On the contrary, upward comparisons includes comparisons with someone else found to be superior.

Festinger (1954) assumed several hypotheses within the scope of SCT. It is proposed that human organisms have a tendency to evaluate their abilities and opinions, which function in tie while affecting behavior. These evaluations are conducted with respect to the opinions and abilities of others especially in the absence of objective and non-social means. Moreover, in the case of abilities, they have a unidirectional drive to do better and better; on the other hand, they intrinsically prefer one opinion over another after comparing themselves with others. That is why, changing one’s ability is difficult, or impossible due to some non-social restraints, which do not exist for the opinion. When hostility is provoked by the idea that ongoing comparison with the particular persons would result in unpleasant consequences, individuals tend to end comparison behavior. Furthermore, the comparison drive increases positively with the similarity between the comparison edges. That is, individuals do not tend to act in comparison with others being too divergent from themselves. On the other hand, comparisons applied within a particular group with respect to the group’s abilities and opinions increases the likelihood of uniformity within that group.

With respect to the aforementioned assumptions, SCT was used in the current study to understand deeply the mechanisms of associations between media exposures of mothers and maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitive, and intensive mothering, which was discussed in the following chapters.
2.6.1.1. Social Comparison Theory and Mothers

As mentioned above, in SCT, Festinger states (1954) that social influence processes and some kind of competitive behaviors are the indicators of the same socio-psychological process. In fact, they derive from peoples’ drive for self-evaluation about their opinions and abilities, which necessitates the evaluation based on comparison with opinions and abilities of other persons. They tend to set the evaluation process with the ones they perceive as similar to them, not too divergent from themselves (Festinger, 1954).

Various studies have been conducted with mothers based on social comparison theory. Blanchard, Blalock, DeVellis, DeVellis, and Johnson (1999) researched social comparisons among mothers of premature and full-term infants. Vandenplas-Holper, Roskam, and Pirot (2006) investigated mothers’ social comparisons for their children’s personality. Gentina, Decoopman, and Ruvio (2013) studied social comparisons of mothers with adolescent daughter and their consumer behaviors. However, a few of them examined such comparison of mothers in light of media. For example, alongside of Chae (2015), setting the idea of the current research and mentioned before (See Introduction Section), Coyne, McDaniel, Stockdale (2017) explored associations between making social comparisons on social networking sites with mothers’ parenting, mental health, and romantic relationship outcomes, in which they argued negative outcomes for mothers because of portrays of mothers “perfect selves” instead of “actual selves” on the sites.

2.6.2. Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness and Intensive Mothering

“Beliefs are mental constructions aggregated from past experience, integrated into concepts that are held to be true and that guide behavior” (Vandenplas-Holper, Roskam, & Pirot, 2006, p. 339). Belief systems defined as “structures of norms that are interrelated and that vary mainly in the degree in which they are systemic”, in which several beliefs interrelated with each other (Usó-Doménech & Nescolarde-
Selva, 2016, p. 147). The elements of belief systems were provided as values, substantive beliefs, orientation, language, perspective, prescriptions, and ideological technology (Usó-Doménech & Nescolarde-Selva, 2016).

The researchers’ interest in parental belief systems has been raised with respect to the notion that socialization’s accounts would be incomplete without assessing parents’ thoughts about what they do (Vandenplas-Holper et al., 2006). In literature, four main themes regarding beliefs could be observed; 1) what is the content, or nature of parental beliefs, 2) where these beliefs was originated, 3) how beliefs and behaviors is associated, 4) what are the consequences of such beliefs for the development of children (Miller, 1988; Goodnow, 1988; Sigel, 1985).

In the current study, maternal belief systems, particularly social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive mothering, was focused to assess the association of such belief systems with parental engagement motivators implying their engagement behaviors in their children’s education. Additionally, whether the belief systems were originated by mass media portrayals was examined as well as the relationship between the three beliefs. The three maternal beliefs of the current study’s interest were discussed in following sections.

2.6.2.1. Maternal Social Comparison Orientation

In light of the idea of possible differences in people’s disposition to compare themselves with others (Wills, 1981), Hemphill and Lehman (1991) mentioned “the need for researchers to include measures of social comparison that acknowledge the fact that people may not wish to compare with others to an equal extent” (p. 390). Thus, Gibbons and Buunk (1999) proposed the concept of social comparison orientation (SCO) to refer to the personality disposition of individuals who are inclined to use social comparisons to evaluate their characteristics, who tend to focus on how they are doing in comparison with others, and who have a tendency to relate what happens to others to themselves.
Gilbert, Giesler, and Morris (1995) defined the process of social comparison as "spontaneous, effortless, and unintentional" and "relatively automatic" (p. 227). However, it also dependent on the change of circumstances and situations when comparison-based information is needed (Gibbons & Buunk, 1999). Mostly, uncertainty is a trigger for individuals’ interest in social comparison (Festinger, 1954). Among situational factors being related with individuals’ dispositions, especially uncertainty about the self increases one’s tendency to social comparisons. Thus, individuals’ low self-esteem, high depression and different personality styles are sensitive to comparing themselves with others (Gibbons & Buunk, 1999). Also, situations awakening competition feelings tend to promote social comparison of most people (Ruble & Frey, 1991).

Garcia, Tor, and Schiff (2013) studied the combination of social comparisons and competitiveness by claiming the social comparison is an essential source of competitive attitudes. In their social comparison model of competition, they proposed individual and situational factors increasing social comparisons and as a result giving rise to variety of competitive attitudes. As defined (Garcia et al., 2013), individual factors are “those that vary from person to person”, such as the similarity of rivals, personality dispositions, and situational factors are “those factors on the social comparison landscape that affect similarly situated individuals”, such as proximity to a standard, the number of competitors (p. 1). They assumed that such factors affect the extent of comparison concerns, which is one’s desire to achieve, which result in competitive behaviors.

While making a social comparison, individuals require information about others that is used to associate it with themselves (Corcoran et al., 2011). That is, “individuals must be exposed to comparison-related information and willing to make a connection between the information and the self” (Chae, 2017, p.4). Mass media portrayals are the platforms offering people the comparison related information. Both the information presented media genres (Chae, 2015) and celebrity profiles (Chae, 2017) are the tools as for comparison references.
As discussed in Section 2.6.1.1, there are a few studies investigating mother’s SCO (e.g. Chae, 2015; Blanchard et al., 1999; Gentina et al., 2013; Coyne et al., 2017). Thus, whether mothers’ self-evaluations by comparing themselves to others is associated with mother’s engagement decisions was investigated in the current study. Additionally, SCO’s predictability from mother’s media exposures was examined. Moreover, its predictive ability (in a combined way with competitiveness) was searched.

2.6.2.2. Maternal Competitive Attitudes

Female competitiveness has been discussed in two perspectives in literature: evolutionary and sociologically. Within evolutionary perspective, female intrasexual competition was supported in the study conducted among wild female (pregnant) banded mongooses (Inzani, Marshall, Sanderson, Nichols, Thompson, Kalema-Zikusoka, Hodge, Cant & Vitikainen, 2016). The scientists observed positive association between the fetus size and the number of potential female breeders in the group, supporting the hypothesis that mammal females regulate prenatal investment with respect to the competition in the postnatal environment. Additionally, Barash (2006) revealed the existence of fitness tradeoffs during motherhood to adjust her maternal investment to adapt local social and ecological conditions in her research. Looking at the evolutionary perspectives accenting that females evolved to “translate reproductive effort into progeny who would survive and later reproduce”, not for “the betterment of society or the wellbeing of the group”, Festinger (2013; p.319) proposed possible benefits of competition among mothers such as increased resources being used to rise quality of offspring.

Unlike the evolutionary perspective, sociological standpoints of competitive mothering have been investigated by variety of researchers (Barash, 2006; Douglas & Michaels, 2004; Smither & Houston, 1992; Chae, 2015). It has been regularly identified that the societies’ beliefs contained definition of mothering as a central part of female identity (Barash, 2006; Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004) and encouragements to women to compete in issues relevant to “children: fertile versus
infertile, mothers versus childless women, working mothers versus soccer moms, mothers of high-achieving kids versus mothers whose kids are average or troubled” (Barash, 2006, p. 133).

Douglas and Michaels (2004) argued one’s beliefs of perceiving motherhood as an individual achievement as the reason of motherhood turning into a kind of competition. On the other hand, Smither and Houston (1992) claimed that mothers’ competitiveness is an individual trait, but due to its interpersonal nature, environmental factors heavily influence it. Moreover, social comparison leads to competition especially when abilities are evaluated (Festinger, 1954) because comparison can motivate an individual to make an effort to make up for his/her weakness (Kruglanski & Mayseless, 1990) as well as giving opportunity for self-monitoring practices (Blackford, 2004).

Applied to the media exposures of mothers, Horovitz (2007) exemplified the belief of competition for individual achievement that alpha moms view mothering as a work that they have to accomplish and do research on mothering through the Internet. Chae (2015) supported Smither and Houston’s (1992) claim in a way that repeated exposure to information was associated with one’s feelings of competitiveness. In line with the theory of social comparisons affecting competitiveness, Chae (2015) reported that mothers’ exposure to media representations predicted their competitiveness feelings, which was supported by Douglas and Michaels (2004) with respect to celebrity mother portraits leading so many mothers perceive motherhood as a tool for their achievement whose process encompasses social comparisons and competitiveness. Additional to the celebrity mother exposures, online childrearing exposures ratifying maternal competitive attitudes proved by Wall (2010) the fact that brain development discourse on media accelerated mothers’ competitive behaviors due to the mothers’ beliefs toward being a better mother than others, shaping her children’s future outcomes.

Contemporary mothers tend to demonstrate their nurturing abilities, actively information seeking behaviors from experts, and allocating most of their time and energy, corresponding the elements of IMI (See Section 2.6.2.3), to the other mothers
(Mchenry & Schultz, 2014). The tendency result in the competitive communication once the mothers want to show others how meet the societies expectations being a good mother (Mchenry & Schultz, 2014). According to them, competitive communication between women is a way of performing new momism, especially among middle-class mothers (Hays, 1996). Unlikely, Blackford (2004) claimed regarding suburban mothers’ competition performances that they signified “the fact that mothers struggle to authenticate the performance of their role for the suburban community’ (239).

Linney, Korologou-Linden, and Campbell (2017) studies maternal competition with respect to maternal and child characteristics. They reported that maternal emotional investment with respect to their mothering role was the strongest predictor among other characteristics like age, marital status, number of children, etc. Moreover, women with a smaller number of children tended to be more competitive.

In conclusion, researchers discussed maternal competitive attitudes from evolutional and sociological standpoints that rivalry among mothers results from reproductive and survival instincts and societies viewpoints romanticize motherhood to be seen as a way of achievement as well as being an individual trait making the one being affected more by social expectations via social comparisons, respectively. Applied to the current study, the association of media exposures of mothers with maternal competitive attitudes was investigated. Also, as discussed above and in Section 2.6.2.3, it was proposed that contemporary motherhood beliefs of the society triggered the competition among mothers. However, considering the viewpoints perceiving competition as an individual trait and the perceptions of evolutionists, whether mothers’ competitive attitudes predicts IMI, being the dominant 21st century motherhood, or not was investigated. Furthermore, such attitudes’ relation with parental engagement motivator of mother to support their children’s educational success was examined to see whether they competitively invest in children’s education as they did in the examples of brain development and reproductive contents.
2.6.2.3. Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Ideology

The definition of intensive motherhood ideology (IMI) was first declared by Sharon Hays (1996) as a gendered model whose methods are child-centered, expert-guided, emotionally absorbing, labor intensive, and financially expensive” (p. 8), which was later supported by Douglas and Michaels (2004) under “new momism” term (See Section 2.6.). IMI loads exhausting responsibilities on women which is not logical to meet by one individual (Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Although different mothers in different cultures experience it in variety of shapes, it is the contemporary dominant system endorsed by women whose common purpose is being a better mother. In detail, IMI composed of three domains: sacred children/sacred mothering; the responsibility of individual mothers; and intensive methods of childrearing (Hays, 1996).

Sacred children/sacred mothering, the first domain, includes the belief that children are good in nature, and that their sacred innocence must be protected. According to this perspective, children’s development may negatively be affected when they are not protected from the troubles of world. Being parallel to the sacred child notions, motherhood is perceived as sacred too. It is the most important role a woman can possess according to the perspective. Thus, the significance of mothering and commitment to children is intensified. Children are concrete representation endless devotion of mothers’ as well as their commitment to protect children innocence.

The responsibility of individual mothers, the second domain, encompasses the assumption that children better develop under especially exclusive maternal care as maternal love are perceived to be a natural part of motherhood. That is, mothers are best caregivers for children because mothers are biologically equipped with childrearing skills rather than fathers. Within this viewpoint, mothers are expected to accomplish their innate drive and talent regarding childrearing. Their responsibilities range from children’s basic needs like food, clothing, etc. to supporting their emotional, social, and cognitive development.
Intensive methods of childrearing, the third domain, refers the heavy requirements of IMI from mothers both psychologically and physically to meet children’s needs. IMI is extremely demanding with the necessities of a great amount of time, energy, and resources for children which restrains the mothers’ time for themselves. According to IMI, it is reasonable to prioritize the needs of their children over their own desires and needs.

Taken together, according to Hays (1996), the aforementioned domains and their corresponding beliefs represent IMI. The core of the domains is the viewpoint that the endorsement of intensive mothering expects a great amount of time, energy, and resources from mothers. Consequently, it has been assumed as an ideology only white, middle-class, married women can endorse and undertake.

Lareau (2011) criticized that working-class and middle-class mothers might articulate beliefs being parallel with IMI although their expression behaviors could be different as well as its outcomes on mothers. To illustrate, labor intensive tasks of IMI might create more frustration for mothers with low socioeconomic status than middle, or upper-class ones. Regarding the behaviors, middle-class parents also engaged actively in their children’s institutional lives.

Kyung (1999) called IMI as scientific motherhood including professional mothers, referring the combination of science, capitalism, and motherhood, and said capitalism made mothers to believe in so-called ‘science’ of childcare by advertising and commercializing child-rearing via mass media genres, which was supported later by several researchers in a slightly different way by framing the discussion in accordance with neoliberalism (Brown, 2014). Professional mothers, prevalent among unemployed young middle-class mothers, not only spend a great deal of time educating themselves on the latest available knowledge on child development and pre-school education, but also spend large amounts of time and money, on a daily basis, in attempting to appropriately apply that knowledge to their own children.

Vancour and Sherman (2010) conducted a qualitative study to assess the experiences of seventeen academic women with preschool children in setting a balance between
their work and family lives in New England. They reported the majority of women’s endorsement of IMI in the study. Such women reported their participation in different kind of developmental appropriate activities supporting the education of their children, like attending their classes, playing with them, etc., which required demanding times to do according to them.

Clarke (2011) investigated socially constructed experiences of mothers with children with special needs through interviewing sixteen of them being at middle ages. Although parental engagement in education, including teacher, school staff, or community partnership, was not the focus of the article, the mothers revealed IMI and one of them, in the narratives presented, reported working with kindergarten teacher occurring in the process of diagnosis.

Looking at the origins of IMI, the two types of media contents, celebrity mom discourse and online childrearing information, promote intensive mothering ideology (Chae, 2015). In the media, celebrity moms often say that they value mothering more than their career (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Like the U.S. media, the Korean media also frequently portray celebrity mom stories as well as exceptionally successful ordinary mothers, and they tend to romanticize the mother’s role (Han, 2002).

Online information shows how ideal mothers seek perfection in mothering (Lang, 2008). Madge and O’Connor (2006) observed an online mothering community and found that traditional gender roles and motherhood ideology were prevalent. Moreover, Pylypa (2015) studied the sample of single, adaptive mothers and reported their socialization process to meet the needs of the child being adapted by “social workers, adaptive agency staff, adaption workshops, parenting courses, education materials, self-help books, newsletters, Internet sources”, which evident their information seeking process via mass media to be better mother. When opinions are evaluated, individuals feel pressure toward uniformity, but when abilities are evaluated, individuals try to do better (Festinger, 1954). Endorsement of the intensive mothering ideology is one’s opinion rather than ability. Therefore, exposed to aforementioned sources, mothers will largely come to agree with the ideology.
In addition, comparison standards in the media are almost unattainable, but mothers would still engage in comparison with ideal mothers’ reference. Festinger (1954) argued that people compare themselves with similar others, but later, scholars found that people compare themselves with dissimilar others (Gilbert et al., 1995). Just as women compare themselves with thin media models as much as they do to peers (Engeln-Maddox, 2005), mothers compare themselves with ideal mothers. Thus, the two types of media contents uphold intensive mothering. Exposed to such information, mothers proposed to engage in social comparison. Because information is framed within the dominant ideology, mothers would feel the pressure to follow the ideology.

2.7. Motherhood and Media in Turkey

As discussed before, motherhood is socially and historically constructed (Bassin, Honey, & Kaplan, 1994). In Turkish context, social historical changes regarding the perceptions of being a good mother could be observed (Parmaksız, 2012). In the late periods of the Ottoman Empire, women were perceived as the mothers of the nation, which should be educated to become better mothers, since it was considered a required intellectual reform saving the state from collapse (Parmaksız, 2012). The declaration of the Republic in 1923 started the modernization attempts in Turkey; hence, new gender roles were accompanied by the society to strengthen women’s social status (Parmaksız, 2012). The new society required women to get a profession in the public without losing the role of being a Turkish mother (Parmaksız, 2012). The projects of the Republic increased social equality of women; however, in 1950s, women working outside the home were accused from being bad mothers damaging the family and children’s development (Parmaksız, 2012). Similar to other nations in the world like the Americans, happy housewife representations seeking self-actualization as a mother and wife were addressed in mass media (Parmaksız, 2012). Since 50s, feminist movements have highlighted the criticisms of Western societies regarding traditional gender roles via mass media; however, those themes have been still perceived as being too radical by the governments, which could be observed from their policies (Parmaksız, 2012). To illustrate, The Directorate of Women’s
Status and Problems, founded in 1989 and 1990, supported television programs prioritizing the income-generating home activities for women because working outside is detrimental to the peaceful atmosphere of the family (Parmaksız, 2012). Currently, these gender roles are supported by the current policy makers by aligning these beliefs to religion (Parmaksız, 2012).

In Turkey, 99% of the population declared themselves as Muslims (Presidency of Religious Affairs, 2014). Murphy-Geiss (2010) stated that the vast majority of Muslim women have put being wives and mothers first in the hierarchy of their roles. According to the writer, the Muslim mothers have been trying to compensate for traditional Islamic views against the ideals of Western modernization, imposed with globalization. In fact, Islam society mainly believes that childrearing is the primary role of woman which is the most honorable thing they do for the sake of the larger society, which is also supported by some part of the contemporary western culture, but with a slight difference of assigned roles to women to work outside the home. Indeed, the mothers such tendency result in mothers’ effort to show their children that their time is all for them, even worked outside, which supports IMI. Applied to the current study, it was assumed that participants might report endorsement of IM and their endorsement might predict the motivators to engage in their children’s education to fulfill their roles as a mother wishing better development of their children.

Uğurlu (2013) investigated media’s role on the process in which women learn the responsibilities of motherhood. She conducted interviews with nine academic mothers in Eskişehir. The majority of the participants reported their leisure activities as surfing on the Internet, watching television, reading newspapers, and reading books, respectively. In these media genres, the Internet (n=8) and the books (n=4) were utilized to access pregnancy and childrearing related information by the participants. Considering stereotypical styles of television advertisements regarding motherhood, Uğurlu (2013) asked the participants whether they skipped the advertisements or not while watching television. They reported being attracted by the advertisements including children, selling child related products, and having family
related themes, which was interpreted as being exposed to the mothering codes of advertisements giving messages to women that childrearing is mainly their responsibility. Also, they discussed searching childrearing information on the Internet, in print media, films, interpersonal communications. Only one of them explained acquiring childrearing information from the websites being supported by doctors, which corresponds to trusting only formal online resources.

Moreover, in the study, the participants’ ideas about the media contents of celebrities’ motherhood were asked (Uğurlu, 2013). The participants commonly perceived those contents as branding of celebrities, which was confirmed by international literature too (Susie, Lawrance, & Raymond, 2017; Moir, 2015; Persis Murray, 2015). Also, all of the participants criticized the celebrity mother’s representations as being unrealistic. Additionally, they reported their exposures to the celebrity messages in mass media possessing the idea that having a child brings happiness. The academic mothers criticized such discourse of celebrities as being unrealistic. Uğurlu (2013) inferred about these findings that the participants perceived the social teachings in mass media and made commends within these viewpoints.

Uğurlu’s study (2013) contains celebrities of old media like models, singers, etc. However, in section 2.5.1.1, microcelebrities were defined as a new kind of celebrity in this new media century. Yazıcı and Özel (2017) analyzed a popular social media profile of a microcelebrity with a preschool age child in Turkey. They reported that the celebrity mainly aimed to educate mothers for increasing their knowledge on child development, directing them to have quality time with their child by sharing videos and photographs of the activities which she conducted with her own child. These contents could be considered as messages reinforcing the aforementioned dominant cultural motherhood responsibilities.

In conclusion, the present study argued by grounding its base in international and national literature that contemporary motherhood is characterized by intensive mothering ideology, comparison, and competition and that these are associated with the media. Many studies have explored media representations of motherhood (e.g.,
Douglas & Michaels, 2004; Keller, 1994), but the relationship between media exposure and motherhood has rarely been empirically investigated (Chae, 2015). Moreover, there is a need to identify whether exposure to celebrity mother discourse and online childrearing information is associated with the endorsement of IMI, SCO and CA of mothers in different contexts rather than Korea (Chae, 2015), which is Turkey in the present study. Also, the mothers’, endorsing intensive beliefs, enthusiasm to support their children’s development and have been clued in literature (e.g. Vancour & Sherman, 2010; Clarke (2011), directly family engagement issue, which addresses the mothers’ willingness be an active counterpart alongside of especially schools and teachers in the educational process, could not be observed within the purposes of existing literature.

2.8. Summary of the Literature Review

Literature revealed variety of studies focusing on Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s (2005) 1st level of revised version FE model, encompassing motivators of parents’ engagement decisions in their children’s education, specifically their psychological motivational beliefs, contextual perceptions, and perceived life contexts regarding their engagement. The great body of research assessed the motivators’ relation on parents’ engagement behaviors to test what the model have assumed. However, there is a lack of empirical research investigating the origin of such motivators within the mothers’ side. Within the sociological standpoints, the elements determining the mechanisms behind the contributors of mother’s engagement motivators could be framed with respect to Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory in a broad way: mass media exposures of mothers to childrearing information and celebrity mothers and maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive mothering.

Indeed, such mechanisms could be investigated within Festinger’s Social Comparison Theory. In literature, the discussions regarding current motherhood ideologies (i.e. IMI) and the factors influencing them like mass media, social comparisons, and competitiveness were clustered in a kind of nested way. Thus,
these elements were investigated as a combined way being assumed to predict maternal engagement motivators. Furthermore, the relationship nature of media and related maternal belief systems was discussed in literature in some studies. However, empirical study gap in literature was observed, which assess the relationship between media exposures and maternal belief systems especially among mothers with preschool children. Lastly, in line with the researchers suggesting the studies performed about contemporary ideal motherhood beliefs, the requirement in literature for assessing how IMI was prompted by SCO, and CA, and media exposures was observed. To conclude, in the current study, the association of maternal belief systems and mass media exposures within themselves and across parental engagement motivators in their children’s education was aimed to contribute to literature.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The current study is designed into three phases, which are preparatory, pilot and main study. Preparatory phase employs preparation works for the study, phase I refers the procedures and analysis applied in pilot study, and phase II includes the process of the main study. Thus, this chapter presents how the data was collected and analyzed in three main parts divided based on the phases. After stating the design of the project, three phases were discussed in detail mentioning data collection, analysis, and validity and reliability issues.

3.1. Preparatory Phase

The purpose of the phase is to establish the base of the study including starting from defining the aims, population and sample, and ending with preparation of the data collection instrument. The procedures of the preparatory phase were mentioned in the next sections.

3.1.1. Design of the project

The purpose of the study was to assess the relationship between maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitive attitudes and intensive motherhood, which would be investigated whether reinforced by media exposures, among mothers with children attending kindergarten and the determinants of their engagements decisions toward helping their child succeed in schools. Specifically, answers were sought to determine the extent that the mothers’ media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information is related with the maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitive attitudes and intensive motherhood. Moreover, it was examined that how well the combination of the aforementioned maternal belief systems can predict the determinants of parental engagement decisions in their child’s education.
With respect to the research questions, the current study’s design had a correlational nature, being one of the quantitative research methodologies. In fact, according to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) proposed that correlational design, in which the associations among two or more variables are investigated without any manipulations, is useful in examining crucial human behaviors or predicting possible outcomes. In this sense, both explanatory and prediction purposes of the correlational research design were used in the study.

In the overall research design, a three phases process with ten non-linear steps was followed as presented in Research Process (See Figure 3.1). In the figure, each step was depicted with a circle, each with a connection with certain steps of the process. The interrelation between some steps were represented with double-headed arrows.

The preparatory phase composed of the steps from 1 to 5 established the base of the study, referring (1) problem selection and definition, (2) reviewing the literature including relevant conceptual resources and conducted empirical studies, (3) deriving hypothesis and questions, (4) defining population and sampling, and (5) constructing the data collection instrument, in which the developments and adaptations of the scales measuring variables were applied.

The first stage phase comprised two steps, 6 and 7. Firstly, (6) the data collection tool was pilot-tested. The findings obtained from the pilot study were investigated regarding validity and reliability issues, which guided (7) editing and revising the tool in terms of both the content and the design.

In light of the previous phase, the last phase formed by the process of the main study with the steps of 8, 9, and 10. After (8) the collection of the data set, (9) the analysis addressing validity issues for the constructs edited in the phase one, and research questions of the study were conducted; then, (10) the results were discussed. The details of the phase one and two were presented later in this section.
Figure 3.1. Research process
3.1.2. Instrumentation

The instruments employed to gather relevant data in this study were the demographic information form, the adapted Turkish versions of the scales in Chae’s article (2015) for media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information, endorsement of intensive mothering ideology, social comparison orientation, and competitiveness, and the scales of the first level of parent involvement model of Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler. In total, a four-page survey form with 102 items was created. In the following sections, the constructs of the data collection tool were described in detail (See Table 3.1).

3.1.2.1. Demographic Information Form

In the survey form, after the information regarding ethical considerations were stated, seven questions were asked to the participants in the demographic information section. In this form, the participating mothers’ current graduation level, employment status, monthly family income, the number children they have, the age of the child/children who attend/s kindergarten, and the age of the mother, the birth years of their child/children, to decide the mother’s recency of giving birth, were asked. (See Appendix C). For the variable of their recency of giving birth, the year difference between the last two children’s births was considered if she was with three or more children.

3.1.2.2. Media Exposure Scales

Chae (2015) assessed mothers’ media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information based on 5-point Likert scale (1=never to 5=more than 5 times a week). Specifically, the participants were asked how frequently they exposed to celebrity mothers and childrearing information from all kinds of media, being television, print media, the Internet, formal online and informal online. The analyses were conducted separately for each media genre, including celebrity mothers being
constituted by taking the total scores for such media exposures from any kinds of media.

For the fourth research question of the study, similar procedure of Chae (2015) were followed. In fact, each media genre exposure was calculated by averaging the items related to the genre. To illustrate, there were two items in childrearing exposure scale measuring the exposures on television. The averaged values of the items were included to the analysis as television exposure variable. On the other hand, since the scope of the other research questions was slightly different than Chae’s, instead of considering celebrity mothers as a media genre alongside of media kinds on which the participants exposed to childrearing information, total scores of celebrity exposures and childrearing exposures, obtained from adapted versions of the scale, were used as the representing values of two separate variables.

3.1.2.3. Maternal Belief Systems’ Scales

The scales regarding maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive motherhood were originally developed by Chae (2015) and adapted by the researcher for the current study. The detailed information of the scales is presented below.

*Social comparison orientation* (SCO) of mothers was assessed by six items, reworded by Chae (2015) from the Iowa-Netherlands Comparison Orientation Measure (Gibbons & Buunk, 1999). Indeed, the latter scale measures the differences of individuals with respect to how they tend to compare themselves with others (Buunk & Gibbons, 2006) with eleven items. The researcher adapted the scale to describe the mothers’ SCO (See Appendix A). Although the half of the items measured the comparison of abilities (i.e. “I always pay a lot of attention to how I do as a mother compared with what other mothers do”) and the other half corresponded the comparison of opinions (i.e. “I always like to know what other mothers in a similar situation would do”), an explanatory factor analysis revealed one major
factor. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha (α), the index of reliability for the scale, was found to be .83

To assess competitive attitudes of mothers, an adapted version of The Work and Family Orientation questionnaire (Helmreich & Spence, 1978), aiming to measure elements of achievement motivation and attitudes toward family and career, was used by Chae (2015). The original questionnaire includes thirty-two items, whose five items measures competitiveness in the work environment. Chae (2015) modified the four of the related items (See Appendix A) to describe mothers’ competitiveness (i.e. “It is important to me to perform better them other mothers”). An explanatory factor analysis suggested unidimensionality of the scale. Reliability test for internal consistency of the scale proposed Cronbach’s alpha value of .74.

Chae (2015) developed a six-item scale assessing the endorsement of intensive mothering ideology (See Appendix A), referring the extent of the participants’ agreements on intensive mothering ideology, with a 5-point Likert scale nature (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). “Women have to devote all her time and energy to her children” is an example of items of the scale. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted, and the results indicated that the scale was unidimensional. The increase in scale scores, ranging from 6 to 30, represented rises in agreement degrees of the participants on the ideology. Internal consistency coefficient, calculated by using Cronbach Alpha formula, was reported as .73.

3.1.2.4. Motivators of Maternal Engagement Decisions Toward Their Children’s Education

Walker et al (2005) reported the original versions of the scales of Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler’s parent involvement model, with which assessment of the motivators of why parents involve in their children’s education was aimed (See Appendix B). The instrument composed of eight scales in total, including total fifty-six items, with 6-point Likert type. Higher scores on the scales represent the likelihood of parental involvement with respect to their positive perceptions, or beliefs while lower scores
indicate their tendency to have low involvement rates based on their negative perceptions.

Taking a closer look to the model proves psychological and constructional factors influencing parent involvement with three overarching constructs being constituted by seven scales. The overarching and their constitutive constructs were as follows;

1) *parents’ motivational beliefs on their involvement* constituted by 1.1) Parental Role Construction Scale, including Parental Role Activity Beliefs Scale and Valence toward School Scale, 1.2) Parental Self-efficacy for Helping the Child Succeed in School,

2) *parents’ perceptions of invitations from others*, formed by 2.1) Perceptions of General School Invitations Scale, 2.2) Perception of Specific Child Invitations Scale, and 3) Perception of Specific Teacher Invitations Scale, and

3) *parents’ self-perceived life context on their involvement*, created by 3.1) Self-perceived Time and Energy Scale and 3.2) Self-Perceived Skills and Knowledge Scale.

The aforementioned scales were firstly administered to parents whose children were from fourth to sixth grades in the United States (Walker et al., 2005). Then, Tekin (2008) adapted these into Turkish, except Specific Child Invitations Scale and Valence toward School Scale, to apply them to parents with elementary school aged children. The scales’ adaptation study for parents with preschool level children of Tekin’s version (2008) was conducted by Ertan (2017) as well as of Walker, et al. (2005) translations and adaptations of the original scales, Specific Child Invitations Scale and Valence toward School Scale (Walker, et al., 2005). Among them, the latter scale is not used in the current study since Ertan (2017) suggested its exclusion because of its concrete relevance with past experiences, making it tough to be influenced by the current beliefs and perceptions.
Table 3.1.  
*Information regarding Data Collection Tool*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Likert Type-Response Anchor</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic Information Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly family income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recency of child birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Exposure Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity mothers</td>
<td>1=never to 5=more than 5 times a week</td>
<td>Chae (2015)</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chae (2015)</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal Belief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chae (2015)</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The endorsement of intensive mothering ideology</td>
<td>1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree</td>
<td>Chae (2015)</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social comparison orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chae (2015)</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive attitudes of mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chae (2015)</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivators of Maternal Engagement</td>
<td>Likert Type - Response Anchor</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ motivational beliefs on their involvement</td>
<td>Parental Role Activity Beliefs Scale 1 = disagree very strongly to 5 = agree very strongly</td>
<td>Walker et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Ertan (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The adapted version of Ertan (2017) composed of sixty-eight items in total, whose sixty-two were used in the study due to the exclusion of parents past experiences’ scale. The scales were 5-point Likert type with response anchors of 1 = disagree very strongly, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = agree very strongly, except Perception of Specific Child Invitations Scale, Perception of Specific Teacher Invitations Scale, being 6 point Likert scales with response anchors of 1 = never, 2 = 1 or 2 times, 3 = 4 or 5 times, 4 = once a week, 5 = a few times a week, 6 = daily. It was reported by the researchers that the procedures they applied for the validation of the scales, i.e. expert opinions, confirmatory factor analysis, proved their appropriateness to be employed to the parents of preschoolers. Moreover, the reliability measures of the scales pointed out satisfactory internal consistencies using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients being in the values between .74 and .94.

3.1.3. Translation and Adaptation of the Instruments

The original scales were translated and adapted into Turkish. Adaption was defined as “If the construct is not fully covered in the new group, the instrument can be adapted by rephrasing, adding, or replacing items that measure the missing aspects” (Vijver & Leung, 1997, p.265). Hence, the researcher required to apply some revisions with the aim of covering the field requirements and the target population characteristics. Furthermore, if the adaptation of the instrument is applied for another language, it is significant to utilize psychologically and culturally appropriate words and expressions in the second language (Hambleton, 2005) Therefore, essential modifications were made by altering the emphasis, the words, the response anchors in order to assess domain specific viewpoints of participants for the aim of the study.

Additionally, Hambleton (2005) recommended multiple translators to avoid particular words or expressions (Hambleton, 2005). Thus, the scales were firstly translated by the researcher and then delivered to two Turkish native speakers with advanced level English to assess compatibility and language issues. Then, three advanced experts with PhD degree in Early Childhood Education department, one specialized in media studies and one specialized in parent involvement field, for their
expert views. As a result, the experts being proficient in both languages and being interested in similar research subject investigated the items in detail and made comments on the most suitable meaning of the items for the aim and the sample of the study.

After the consensus on the items of the scales, the scales were piloted to ensure the validity and reliability issues. Some of the scales validated in pilot study analysis. However, the validation of the ones proved to be needed to revisions were ensured with main study data. The processes were presented in the following section in details.

3.2. Phase I: Pilot Study

The purpose of the pilot is to assess the feasibility of the instruments of the main study, including the adapted scales regarding media exposures and maternal belief systems, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of the planned procedures and analysis techniques. The procedures of the pilot study were mentioned in the next sections.

3.2.1. Sample and Procedure

The data was collected in Etimesgut, Ankara from five public and eleven private independent kindergartens with the same procedures in main study phase (See 3.3.2) in this phase. While collecting the data, similarity between the main study and pilot study population was granted. Although neighborhood-based socio-demographic statistics of Etimesgut could not been reached, the data was collected in the neighborhoods of Etimesgut being informally observed as having possible similar characteristics with the main study districts of Manisa. In detail, Bağlıca, Eryaman, Alsancak, Süvari, and Elvan neighborhoods of Etimesgut would likely have parallel features with Yunus Emre, Salihli, Kula, Şehzadeler, and Turgutlu districts of Manisa, respectively. This assumed similarity might be evidenced within the current study’s pilot and main study sample. Indeed, the frequencies of socio-demographic characteristics of pilot study samle regarding the particants’ education status,
monthly family income levels, employment status were almost analogous to that of main study sample.

Sample size of pilot study depends on what is aimed with the pilot study such as scale development or revising an existing one, and feasibility of a study (Johanson & Brooks, 2010). Since the current pilot study employed for adaptations of the scales of the media exposure scales regarding celebrity mothers and childrearing information, and maternal belief system scales for social comparison orientation, competitiveness and intensive motherhood, the rule of thumb for factor analysis techniques was taken into consideration.

With no general agreement on sample size rule of thumb, several suggestions are provided in literature. The examples can be provided as sample sizes whose item-response-ratio is at least 1:10 (Sveinbjørnsdóttir & Thorsteinsson, 2008), 1:5 with at least 100 observations (Gorsuch, 1983), 1:3 to 1:6 (Cattell, 1978) for scale development, or adaptation, studies. Accordingly, there were thirty-three items in total. Thus, 1200 surveys were distributed and after the data cleaning processes, the required sample size was assured (n=528). After the aimed sample size, the data set was prepared for validation and reliability analysis being discussed in the following section. The descriptive information for pilot study participants, like ages, graduation, etc., was provided in Appendix D.

3.2.2. Analysis for Exploratory Pre-Studies

Factor analysis is a data reduction technique examining intercorrelations among a set of variables in a scale (Pallant, 2011). Thompson (2004) provided the existence of two techniques for factor analysis, namely exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Matsunaga (2010) suggested a “hybrid approach”, in which an EFA initially preformed and a follow-up CFA was conducted for EFA results with separate datasets. For each scales of concern for adaptation purposes, an EFA to assess the factor structure of the adapted scales regarding exposure and maternal belief systems via SPSS 22, being followed by a confirmatory
factor analysis (CFA) to evaluate the quality of the factor structure by statistically testing the overall model, were performed using The LISREL 8.8 program developed by Jöreskog and Sörbom (2006). The data were randomly divided into two to be subjected to EFA \((n=264)\) and CFA \((n=264)\) analysis separately. Moreover, all of the scales Cronbach Alpha values were calculated to address reliability. All necessary modifications in scales were applied as a result of the pilot study. In the following sections, the factor analyses result as well as reliability tests results were provided in different parts per scales.

3.2.2.1. Factor Analyses for Media Exposure Scales

3.2.2.1.1. Media Exposure to Childrearing Information Scale

Pallant (2011) provided assumptions of factor analysis, namely sample size and the strengths of the associations among items. Satisfaction of the former assumption was presented in Section 3.1.1. The latter assumption inspected by Bartlett’s test of sphericity which is expected to be significant \((p < .05)\), proving the possibility of the test to find out an underlying structure of the scale. Moreover, the factorability of the scales was assessed by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO), whose required value is \(.6\) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

After the satisfaction of aforementioned assumptions, eigenvalues, scatterplot, rotation matrices, and communality coefficients were examined. Low communality coefficients of the third and the fifth items in which one factor solution were indicated by eigenvalues and parallel analysis were observed (See Appendix E-Table A.2). Thus, omission or retranslation options were considered.

Reinvestigating the items of the scale, a clarity issue was detected in these items (See Table 3.2.). In fact, it was observed that the items aim to measure informal and formal online information exposures of the participants. The reason of the result may be not being able to define such resources; therefore, the words of formal and informal were discarded and the examples given at the end of the items used for
descriptive purposes. Then, the scale was subjected to factor analysis with main study dataset, which was presented below.

For media exposure to childrearing information scale with 8 items, Bartlett’s test of sphericity test was significant ($\chi^2 (25) = 1204.049, p<0.001$). Before conducting the EFA, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and values were analyzed to provide evidences for adequacy of sampling and appropriateness of factor analysis. KMO exceeded the required value of .6 ($KMO= .83$). Thus, the tests revealed appropriateness of the data for factor analysis.

Table 3.2.

The Items of Media Exposure to Childrearing Information Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pilot Version</td>
<td>In the internet, I obtain information regarding children from informal sources (e.g. from mothers’ blogs, from social media platforms like Facebook/ Twitter/Instagram, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Version</td>
<td>In the internet, I obtain information regarding children from mothers’ blogs, social media platforms like Facebook/ Twitter/Instagram, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Pilot Version</td>
<td>In the Internet, I examine beneficial information regarding childrearing from formal sources (e.g. formal web pages of experts, formal organizations, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Version</td>
<td>In the Internet, I obtain information from beneficial information regarding childrearing from experts’ webpages, formal organizations’ formal web pages, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PCA revealed two components with eigenvalues greater than 1, explaining 42.83% and 14.08% of the variance respectively. An inspection of screeplot revealed a clear break after the first component, indicating one underlying components. However, Horn’s parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) confirmed bidimensionality of the scale.

![Scree plot](image)

*Figure 3.2. Scree plot for media childrearing information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pattern coefficients</th>
<th>Structure coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td>Component 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR3</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.791*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR1</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.839*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR5</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.816*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR2</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.639*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR8</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR6</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR4</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR7</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oblique rotation results declared clear distinction between two components, in which items 3, 1, 5, and 3 loaded on the first component while the items 8, 6, 4, and 7...
primarily loaded on the second one (See Table 3.3.). Examining the items, common points for the items loading in the same component was not detected (See Appendix C). Thus, the scales forced to one factor solution.

Forcing one component solution, component matrix presenting unrotated loadings of the items and communality coefficients was investigated (Table 3.4.). It was inspected that the all items satisfactorily loaded on the component with coefficient values ranging from .49 to 75. However, correlations of items 6, about radio, and 7, regarding interpersonal communication, with other items were not observed. Pallant (2011) suggested reduction of the items with communality coefficients less than .3 since the possibility of them measuring something different from the scale. Thus, exclusion of the items was taken into consideration.

After EFA, supporting unidimensionality of the scale, CFA using maximum likelihood estimation to confirm the hypothesis of the observed variables loaded on the latent variable “childrearing information exposure” (See Figure 3.3). The items 6 and 7, having evidences of exclusion requirements in EFA, the analysis repeated by omitting the items each time. The results were more satisfactory without the two items. Therefore, CFA with 6 items was reported.

Table 3.4.

Pattern and Structure Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Media Exposure to Childrearing Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component coefficients</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR1</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR5</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR4</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR2</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR3</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR8</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR7</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR6</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluations of multiple goodness-of-fit tests for the one factor model for all 6 items showed perfect fit to the data, after the model modifications were performed by adding a path between item 4 and 8 (see Table 3.5). The NNFI (.97) and CFI (.98) values showed a perfect fit as values being greater than .95 (Thompson, 2004). The RMSEA (.07) value could be considered as a good fit (Steiger, 2007). The value of $\chi^2/df$ (25.87/8 = 3.23) indicated a perfect fit since it was less than 5 (Kline, 2005). According to Hooper, Coughlan, and Mullen (2008), the GFI (.98) and AGFI (.95) suggested a perfect fit. Finally, SRMR (.029) indicated a perfect fit (Brown, 2006). Reviewing the aforementioned fit indices, it could be concluded that the media exposure to childrearing information scale perfectly converged with hypothesized unidimensional model.
Table 3.5.

Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish Version of Media Exposure to Childrearing Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. NNFI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; GFI = goodness of fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean residual. *$p < .05$

3.2.2.1.2. Media Exposure to Celebrity Mothers

Prior to the analysis, the suitability of data for factor analysis media exposure to celebrity mothers scale with 9 items was tested. Bartlett’s test of sphericity test was significant ($\chi^2(36) = 2717.116, p<0.001$). KMO exceeded the required value of .6 ($KMO=.89$). Thus, the tests revealed appropriateness of the data for factor analysis.

PCA revealed one component with eigenvalues greater than 1, explaining 57.1% of the variance. An inspection of screeplot revealed a clear break after the first component, indicating one underlying components. Horn’s parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) also confirmed unidimensionality of the scale.

*Figure 3.4. Scree plot for celebrity exposure*
Since a perfect one component solution revealed, the analysis did not show any rotation strategy. Thus, component matrix presenting unrotated loadings of the items was investigated (Table 3.6). It was inspected that all items loaded the component quite strongly with coefficient values ranging from .61 to 83.

Table 3.6.

**Pattern and Structure Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Celebrity Exposure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component coefficients</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM2</td>
<td>.834*</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM9</td>
<td>.810*</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM7</td>
<td>.805*</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM3</td>
<td>.790*</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM8</td>
<td>.752*</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM6</td>
<td>.746*</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM1</td>
<td>.714*</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM4</td>
<td>.707*</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM5</td>
<td>.618*</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *= major loadings for each item.

After EFA, supporting unidimensionality of the scale, CFA using maximum likelihood estimation to confirm the hypothesis of the observed variables loaded on the latent variable “celebrity mother exposure” (See Figure 3.5).

\[\text{item of the scale was changed in main study analysis. The changed items correspond to the followings in main study survey (See Appendix C): mFAMOM3 of pilot study corresponds to the item 8 in the main study; mFAMOM5 of pilot study corresponds to the item 9 in the main study.} \]
Evaluations of multiple goodness-of-fit tests for the two-factor model for all 9 items showed perfect fit to the data, after the model modifications were performed by adding two paths to the model between the items 4 - 6 and 8 - 9 (see Table 3.7). The NNFI (.97) and CFI (.98) values showed a perfect fit as values being greater than .95 (Thompson, 2004). The RMSEA (.098) value could be considered as a poor fit (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The value of $\chi^2/df$ (87.58/25 = 3.50) indicated a perfect fit since it was less than 5 (Kline, 2005). According to Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008), the GFI (.93) and AGFI (.88) suggested a good and a poor fit respectively. Finally, SRMR (.043) indicated a perfect fit (Brown, 2006). Reviewing the aforementioned fit indices, it could be concluded that the Turkish version of the scale regarding mothers’ media exposure to celebrities had an admissible fit.
Table 3.7.

Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish Version of Celebrity Mother Media Exposure Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87.58</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NNFI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; GFI = goodness of fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean residual. *$p < .05$

3.2.2.2. Factor Analyses for Maternal Belief System Scales

3.2.2.2.1. Social Comparison Orientation Scale

Prior to the analysis, the suitability of data for factor analysis social comparison orientation scale with 6 items was tested. Bartlett’s test of sphericity test was significant ($\chi^2(15) = 899.080$, $p<0.001$). KMO exceeded the required value of .6 ($KMO=.74$). Thus, the tests revealed appropriateness of the data for factor analysis.

PCA revealed the two components with eigenvalues greater than 1, explaining 46.2% and 20.59% of the variance respectively. An inspection of screeplot revealed a clear break between the second and the third components, indicating two underlying components. Horn’s parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) also confirmed the existence of two components.

Figure 3.6. Scree plot for SCO
The two-component solution explained 66.8% of variance in total. Following oblique rotation, to aid in the interpretation of these components, the two components showed a negative moderate intercorrelation (r = -.34). Inspection of the pattern and structure matrix (See Table 3.8) indicated a perfect clear two-factor solution. Accordingly, the last three items loaded highly on the first component while the first three items loaded on the second one.

The results indicated that although the loading values of all items except item 4 in line with the original scale of the Iowa-Netherlands Comparison Orientation Measure (Gibbons & Buunk, 1999) but inconsistent with the adapted version of Chae (2015). That is why, although Chae (2015) presented that the items 1, 2, and 3 were related with the comparison of abilities while the items 4, 5, and 6 measured the comparison of opinions, being consistent with the original version measure, the researcher founded one component solution. Since the current results were parallel with the former version, the two components solution was acceptable.

Table 3.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pattern coefficients</th>
<th>Structure coefficients</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO4</td>
<td>.832*</td>
<td>.806*</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO5</td>
<td>.826*</td>
<td>.833*</td>
<td>-.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO6</td>
<td>.748*</td>
<td>.784*</td>
<td>-.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO1</td>
<td>-.814*</td>
<td>-.769*</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO2</td>
<td>-.803*</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>-.840*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO3</td>
<td>-.800*</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>-.836*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *= major loadings for each item.

After EFA, supporting bi-dimensionality of the scale, CFA using maximum likelihood estimation to confirm the hypothesis of the observed variables SCO1, SCO2, SCO3 loaded on the latent variable “ability comparison”, the observed
variables SCO4, SCO5, SCO6 loaded on the latent variable “opinion comparison” (See Figure 3.7).

Evaluations of multiple goodness-of-fit tests for the two-factor model for all 6 items showed perfect fit to the data (see Table 3.9). The NNFI (.96) and CFI (.98) values showed a perfect fit as values being greater than .95 (Thompson, 2004). The RMSEA (.066) value could be considered as a good fit (Steiger, 2007). The value of $\chi^2$/df (17.16/8 = 2.15) indicated a perfect fit since it was less than 3 (Kline, 2005). According to Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008), the GFI (.98) and AGFI (.94) suggested a perfect and a good fit respectively. Finally, SRMR (.044) indicated a perfect fit (Brown, 2006). To sum up, since the majority of values suggested, it could be concluded that the Turkish version of SCO had a perfect fit.
Table 3.9.

**Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish Version of SCO Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Factor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NNFI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; GFI = goodness of fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean residual. *$p < .05$*

### 3.2.2.2.2. Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes Scale

The factor analysis tests assessing the underlying structure of mothers’ competitiveness attitudes revealed low correlations, low communality coefficients of the second item in which one factor solution were indicated by eigenvalues and parallel analysis (See Appendix E-Table A.3). Thus, omission or retranslation options were considered.

Reinvestigating the items of the scale, a cultural issue was detected in this item. Indeed, the original English version, pilot Turkish version, and main Turkish version items in the study of Chae (2015) were presented in the Table 3.10. In fact, it was observed that the mother’s proposed self-evaluation criteria with respect to “the others” was stressed in the items. Item 2 of original version underlines the point with the word of “winning”. In Turkish culture, within the sample of pilot study, the Word “başarı” did not emphasized the reference point of “the others”; therefore, a phrase for the idea of “compared to others”, in way of defining the word “başarı”, was added to the item. Then, the scale was subjected to factor analysis with main study dataset, which was presented below.

Prior to the analysis, the suitability of the data for factor analysis, mothers’ competitiveness attitudes scale with 4 items was tested. Bartlett’s test of sphericity test was significant ($\chi^2(6) = 920.480$, $p<0.001$). KMO exceeded the required value of .6 ($KMO=.73$). Thus, the tests revealed appropriateness of the data for factor analysis.
Table 3.10.

*The Items of Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1**</td>
<td>Original Version*</td>
<td>It is important to me to perform better than other mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Turkish Version</td>
<td>It is important to me to perform what I do better than other mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Turkish Version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Original Version*</td>
<td>I feel winning is important in mothering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Turkish Version</td>
<td>I think being successful in mothering is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Turkish Version</td>
<td>In the case of mothering, being more successful in comparison with other mothers is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3**</td>
<td>Original Version*</td>
<td>It annoys me when other mothers perform better than I do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Turkish Version</td>
<td>I feel nervous when other mothers do things better than I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Turkish Version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4**</td>
<td>Original Version*</td>
<td>I try harder when I am in competition with other mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Turkish Version</td>
<td>If I am in rivalry with other mothers, I try harder to be better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Turkish Version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Original versions: Chae (2015), **The items being the same in pilot and main versions

PCA revealed one component with eigenvalues greater than 1, explaining 66.3% of the variance. An inspection of screeplot revealed a clear break after the first component, indicating one underlying components. Horn’s parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) also confirmed unidimensionality of the scale.

![Scree Plot](image)

*Figure 3.8. Scree plot for mothers’ competitiveness*
Since a one component solution perfectly revealed, the analysis did not show any rotation strategy. Thus, component matrix presenting unrotated loadings of the items was investigated (Table 3.11). It was inspected that all items loaded the component quite strongly with coefficient values ranging from .76 to 86.

Table 3.11.

Pattern and Structure Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component coefficients</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP2</td>
<td>.834*</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP1</td>
<td>.810*</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP4</td>
<td>.805*</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP3</td>
<td>.790*</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = major loadings for each item.

After EFA, supporting unidimensionality of the scale, CFA using maximum likelihood estimation to confirm the hypothesis of the observed variables loaded on the latent variable “mothers’ competitiveness” (See Figure 3.9.).

![Figure 3.9. Hypothesized model for mothers’ competitiveness](image)

Chi-Square=0.06, df=1, P-value=0.80921, RMSEA=0.000

Figure 3.9. Hypothesized model for mothers’ competitiveness
Evaluations of multiple goodness-of-fit tests for the two-factor model for all 4 items showed perfect fit to the data, after the model modifications were performed by adding a path between item 1 and 2 (see Table 3.13). The NNFI (1.01) and CFI (1.00) values showed a perfect fit as values being greater than .95 (Thompson, 2004). The RMSEA (.00) value could be considered as a perfect fit (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The value of $\chi^2/df$ (.06/1 = .06) indicated a perfect fit since it was less than 5 (Kline, 2005). According to Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008, the GFI (1.00) and AGFI (1.00) suggested a perfect fit. Finally, SRMR (.001) indicated a perfect fit (Brown, 2006). Reviewing the aforementioned fit indices, it could be concluded that the Turkish version of the mothers’ competitive attitudes scale perfectly converged with hypothesized unidimensional model.

Table 3.12.

*Goodness-of-Fit Indicators of the Models for the Turkish Version of Mothers’ Competitive Attitudes Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* NNFI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; GFI = goodness of fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean residual. *p < .05

3.2.2.2.3. Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Ideology

The factor analysis tests assessing the underlying structure of *endorsement of intensive motherhood ideology* scale revealed low correlations, low communality coefficients, and overlapping loadings on two factors in pattern matrix coefficients of the items 3, 4, 5 and 6, in which one factor solution were indicated by eigenvalues and parallel analysis (See Appendix E-Table A.4). Thus, deletion or retranslation options were considered.

Reexamining the items of the scale, the linguistic and psychological issues regarding the items for the pilot study sample was suspected in these items. The original English version, pilot Turkish version, and main Turkish version items in the study
of Chae (2015) were presented in the Table 3.13. In fact, it was observed that the problems of clarity of items might result in incoherence of the scale items, except item 4. Thus, slight changes applied to the items of 3, 5, and 6. Moreover, using I-language in the item 6 which was associated with feeling of guilt might result in the participants to hesitate consistent answers. Therefore, item 6 was transformed into a sentence whose subject referring a broad group of individuals. Then, the scale was subjected to factor analysis with main study dataset, which was presented below.

Table 3.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Items of Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Ideology Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># of items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Original versions: Chae (2015), **The items being the same in pilot and main versions
Prior to the analysis, the suitability of the data for factor analysis, endorsement of intensive motherhood ideology scale with 6 items was tested. Bartlett’s test of sphericity test was significant ($\chi^2(15) = 389.630, p<0.001$). KMO exceeded the required value of .6 ($KMO = .73$). Thus, the tests revealed appropriateness of the data for factor analysis.

PCA revealed one component with eigenvalues greater than 1, explaining 37.2% of the variance. Although the proportion was considered as low, Çökük, Şekerçioğlu, and Büyüköztürk (2016) proposed acceptable explained variance as greater than 30% for social sciences. An inspection of screeplot revealed a clear break after the first component, indicating one underlying components (See Figure 3.10). Horn’s parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) also confirmed unidimensionality of the scale.

Since one component solution perfectly revealed, the analysis did not show any rotation strategy. Thus, component matrix presenting unrotated loadings of the items was investigated (See Table 3.14). It was inspected that all items loaded the component quite strongly with coefficient values ranging from .53 to 71. Looking at communality coefficients, item four showed lowest loading (.28) being less than .3, indicating poor fit of the item with others (Pallant, 2011).
Table 3.14.

Component Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component coefficients</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE2</td>
<td>.706*</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE3</td>
<td>.649*</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE5</td>
<td>.611*</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE1</td>
<td>.611*</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE6</td>
<td>.538*</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE4</td>
<td>.526*</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *= major loadings for each item.

After EFA, supporting unidimensionality of the scale, CFA using maximum likelihood estimation to confirm the hypothesis of the observed variables loaded on the latent variable “intensive motherhood ideology” (See Figure 3.11). Given evidence of the strong loading of item 4 and insufficient explained variance in it, CFA conducted both with and without item 4. CFA reported weaker fit indices without the item; so, the scale was evaluated with it.

Evaluations of multiple goodness-of-fit tests for the two-factor model for all 4 items showed perfect fit to the data, after the model modifications were performed by adding a path between item 1 and 5 (see Table 3.15). The NNFI (.99) and CFI (.99) values showed a perfect fit as values being greater than .95 (Thompson, 2004). The RMSEA (.03) value could be considered as a perfect fit (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).
The value of $\chi^2/df$ (9.30/7 = 1.33) indicated a perfect fit since it was less than 5 (Kline, 2005). According to Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008), the GFI (.99) and AGFI (.98) suggested a perfect fit. Finally, SRMR (.026) indicated a perfect fit (Brown, 2006). Reviewing the aforementioned fit indices, it could be concluded that the Turkish version of the endorsement of intensive motherhood ideology scale perfectly converged with hypothesized unidimensional model.

### Table 3.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. NNFI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; GFI = goodness of fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean residual. *$p < .05$*

### 3.2.3. Validity

Validity is defined as “the appropriateness, meaningfulness, correctness, and usefulness of the inferences a researcher makes” (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012,
While selecting an instrument, validity is so crucial to take into consideration because a valid instrument measures what it aims to measure (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012).

There are different kinds of validation evidence that should be addressed during the research which are content-related, criterion-related and construct-related evidence. Firstly, content-related evidence is related with the format and content of an instrument; such as typing size to be read easily, appropriateness of language to be easily and correctly understood. Secondly, criterion-related evidence is gathered by comparing the results of instruments measuring the same items. Lastly, construct-related evidence refers “the nature of psychological construct or characteristic being measured by the instrument” (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012, p.148). Since this phase, content and construct related evidences was gathered.

Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun (2012) state necessity of consulting experts, having sufficient information on what is intended to measure with a given instrument, to confirm the content-related validity of research. In the preparatory phase as stated at the Section 3.1, the scales’ appropriateness with respect to Turkish culture, language clarity, and format effectiveness conducted and validity issues was evaluated. The Phase I also addressed format effectiveness by investigating the data being collected.

During phase I, construct validity of the research was ensured with factor analysis using hybrid approach as discussed at Section 3.2.2. Indeed, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with the pilot study datasets. The results revealed clear evidences for construct validity of the scale.

### 3.2.4. Reliability

The reliability of the scales was calculated after content and construct-related evidences have been collected for validation. The reliability of an instrument refers to the internal consistency of scores obtained using the particular instrument (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). Thus, it is important for a researcher to have reliable results. The Cronbach’s Alpha is the frequently used method for the
calculation of reliability. The Cronbach Alpha values above .7 are acceptable; however, it is better to have a value of higher than .8 (Pallant, 2011). In pilot study, the Cronbach Alpha values of the scales were calculated to be sure of reliability. The results revealed the values ranging from .60 to .93 (See Appendix F-Table A.5, Table A.6, Table A.7, Table A.8, Table A.9). In the appendix (Table A.10, Table A.11, Table A.12, Table A.13, Table A.14, Table A.15), the reliability results of main study data presented with values from .63 to 93, in which the scale-based improvements of the values were observed.

While giving decisions to remaining or reducing the items of the adapted scales, item total statistics were investigated (See Appendix F). All of the values were compatible with factor analysis, except media exposure scales. In detail, the values in item-total statistics table suggested reliability of media exposure to childrearing scale’s item assessing interpersonal communications (mREAR7). Thus, the item was used in genre-based analysis regarding the fourth research question although it was excluded from the scale when the items total scores were utilized in accordance with EFA and CFA results. Moreover, the values in item-total statistics table suggested that the item assessing celebrity mother exposures on radio (mFAMOM9) decreases the reliability of the whole scale. Thus, the reduction of the item was decided.

3.3. Phase II: Main Study

The purpose of the main study is to investigate the research questions and hypothesis of the project. Answering the questions, targeted population and selected sample, analysis procedures, and validity issues was presented in detail in following sections.

3.3.1. Population and Sample

The target population of the study is Turkish mothers with children at 36 to 72 months old attending kindergarten at Manisa. The accessible population is the mothers of preschoolers that attend private or public preschools and living in Yunus Emre, Şehzadeler, Salihli, Turgutlu, and Kula districts. Alongside of the effortlessness of transportation, the reason of selecting the districts as accessible
population is that the four of them, except Kula, are in the first five biggest districts in terms of population, composing 15.78%, 12.16%, 11.45%, 11.21% of Manisa respectively (Manisa Nüfusu, 2017).

Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) mentioned that most of educational research studies use nonrandom samples due to being sometimes infeasible or not possible to obtain a random sample. The sample was selected by convenience sampling method according to the effortlessness of transportation. The independent kindergarten school list, both private and public, was requested from the Manisa National Education Directorate. The schools from the list were reached and the ones given permission to conduct the study in their roof were object to the study. 2400 questionnaires were sent to the mothers at 24 independent kindergartens, 6 private and 18 public. 1130 of the questionnaires were returned, corresponding almost 47% of return rate. Among them, 84 of them were either empty or filled by the same participant, being with two children attending kindergarten, or filled by not the mother, grandparents. As a result, data from sample of 1046 participants were subjected to the analysis at start.

3.3.2. Data Collection Procedure

Before the study, necessary permissions were obtained from the researcher developing the original instruments. Also, the permission of Applied Ethics Research Center in METU and Ministry of Education to employ the questionnaires were gathered. Once, the permissions were collected, the researcher came together with administrators of the selected schools. They were informed about the purpose of the study as well as the ethical considerations. In coordination with the administration and the teachers of the schools allowing the study, the researcher scheduled one or one and a half week to administer the instruments to the mothers of children in their schools. In fact, the teachers were requested to distribute the questionnaires to their students’ mothers on arrival-departure times to fill them in their home settings. Once the allocated time ended, the researcher collected the returned questionnaires from
the schools. The data collection period started in the last week of December, 2017 and finished in the middle of January, 2018.

A consent form explaining the purpose of the study and inform the participants about their responsibilities and rights were prepared. The participants had the right to refuse to participate in the study before beginning or to withdraw from the study at any time. The names of the participants were not written on forms for anonymity of the participants and the confidentiality of the research data. It took approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaires. The email addresses of the researcher and the supervisor were written on the consent form to contact for any related questions risen about the study.

3.3.3. Internal Validity Threats

Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012) define internal validity as “any relationship observed between two or more variables should be unambiguous as to what it means rather than being due to something else” (p.166). This refers that the differences examined in the dependent variable should be directly related with the independent variable not any other unexpected variables. Possible internal threats are subject characteristics, mortality, location and instrumentation for survey-based research (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). It is important for researchers to be aware of the possible threats to the internal validity of their study to design their study accordingly for more valid and reliable results.

According to Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun (2012), subject characteristics as a result of selecting them based on specific features in studies may be one of the threats to the internal validity of studies. That is why; other important characteristics of the selected group may be different from the population, which can affect the results. In the current study, to minimize the effect of the threat, obtaining and using more information on the subjects were tried to be enhanced. The factors regarding the participants’ socio-demographic features such as age, education level, monthly family income, number of children they have, etc. were investigated to due to their
possibility to be an unintended variable. Thus, initially, both public and private schools’ parents in the five districts was tried to be reached assuming that they would have similar characteristics based on living in same region. However, private schools were generally so resistant to not be involved in the study. Thus, to overcome the threat, the administrators were asked to summarize general socio-economic status of the parents of their students. Accordingly, the choice of schools was tried to be made in a rough balance. Moreover, when the analysis technique allowed, i.e. hierarchical multiple regression, such variables were included into the analysis as control variables. Thus, the subject characteristics threat could be considered as being eliminated for this study.

Mortality is another threat to the internal validity of the study because of possible withdrawal of subjects from the study or failure to collect all scales (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). Because the surveys will be sent to home to be filled, mortality is an important threat in this study. To increase the amount of participation, the administrators and sometimes the teachers were requested to explain the importance of the turning back of the questionnaires. Furthermore, in the forms distributed with them, the purpose of the study and the importance of completely filling the questionnaires was clearly explained to increase the number of fully answered questionnaires. Considering a quite high return rate of 47% (See Section 3.3.1), it could be concluded that the mortality threat was overcome.

Another threat is location, referring to physical characteristics or the atmosphere of the place where the data are collected scales (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). It is stated that the location of the data collection might affect the responses of participants. The fact that the questionnaires were answered in participants own home settings increases the chance of having the threat for the study due to variety of home conditions for each of them. The solution might be holding the location constant by administering it on the schools at the same time to all mothers. However, the option was not feasible for the study and may result in external validity problems by accessing mostly to the mothers with high levels of the determinants of the engagement decisions, being an intended variable of the study.
Instrumentation may create some internal validity threats. Two of them are instrument decay and the data collector characteristics. First of all, instrument decay occurs if an instrument is changed or scored in a different way (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). Due to the inexistence of open ended questions that can be scored differently and same format print for all the surveys will not make instrument decay a threat for this study. Secondly, the data collector characteristics may create some different feelings or understandings on participants, resulting in misrepresentation of original thoughts (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). Since one scale of the questionnaire was intended to measure the participants’ assessment of the teachers of their child, being the data collector at the same time, the data collector characteristics may be a potential threat for the validity. Thus, the teachers were informed the confidentiality of the responses. Moreover, because of no treatment in administration process, the threat was not triggered by the interaction between the participants and the data collector.

3.3.4. Ethical Issues

Three ethical principles to been aware of by researchers were proposed as protecting participants from harm, ensuring confidentiality of participants, and absence of deception of the participants (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). In the study, any physical or psychological harm were not given to the participants. Also, participants’ voluntary participation was an issue carefully ensured. Moreover, the participants’ rights of leaving the questionnaire when they wanted were declared them.

In addition, any personal information regarding the participants’ identity were not requested unless they wanted. Instead, writing a nickname or their own name options provided them in the consent form to set the confidentiality of the data. Lastly, necessary explanations were clearly written in the questionnaires. Thus, the deception of the participants was not a problem in the study. In conclusion, careful attention was given for all ethical issues.
3.3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

The analysis was conducted via SPSS 22.0 Package program. Before beginning the analysis, data cleaning procedure was applied to check the accuracy of data entry. Additionally, following the procedures presented in Pallant (2011) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), missing values and the assumptions of the tests were evaluated.

After correcting data entry errors, missing data were investigated with the aid of frequencies, descriptive statistics, and missing values analysis (MVA). Firstly, the cases with 20% unresponded items were deleted (n=11) with suspicion of low responsiveness, resulting a decrease of sample size from 1046 to 1035. Missing data were less than 5% cut-off point, allowing to apply missing value estimation techniques (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). To apply one of the techniques, evidence of data being completely missing at random (MCAR) or missing at random (MAR) is required. To assess whether missing values were MCAR, Little's MCAR test were conducted and the results indicated that missing values were distributed completely at random ($\chi^2 (2130) = 2125.833, p > .521$). The result proposed suitability of data for safety of missing value imputation with expectation and maximization (EM) algorithm, chosen due to its advantages of avoiding overfitting, avoiding impossible matrices, and realistic variance estimation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Thus, missing values were imputed with EM method\(^5\). Then, the outliers were analyzed.

Both univariate and multivariate outliers, among dichotomous and continuous variables, result in Type I and Type II (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001); thus, the existence of both type of outliers was checked. To spot univariate outliers, z scores were calculated for all variables of interest.

\(^5\) All of the analyses were conducted both with and without missing value datasets as Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggested. The analyses revealed similar results.
Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) suggested a 3.29 cut-off point for z scores with a caution that a few standardized scores exceeding the cut-off point are excepted if the sample size is very large. Parallelly, Büyüköztürk, Cakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, Demirel (2016) advised focusing on excess of 4.00 for large sample sizes, which taking into consideration in the study. Several cases exceeded the point in some variables.

Multivariate outliers were detected by calculating Mahalanobis Distance at $p<.001$ for each research question (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Using the authors’ guidelines, the cases with a Mahalanobis Distance greater than $\chi^2(8) = 26.124$ for CCA1, $\chi^2(12) = 32.909$ for CCA2 and CCA3, $\chi^2(10) = 29.588$ for HRM considered as outliers. Several cases revealed as such.

Lastly, the deviants, being both univariate and multivariate, were identified to decide the way dealing with them by either deletion, transformation or score alteration (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). The once with extreme values for most of the variables were deleted ($n=7$) while the others’ values, not considered as being not a part of the sample with univariately extreme values in one or two variables, were changed to relatively lower ones ($n=15$). After alteration, multivariate outliers were identified again, showing no problem.

Then, a descriptive analysis, offering means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values, was performed to investigate the general pattern of the mothers’ media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information, their maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive motherhood ideology, determinants of their engagement decisions. Furthermore, three canonical correlation analyses and one hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess the proposed relationships between media exposure, the maternal beliefs and determinants of engagement decisions with 0.5 significance level.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter, the findings of this study will be presented in detail. As explained beforehand, three canonical correlation analysis (CCA) and one hierarchical regression analysis (HMR) methods were conducted to answer three research questions. Moreover, preliminary analyses were done to ensure the required assumptions for CCA and HMR. The results presented into two main section, one for assumptions and the one for inferential statistics regarding research questions.

4.1. Assumptions

To apply CCA and HMR, a number of assumptions should be met, which are sample size, normality, outliers, multicollinearity, linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence of residuals.

4.1.1. For Canonical Correlation Analysis

4.1.1.1. Sample size

According to Stevens (1996), in CCA analysis, estimation of only the most important canonical function’s canonical loadings, sample size whose subject-to-variable ratio of at least 20:1 is recommended while arriving at reliable estimates for two canonical functions, a sample size whose subject-to-variable ratio of at least between 40:1 and 60:1 is recommended. Moreover, Barcikowski and Stevens (1975) suggested that CCA requires larger sample sizes \(n > 200\) to detect even weaker canonical correlations (e.g., \(R = 0.3\)). Considering CCA’s with 8, 12 and 12 variables, respectively, it can be concluded that the study \(N=1027\) after deletions) exceeded the minimum required sample size in a considerable amount.
4.1.1.2. Multivariate Normality

Although univariate normality is not an assumption for CCA, inferences about significant canonical variate pairs requires multivariate normality assumption, which refers the normal distributions of all variables as well as all linear combinations of variables (Henson, 1999). Since, the absence of being not too strict and sensitive test for multivariate normality, the likelihood of the satisfaction of the assumption increases with univariate and bivariate normality of the variables (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001).

To assess univariate normality, statistical or graphical methods can be used. Yet, the sensitiveness of the tests for skewness and kurtosis values to the sample sizes (e.g. 200+), graphical methods (e.g. histogram) is recommended to assess normality (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Thus, histograms and normal probability plots were examined for the purpose (See Appendix G-Figure A.1, Figure A.2, Figure A.3). Asymmetrical bell-shaped of actual scores distributions were sought in histograms while a reasonably straight line between the observed value for each score and the expected value from the normal distribution in normal probability plots. In accordance with histograms and the plots, media exposure to celebrity mothers variable (Tot_Famom_nom) revealed substantial positive skewness, requiring logarithm transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Applying the transformation technique improved the normality of the variable; so, the transformed version of it was used for the analysis. The other variables showed no important departure from normality.

To assess bivariate normality, bivariate plots including all variables of interest of the study were examined, looking for roughly elliptical shape (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) (See Appendix G- Figure A.4, Figure A.5, Figure A.6). Although some bivariate pairs distributions were not perfect elliptical shapes, the graphs revealed no major deviations from normality.
4.1.1.3. Linearity and Homoscedasticity

Linearity, corresponding a straight-line relationship between two variables, should be validated for CCA because the analysis works on correlation or covariance matrices and it maximizes linear relationships between the variate pairs of the two sets (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Moreover, the authors suggested that the relationship between pairs of variables should be homoscedastic, referring the variance of variable is almost at same scores for other variable’s all scores, in order to have more powerful CCA results.

To assess linearity and homoscedasticity, bivariate scatterplots were screened to check an oval-shape. Since there was no evidence of curvilinear relationship between any pairs and scores of paired variables were roughly similar to each other, it was proved that the linearity and homoscedastic assumptions was not violated.

4.1.1.4. Multicollinearity

According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), absence of multicollinearity, referring that the variables, both in each set and across sets, are not closely correlated to another, is crucial for CCA. Thus, bivariate correlations were analyzed to be sure that the correlation values did not exceed the critical value of .90 (Field, 2005). According to Appendix G (Table A.16, Table A.17), the absence of multicollinearity of the variables was satisfied.

4.1.2. For Hierarchical Multiple Regression

4.1.2.1. Sample Size

In the case of HRM regarding sample size requirements, Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) provided a formula based on the number of independent variables: \( N > 50 + 8m \) (where \( m \) corresponds to the number of independent variables). Additionally, Fraenkel & Wallen (1993) recommended that the sample size should be as large as
possible regarding the researcher’s time and energy constraints. Thus, the study exceeded the minimum required sample size for HRM analysis with $n_{\text{total}}=10$ ($\text{Block}_1=6; \text{Block}_2=4$).

### 4.1.2.2. Normality of Errors

The residuals, referring the differences between the observed dependent variable (endorsement of intensive motherhood ideology) scores and the predicted ones, should be normally, i.e. randomly, distributed for multiple regression normality assumption (Pallant, 2011). Residuals normality were checked via histogram and normal P-P plot (See Appendix G-Figure A.7). It can be visually inspected that the histogram has a perfect bell-shaped figure and normal P-P plot, the points lie in a perfect straight diagonal line, which proved that the residuals in the model were distributed normally.

### 4.1.2.3. Linearity and Homoscedasticity

Linearity and homoscedasticity of the residuals, which are evaluated via the residual scatterplot, should be satisfied to conduct multiple regression analysis (Pallant, 2011). Examining the scatter plot (See Appendix G- Figure A.7), roughly rectangle shape of the overall pattern of the scatterplot sets (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) presented an evidence of linearity of the residuals while horizontal scatter of the variance of the residuals to the right side and vertical disperse to the center (Field, 2009) suggested a proof for homoscedasticity.

### 4.1.2.4. Multicollinearity and singularity

Multiple regression analysis requires absence of multicollinearity ($r < .90$) between two or more predictor variables in regression model (Pallant, 2011). Supporting the $r$ values lower than .90 (See Appendix G-Table A.19), Tolerance values, being an indicator of the extent of the variability of the specific independent is not predicted by the other independent variables in the model, was indicated the satisfaction of the
assumption with values ranging from .556 to 795, being greater than the desired value of .10 (Pallant, 2011).

4.1.2.5. Independence of Residuals

Regression analysis requires uncorrelated or independent residual terms for any two observations, which can be checked by Durbin Watson test, whose value is expected to be between 1.0 and 3.0 (Field, 2009). The analysis showed that the assumption of independence of errors was validated with a Durbin Watson value of 2.027.

4.2. Descriptive Results

To assess the participants’ characteristics and general patterns of the variables, descriptive results regarding socio-demographic features of the participants and their responses to the scales were presented in the current section.

4.2.1. Demographic Information about the Participants

In Table 4.1, the socio–demographic characteristics of the participants (n = 1027), the mothers with children, attending a preschool institution, at ages of 3 to 6 (M = 4.76), was presented. Age of mothers, ranging from 22 to 54, was on an average 32.91. Moreover, the mothers had the number of children with an average 1.82, ranging between the scores of 1 and 5, while the age difference between their youngest two children was 3.34 with a minimum value of 0 and maximum value of 11. Among the mothers’ education level, bachelor’s degree had the largest frequency (f =424, 33%). High school degree (f =339, 33%), secondary school degree (f =128, 12.5%), elementary school degree (f =101, 10%), graduate degree, i.e. either master’s or doctorate degree (f =30, 3%), and illiterate (f =5, 5%) followed the bachelor’s degree, respectively. The amount of unemployed (f =551, 54%) and employed (f =476, 46%) mothers were so close to each other. Lastly, the largest proportion of participants regarding income belong to the families whose monthly income were between 3001 TL and 5000 TL (f =293, 28.5%) while the smallest proportion was
the income more than 10001 TL (f =12, 1%). The income levels between these two were as follows based on their proportions; monthly income between 2001 and 3000 (f=267, 26%), 1001 and 2000 (f=259, 25%), 5001 and 10000 (f=175, 17%), less than 1000 (f=21, 2%).

Table 4.1.

*Socio – Demographic Characteristics of the Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>4.782</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recency of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employed</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Family Income</td>
<td>less than 1000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3001-5000</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10001 and more</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The presented values were calculated after the replacement of missing values with EM technique; thus, n=1027

4.2.2. General Patterns of the Scales

To assess general patterns of the scales with respect to the second research question, minimum and maximum scores, mean and standard deviation values were examined.
4.2.2.1. The Motivators of Engagement Decisions

Table 4.2, indicates the constructs’ and the overarching constructs’ scores of participants with respect to their engagement decisions, whose highest scores corresponds to positive tendencies, or opinions, with respect to the related construct. As presented, the participants’ motivational beliefs on parent engagement (min.=17, max.=85) were relatively high ($M=63.07$, $SD=7.90$) as well as its sub-constructs’ scores, which are role activity beliefs (min.=10, max.=50, $M=37.40$, $SD=6.27$), and parental self-efficacy (min.=7, max.=35, $M=25.68$, $SD=3.87$).

Moreover, the participants’ self-perceived life context on their parent engagement scores (min.=25, max.=125) were the highest level being observed among the all variables ($M=110.97$, $SD=13.16$) as well as its sub-constructs, being their self-perceived time, energy, and desire (min=18, max=90, $M=73.89$, $SD=10.04$), and their self-perceived skills and knowledge on their parent engagement levels (min=18, max=90, $M=37.09$, $SD=4.50$).

Table 4.2.

| Descriptive Statistics for the Scales regarding the Motivators of Engagement Decisions |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                  | Min    | Max    | $M$    | $SD$   |
| Motivation                       |        |        |        |        |
| Role Activity Beliefs            | 13     | 50     | 37.40  | 6.269  |
| Perceived Self-efficacy          | 13     | 35     | 25.68  | 3.867  |
| Life Context                     |        |        |        |        |
| Time&Energy&Desire               | 36     | 90     | 73.89  | 10.041 |
| Skills & Knowledge               | 21     | 45     | 37.09  | 4.502  |
| Invitation                       |        |        |        |        |
| School Invitation               | 12     | 30     | 25.79  | 3.310  |
| Child Invitation                | 6      | 36     | 20.23  | 5.566  |
| Teacher Invitation              | 6      | 36     | 17.79  | 7.020  |
Lastly, the participants’ levels regarding the perceptions of invitations for parent engagement (min=18, max=102) was perfectly moderate ($M=63.78$, $SD=12.07$). Among its sub-constructs, school invitations’ level was reported as high (min=6, max=30, $M=25.79$, $SD=3.31$), child invitations level was observed as moderate in the favor of high scores (min=6, max=36, $M=20.23$, $SD=5.57$), and teacher invitations’ level was relatively moderate with a tendency toward low scores for (min=6, max=36, $M=17.79$, $SD=7.02$). Among the perceived invitation scales, invitations from teachers was observed as the one with lowest scores.

### 4.2.2.2. Media Exposure

Table 4.3 indicates the mothers’ exposures to childrearing information and celebrity mothers on media, whose highest scores represents high exposure frequencies. The participants childrearing information exposure levels (min.=6, max.=30) were observed as being relatively moderate ($M=20.84$, $SD=4.92$). Indeed, they reported being occasionally exposed to such information via media channels. On the other hand, their levels in terms of the exposure to celebrity mothers on media (min.=8, max.=40) were quite low ($M=16.87$, $SD=7.35$). In fact, they stated being rarely exposed to celebrity mothers on media. (The item-based frequencies presented in Appendix H-Table A.20, Table A.21).

Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>4.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity Mothers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>7.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The presented values were calculated after the replacement of missing values with EM technique; thus, $n=1027$.

Figure 4.1 and 4.2 designates the participats reported exposures (min.=1, max.=5) to childrearing information and celebrity mothers in each media genre seperately. The
participants’ childrearing information exposures from interpersonal communications ($M=3.91$, $SD=1.08$), on print media ($M=3.91$, $SD=1.08$), and on television ($M=3.58$, $SD=0.97$) were observed as high levels. Their informal online ($M=3.28$, $SD=1.06$) and formal online childrearing information ($M=3.44$, $SD=1.05$) exposure levels were moderate.

![Figure 4.1. Descriptive statistics for genre-based childrearing information exposure](image)

Regarding celebrity mother variables, the participants reported low levels of formal online ($M=2.27$, $SD=1.03$), print media ($M=2.1$, $SD=1.01$), informal online ($M=2.0$, $SD=1.01$), and television ($M=1.95$, $SD=.93$) exposures, respectively.

![Figure 4.2. Descriptive statistics for genre-based celebrity mother exposure](image)
4.2.2.3. Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness, and Intensive Motherhood

The high scores for the scales assessing social comparison, competitiveness, and intensive mothering, points out high levels for related maternal belief systems. As indicated in Table 4.4, social comparison orientation of the participants, ranging from 6 to 30, was relatively moderate in the favor of high scores ($M=18.98$, $SD=4.66$). On the other hand, their competitive attitudes, ranging from 4 to 20, were also moderate but with tendency toward low scores ($M=10.12$, $SD=4.12$). Moreover, their endorsement of intensive mothering ideologies, ranging from 6 to 30, was relatively high but in tendency toward medium level ($M=20.43$, $SD=4.15$).

Table 4.4.

*Note. The presented values were calculated after the replacement of missing values with EM technique; thus, $n=1027$.

4.3. Inferential Statistics

4.3.1. Association of Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness Intensive Mothering with Motivators of Parental Engagement

After careful consideration of the current research question, canonical correlation analysis (CCA) was conducted to assess the linear interrelationship between multiple dependent and multiple independent variables (Thompson, 1984). CCA, an exploratory technique allowing researchers to evaluate the patterns among two set of
variables (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2005), is a multivariate analytic technique subsuming other parametric methods, i.e. regression, discriminant analysis and multivariate analysis of variance, in the general linear model (Thompson, 1991). Although a single dependent variable can be predicted from a set of multiple independent variables using multiple regression analysis, CCA simultaneously predicts multiple dependent variables, metric or nonmetric, from multiple independent variables, metric or nonmetric, (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2010). Thus, using CCA, the most powerful and proper multivariate technique (Hair et al, 2010), would limit the increase of the probability of Type I error (Thompson, 1991). Thus, to assess the relationship model of media exposures and the three maternal belief systems and the motivators of mothers’ engagement decisions in their children’s education, two CCAs were applied for the overarching and constitutive motivators of maternal engagement. The results were presented in the following, respectively.

4.3.1.1. Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness Intensive Mothering with Overarching Motivators

4.3.1.1.1. Assessing Overall Model Fit

A CCA was conducted using the five variables of mother’s media exposure and maternal belief systems as predictors of mothers’ motivational beliefs on their engagement, perceptions of invitations from others for their engagement and self-perceived life context on their engagement in order to analyze the multivariate shared relationship between the mother’s media exposure and maternal belief systems and their overarching motivators of their engagement decisions, which are motivational beliefs, perceptions of invitations and self-perceived life context as overarching motivators of their engagement decisions.

According to Table 4.5, this analysis, whose model presented in Figure 4.3, yielded three canonical functions with canonical correlations ($R_c$) .32 (almost 10% overlapping variance), .16 (2.6% overlapping variance), and .10 (1.1% overlapping variance).
variance), respectively. The canonical correlations only for all three canonical functions were statistically significant.

Table 4.5.

Canonical Correlations of the Functions for RQ 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>$R_c$</th>
<th>$R_c^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11064</td>
<td>.31563</td>
<td>.09962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02702</td>
<td>.16220</td>
<td>.02631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01094</td>
<td>.10402</td>
<td>.01082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dimension reduction analysis (See Table 4.6), allowing to test statistical significance of the hierarchical arrangement of functions (Sherry & Henson, 2005) was investigated. Collectively, the full model across all functions was statistically significant using the Wilks’s $\lambda = .867$ criterion, $F(15, 2813.41) = 9.94, p < .001$. The tests revealed that only the first function removed (Wilks’s $\lambda = .963, F(8, 2040.00) = 4.83, p < .001$) and the first two functions removed (Wilks’s $\lambda = .989, F(3, 1021.00) = 3.72, p < .05$) explained a statistically significant amount of shared variance between the variable sets. With respect to the low effect sizes, interpreting the second ($R_c^2=2.6\%$) and the third functions ($R_c^2=1.1\%$) and their corresponding canonical variates considered as not noteworthy. Thus, only the first pair of canonical function was not marginal to discuss was interpreted.

Table 4.6.

Dimension Reduction Analysis for RQ 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Wilks’s $\lambda$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TO 3</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>9.935</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2813.41</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TO 3</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>4.832</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2040.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TO 3</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>3.723</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1021.00</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.3. Canonical Correlation Model for RQ3.1
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To assess the ability of the set of predictor variables to explain the variation in the set of criterion variables, redundancy index ($R_d$) was calculated (See Table 4.7). The results revealed that 5.2% of variance of the combination of mothers’ motivational beliefs, perceptions of invitations from others and self-perceived life context in terms of their engagement decisions for their children’s education was explained by the combination of maternal beliefs systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood and mothers’ exposure to celebrity moms at media and childrearing information on media.

4.3.1.1.2. Interpreting Canonical Weights

Canonical weights, and canonical loadings, also known as canonical structure correlations, of the criterion and predictor variables for the first pair of canonical variates (See Table 4.7), corresponding to the percentage of shared variance between the observed variable and the variate, a synthetic variable generated from the set of observed variables (Sherry & Henson, 2005), was used to examine the patterns among the variables. The squared structure coefficients ($r_s^2$) were also provided in Table 4.7.

Looking at the loadings of the criterion variables, although the greatest contribution belonged to motivation, all of the criterions had primary loadings on the variate ($r_s>.60$), which was supported by the squared structure coefficients. Moreover, the overarching motivators of engagement decisions also tended to have large canonical weights with a slight exception of self-perceived life context with low function coefficients but large structure coefficients. This is due to the multicollinearity between life context and other criterion variables. According to Hair et al (2010) and Thompson (1984), loadings are more reliable and stable than weights in this manner. Additionally, the signs of loadings and weights for all of the criterion variables revealed that they were all positively related to their first variate.
Table 4.7.

*Canonical Solutions for Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems Predicting Overarching Motivators of Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>$r_s^2$ (%)</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>$R_d$ (%)</th>
<th>$R_c$ (%)</th>
<th>$R_{c2}$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.905*</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.611*</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Context</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.614*</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.510*</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.306*</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.485*</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.843*</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* >.30; $r_s$: structure coefficient (canonical loadings); $r_s^2$: squared structure coefficient

Regarding the predictor variable set for the first variate, intensive mothering ideology ($r_s=.84$), being the largest contributor, media exposure to childrearing information ($r_s=.51$), and competitive attitudes ($r_s=.49$) were the primary contributors to the first variate with a secondary contribution by social comparison orientation ($r_s=.31$). On the other hand, media exposure to celebrity mothers ($r_s=.22$) did not share a significant amount of variance with the canonical variate. The signs of the significantly loading predictor variables indicated their positive relation with the variate.

Investigations of the criterions and the predictors together revealed that if the mothers have high levels of maternal belief systems of competition, intensive mothering and social comparisons and frequently exposed to childrearing information as well as celebrity mother representations on media, their levels for the engagement decision motivators of motivation, invitation perceptions, and self-perceived life-context increases.
4.3.1.1.3. Follow-up Univariate Regressions

Follow-up univariate analysis to assess univariate association of criterion variables with predictor variable set was investigated (See Table 4.8). The results revealed that the mothers’ media exposure to childrearing information ($\beta = .16, t(1021) = 4.32, p < .001$), and intensive motherhood ideology of them ($\beta = .26, t(1021) = 7.79, p < .001$) was statistically significant predictors of motivation. Contrary, their celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = -.03, t(1021) = -.74, p > .05$), social comparison orientation ($\beta = -.03, t(1021) = -.95, p > .05$), and competitive attitudes ($\beta = .00, t(1021) = .01, p > .05$) did not statistically significantly predict motivation. Among the significant predictors, media exposure to childrearing information and intensive motherhood revealed positive association with the current criterion.

For mothers’ perceptions of invitation from others, the results revealed statistically significantly predictions of mothers’ media exposure to childrearing information ($\beta = .11, t(1021) = 2.88, p < .01$), competitive attitudes ($\beta = .15, t(1021) = 4.33, p < .001$), and intensive motherhood ideology of them ($\beta = .08, t(1021) = 2.34, p < .05$). On the other hand, their celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = -.04, t(1021) = -.13, p > .05$), and social comparison orientation media ($\beta = .01, t(1021) = .39, p > .05$) did not statistically significantly explain the invitation variable. All of the significant predictors, media exposure to childrearing information, competitive attitudes, and intensive motherhood, had positive association with the current criterion variable.

The mother’s self-perceived life context was statistically significantly explained by the mothers’ media exposure to childrearing information ($\beta = .19, t(1021) = 5.08, p < .001$), and intensive motherhood ideology of them ($\beta = .13, t(1021) = 3.89, p < .001$). The other predictor variables, which are their celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = -.01, t(1021) = -.28, p > .05$), social comparison orientation ($\beta = -.04, t(1021) = -1.28, p > .05$), and competitive attitudes ($\beta = .00, t(1021) = 0.02, p > .05$), were not significantly associated with their perceived life context. The signs of the beta values for significant predictors revealed that the increase in exposure to childrearing
information on media and intensive motherhood ideology result in increase in their levels of self-perceived life context.

Table 4.8.

*Follow-up Univariate Regressions for RQ3.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Stnd.Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>4.316</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>-7.43</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.946</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>7.790</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>2.445</td>
<td>-1.130</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>4.328</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>5.077</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-1.281</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.1.1.4. Validation and Diagnosis**

To apply the validation process of CCA, sensitivity analysis of the predictor variable set was conducted (Hair et al, 2010). Table 4.9 includes the result of such a sensitivity analysis in which the structure coefficients were investigated for stability when individual predictor variables were deleted from the analysis. The canonical loadings in the all analysis with a predictor omitted (social comparison orientation, media exposure to childrearing information, and competitiveness attitudes) were remarkably stable as well as canonical correlations.
Table 4.9.

*Sensitivity Analysis of the Canonical Correlation Results to Removal of a Predictor Variable for RQ3.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results after Deletion of</th>
<th>Complete Variate</th>
<th>SCO</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_c$</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_c^2$</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Variate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r_s$</th>
<th>SCO</th>
<th>Childrearing Info</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Celebrity</th>
<th>IMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.306*</td>
<td>.510*</td>
<td>.485*</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.843*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r_s$</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Invitation</th>
<th>Life Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.905*</td>
<td>.611*</td>
<td>.614*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.2. Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness Intensive Mothering with Constitutive Motivators

4.3.1.2.1. Assessing Overall Model Fit

A CCA was conducted using the five variables of mother’s media exposure and maternal belief systems as predictors of mothers’ role activity beliefs, self-efficacy for helping student succeed in school, perceptions of general school invitations, specific invitations from teacher(s), and specific invitations from student, perceived parental knowledge and skills, and perceived parental time, energy, desire on their
engagement in order to analyze the multivariate shared relationship between the mother’s media exposure and maternal belief systems and their constitutive motivators of their engagement decisions.

This analysis, whose model presented in Figure 4.4, yielded five canonical functions with canonical correlations ($R_c$) .39 (15% overlapping variance), .26 (6.8% overlapping variance), and .14 (almost 2.0% overlapping variance), .11 (1.3% overlapping variance), .7.5 (0.6% overlapping variance), respectively. The canonical correlations for the first four canonical functions were statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>$R_c$</th>
<th>$R_c^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17529</td>
<td>.38620</td>
<td>.14915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.07331</td>
<td>.26135</td>
<td>.06830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.02000</td>
<td>.14004</td>
<td>.01961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.01351</td>
<td>.11544</td>
<td>.01333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.00558</td>
<td>.07449</td>
<td>.00555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the dimension reduction analysis, collectively, the full model across all functions was statistically significant using the Wilks's $\lambda = .763$ criterion, $F (35, 4272.15) = 8.12, p < .001$. The tests revealed that only the first function removed (Wilks’s $\lambda = .896, F (24, 3545.61) = 4.71, p < .001$), the first two functions removed (Wilks’s $\lambda = .962, F (15, 2807.89) = 2.65, p < .05$), the first three functions removed (Wilks’s $\lambda = .981, F (8, 2036.00) = 2.43, p < .05$) explained a statistically significant amount of shared variance between the variable sets. However, amount of shared
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variance between two sets was not statistically significant when the first four functions removed (Wilks’s $\lambda = .995$, $F (3, 1019.00) = 1.90$, $p > .05$). Examining the magnitude of $R_c$ and $R_c^2$ of the functions, it has been revealed that the effect size of the first function was noteworthy to be interpreted ($R_c > .30$, $R_c^2 = .15$). Investigating the other four functions was considered as marginal.

Table 4.11.

*Dimension Reduction Analysis for RQ 3.2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Wilks’s $\lambda$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TO 5</td>
<td>.76257</td>
<td>8.12401</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>4272.15</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TO 5</td>
<td>.89625</td>
<td>4.71225</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>3545.61</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TO 5</td>
<td>.96195</td>
<td>2.64876</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2807.89</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 TO 5</td>
<td>.98120</td>
<td>2.42690</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2036.00</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TO 5</td>
<td>.99445</td>
<td>1.89543</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1019.00</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess the ability of the set of predictor variables to explain the variation in the set of criterion variables, redundancy index ($R_d$) was calculated (See Table 4.12). The results revealed a little amount of variance for constitutive motivators of engagement decisions ($R_d = .032$) explained by the combination of maternal beliefs systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood and mothers’ media exposure to celebrity mothers and childrearing information.

4.3.1.2.2. Interpreting Canonical Weights

Canonical weights, and canonical loadings of the criterion and predictor variables for the first pair of canonical variates (See Table 4.12), corresponding to the percentage of shared variance between the observed variable and the variate was used to examine the patterns among the variables. The squared structure coefficients ($r^2$) were also provided in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12.

**Canonical Solutions for Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems Predicting Constitutive Motivators of Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>Loading ($r_s$)</th>
<th>$r_s^2$ (%)</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>$R_d$ (%)</th>
<th>$R_e$</th>
<th>$R_e^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.853*</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.555*</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.722*</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.861*</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* >.30; $r_s$: structure coefficient (canonical loadings); $r_s^2$: squared structure coefficient

Looking at the loadings of the criterion variables, the greatest contribution belonged to the mothers’ role activity beliefs ($r_s=.85$). Significantly loading variables, following the role activity beliefs, were invitations from the child ($r_s=.54$), invitations from the teacher’s ($r_s=.39$), perceived knowledge and skills ($r_s=.36$), and self-perceived time/energy/desire ($r_s=.33$). Among them, role activity beliefs and invitations from the child were the primary loaders while the others were secondary. The mother’s self-efficacy perceptions ($r_s=-.08$) and the invitations from the school ($r_s=.25$) were not significantly correlated with the variate. Moreover, some inconsistencies were observed between the weights and loadings variables, specifically for perceived time/energy/desire, self-efficacy perceptions, and invitations from the teacher’s variables. Since canonical loadings represents within-set variable-to-variate correlation (Hair et all, 2010) while the weights provide unique contribution of the observed variable, the loadings were more reliable. Additionally, the signs of the loadings and weights for all of the significant criterion variables revealed that they were all positively related to their first variate.
Regarding the predictor variable set for the first variate, the maternal belief systems of intensive mothering ideology \((r_s=.86)\), being the largest contributor, competitive attitudes \((r_s=.72)\), and social comparison orientation \((r_s=.56)\) were significantly and primarily contributed to the first variate. On the other hand, media exposure to childrearing information \((r_s=.29)\) and celebrity mothers \((r_s=.20)\) did not correlated significantly with the canonical variate. The signs of the significantly loading predictor variables indicated their positive relation with the variate.

Taken as a pair, these variates proposed that the combination of more positive perceptions toward constitutive motivators for mother’s engagement decisions, being the role activity beliefs, invitations from the child, invitations from the teacher/s, perceived knowledge and skills, and self-perceived time/energy/desire were associated with high levels of maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive mothering.

### 4.3.1.2.3. Follow-up Univariate Regressions

Follow-up univariate analysis (See Table 4.13) to assess univariate association of criterion variables with predictor variable set was investigated. The mothers’ self-efficacy perceptions was significantly predicted by their media exposure to childrearing information \((\beta = .16, t(1021) = 4.18, p < .001)\), social comparison orientation \((\beta = -.15, t(1021) = -4.34, p < .001)\), competitive attitudes \((\beta = -.10, t(1021) = -2.75, p < .01)\), and intensive motherhood ideology \((\beta = .10, t(1021) = 3.03, p < .01)\). On the other hand, their celebrity mother exposure on media \((\beta = -.06, t(1021) = -1.50, p > .05)\) did not statistically significantly explained the self-efficacy variable. The results revealed that the confident mothers for helping their child succeed in schools were associated with frequent media exposure to childrearing, low levels of social comparison orientation and competitiveness and high levels of intensive motherhood ideology.

Statistically significant amount of variance of mothers’ role activity beliefs, similar to the self-efficacy variable, was extracted from by their media exposure to
childrearing information ($\beta = .10, t(1021) = 2.81, p < .01$), and intensive motherhood ideology ($\beta = .26, t(1021) = 7.96, p < .001$). The other predictors were not significantly associated with the variable; for celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = .00, t(1021) = .01, p > .05$), social comparison orientation ($\beta = .05, t(1021) = 1.57, p > .05$), and competitive attitudes ($\beta = .06, t(1021) = 1.76, p > .05$). The beta values showed that their role activity beliefs were positively related with media exposure to childrearing information and the ideology.

The results revealed that, the mothers perceptions of school invitations was statistically significantly explained by the mothers’ media exposure to childrearing information ($\beta = .12, t(1021) = 3.05, p < .01$ and intensive motherhood ideology of them ($\beta = .07, t(1021) = 2.01, p < .05$). The other predictors were not significantly associated with the variable; for celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = -.03, t(1021) = -.78, p > .05$), social comparison orientation ($\beta = .07, t(1021) = 1.89, p > .05$), and competitive attitudes ($\beta = -.04, t(1021) = -1.12, p > .05$). The frequent perceptions of school invitations were associated with frequent media exposure to childrearing information and high levels of the ideology.

The mothers perceptions of child invitations was statistically significantly explained by the mothers’ media exposure to childrearing information ($\beta = .09, t(1021) = 2.39, p < .05$), competitive attitudes ($\beta = .15, t(1021) = 4.27, p < .001$) and intensive motherhood ideology ($\beta = .10, t(1021) = 2.92, p < .01$). However, celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = -.07, t(1021) = -1.89, p > .05$), and social comparison orientation ($\beta = .00, t(1021) = .08, p > .05$) did not explain the variable significantly. The frequent perceptions of child invitations were associated with frequent media exposure to childrearing information and high levels of the ideology and competitiveness.

Statistically significant amount of variance of mothers’ perceptions of teacher invitations was extracted from only by the competitive attitudes ($\beta = .16, t(1021) = 4.53, p < .0001$). The other predictors were not significantly associated with the variable; for celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = -.00, t(1021) = -.06, p > .05$),
social comparison orientation ($\beta = -.01, t(1021) = .28, p > .05$), and their media exposure to childrearing information($\beta = .06, t(1021) = 1.58, p > .05$), and for intensive motherhood ideology ($\beta = .03, t(1021) = .74, p > .05$). The beta values revealed that there was a positive relationship between teacher invitation perceptions and competitiveness.

The results revealed that the mothers’ media exposure to childrearing information ($\beta = .15, t(1021) = 4.04, p < .001$), and intensive motherhood ideology of them them ($\beta = .11, t(1021) = 3.07, p < .01$) was statistically significant predictors of their self-perceived time/energy/desire. Contrary, their celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = -.01, t(1021) = -.32, p > .05$), social comparison orientation($\beta = -.03, t(1021) = -.81, p > .05$), and competitive attitudes($\beta = .01, t(1021) = .33, p > .05$) did not statistically significantly explain self-perceived time/energy/desire. Among the significant predictors, media exposure to childrearing information and intensive motherhood revealed positive association with the variable.

Like the mothers’ self-perceived time/energy/desire mothers’, their perceived knowledge and skills was statistically significant predicted by media exposure to childrearing information ($\beta = .21, t(1021) = 5.77, p < .001$), and intensive motherhood ideology of them ($\beta = .15, t(1021) = 4.44, p < .001$). However, their celebrity mother exposure on media ($\beta = -.00, t(1021) = -.11, p > .05$), social comparison orientation ($\beta = -.07, t(1021) = -1.92, p > .05$), and competitive attitudes ($\beta = -.02, t(1021) = -.68, p > .05$) did not statistically significantly predict their perceived knowledge and skills. The results revealed positive association of the criterion with the significant predictors, being media exposure to childrearing information and intensive motherhood.
Table 4.13.

*Follow-up Univariate Regressions for RQ 3.2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Childrearing Info</th>
<th>Celebrity</th>
<th>SCO</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>IMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>4.037</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>-.812</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>3.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>4.179</td>
<td>-1.502</td>
<td>-4.344</td>
<td>-2.752</td>
<td>3.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>-.782</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>-1.119</td>
<td>2.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>-1.894</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>4.273</td>
<td>2.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>4.531</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>5.769</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>-1.922</td>
<td>-0.683</td>
<td>4.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>2.815</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td>1.764</td>
<td>7.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1.2.4 Validation and Diagnosis

Sensitivity analysis of the predictor variable set was conducted, in which the structure coefficients were investigated for stability when individual predictor variables were deleted from the analysis, revealed that the canonical loadings in the all analysis with a predictor omitted (social comparison orientation, media exposure to childrearing information, and competitiveness attitudes) were remarkably stable as well as canonical correlations.

Table 4.14.

Sensitivity Analysis of the Canonical Correlation Results to Removal of a Predictor Variable for RQ3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results after Deletion of</th>
<th>Complete Variate</th>
<th>SCO</th>
<th>Childrearing Info</th>
<th>Competitiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_c$</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_c^2$</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_s$ SCO</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Info</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_s$ RA</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RA= Role Activity Beliefs, SE=Self-efficacy, SI=School Invitation, CI=Child Invitation, TI=Teacher Invitation, KS=Knowledge and Skills, TED=Time/Energy/Desire
4.3.2. Association of Media Exposures with Maternal Belief Systems of Social Comparisons, Competitiveness, Intensive Mothering

4.3.2.1. Assessing Overall Model Fit

The CCA was conducted using the nine variables of media exposures as predictors of the three maternal belief systems in order to analyze the multivariate shared relationship between the mother’s media exposure and their maternal belief systems of the interest.

As presented in Table 4.15, this analysis, whose model presented in Figure 4.5, yielded three canonical functions with canonical correlations ($R_c$) .39 (15% overlapping variance), .16 (2.6% overlapping variance), and .12 (1.5% overlapping variance), respectively. The canonical correlations for the all three canonical functions were statistically significant. Collectively, the full model across all functions was statistically significant using the Wilks’s $\lambda = .812$ criterion, $F (27, 2964.97) = 6.95, p < .001$.

Table 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>$R_c$</th>
<th>$R_c^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dimension reduction analysis (See Table 4.16), allowing to test statistical significance of the hierarchical arrangement of functions (Sherry & Henson, 2005) was investigated. As presented, the full model was statistically significant. The test of the first function removed was also statistically significant, Wilks’s $\lambda = .959$, $F (16, 2032.00) = 2.70, p < .001$. Moreover, the tests of the first two functions removed explained a statistically significant amount of shared variance between the variable
sets, Wilks’s $\lambda = .985$, $F (7, 1017.00) = 2.25$, $p < .05$. With respect to the statistical significance tests and low effect size, in accordance with Henson’s (2006) suggestion to use squared canonical correlations ($R^2_c$), i.e. overlapping variances, for effect size estimation, interpreting the second ($R^2_c=2.6\%$) and the third functions ($R^2_c=1.5\%$) and their corresponding canonical variates considered as marginal. Thus, only the first pair of canonical function was considered as noteworthy to be interpreted.

Table 4.16.

*Dimension Reduction Analysis for RQ 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Wilks’s $\lambda$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TO 3</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>8.119</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>2964.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TO 3</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>2.698</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2032.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TO 3</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>2.255</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1017.00</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess the ability of the set of predictor variables to explain the variation in the set of criterion variables, redundancy index ($R_d$), being analogous to multiplying the amount of shared variance of the variate, named as variate adequacy coefficient, by the squared canonical correlation (Thompson, 1984; Hair et al., 2010), was calculated (See Table 4.17). The results revealed that 7.53% of variance of the combination of maternal beliefs systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive motherhood was explained by the combination of mothers’ exposure to celebrity moms at media and childrearing information on media from each media genre.

4.3.2.2. Interpreting Canonical Weights

Canonical weights, or standardized coefficients, and canonical loadings, also known as canonical structure correlations, of the criterion and predictor variables for the first pair of canonical variates (See Table 4.17), corresponding to the percentage of shared variance between the observed variable and the variate, a synthetic variable generated from the set of observed variables (Sherry & Henson, 2005), was used to
examine the patterns among the variables. The squared structure coefficients ($r_s^2$) were also provided in Table 4.17.

### Table 4.17.

*Canonical Solutions for Media Exposures Predicting Maternal Belief Systems*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>Loading ($r_s$)</th>
<th>$r_s^2$ (%)</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>$R_d$ (%)</th>
<th>$R_c$ %</th>
<th>$R_c^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>-.867</td>
<td>-.974*</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-.602*</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMI</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.404*</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-.466*</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Online</td>
<td>-.601</td>
<td>-.370*</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Online</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal TV</td>
<td>-.644</td>
<td>-.714*</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Online</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>-.608*</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Online</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.384*</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity Mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Print</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>-.420</td>
<td>-.601*</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* >.30; $r_s$: structure coefficient (canonical loadings); $r_s^2$: squared structure coefficient

Looking at the loading of the criterion variables with a cutoff correlation of .3 for secondary loadings and .4 for primary loadings, although the greatest contribution belonged to social comparison orientation, all of the criterions had primary loadings on the variate ($r_s$.40), which was supported by the squared structure coefficients. Indeed, the maternal belief systems being the study’s interest, also tended to have large canonical weights. Only IM revealed a slight exception with modest function coefficients but large structure coefficients. Moreover, all of the criterion variables had the same sign, indicating that they were all inversely related to the first variate.
Regarding the predictor variable set for the first variate, interpersonal communications about childrearing, being the largest contributor, celebrity mother exposure on television and on print media, childrearing information exposure on television variables were the primary contributors to the first variate ($r > .40$), with a secondary contribution by both celebrity mother and childrearing exposures on informal online media genre ($r > .30$). The signs of the significantly loading exposure variables indicated their inverse relation with the variate.

Taking together, high levels of maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competition, and intensive mothering were associated with high frequency of childrearing information media exposures from media kinds of television, informal online, interpersonal communications and celebrity mother exposures from television, informal online, print media kinds.

### 4.3.2.3. Follow-up Univariate Regressions

Follow-up univariate analysis to assess univariate association of criterion variables with predictor variable set was investigated. The results revealed that social comparison orientation of mothers was statistically significantly predicted by childrearing information on informal online media ($\beta = .23, t(1017) = 4.19, p < .001$), formal online media ($\beta = -.19, t(1017) = -3.32, p < .01$), print media ($\beta = -.10, t(1017) = -2.95, p < .01$), interpersonal communications ($\beta = .26, t(1017) = 8.01, p < .01$) and celebrity mother exposure on television ($\beta = .12, t(1017) = 2.94, p < .01$), formal online media ($\beta = .05, t(1017) = 1.32, p > .05$), print media ($\beta = .14, t(1017) = 2.99, p < .01$); however, childrearing information on television ($\beta = -.02, t(1017) = -.50, p > .05$), and celebrity mother exposure on informal online media ($\beta = .04, t(1017) = .55, p > .05$) were not statistically significantly predicted it. Among the significant childrearing information predictors, media exposures from informal online, and interpersonal communications were positively, formal online and print media were negatively related with the criterion variable. Also, celebrity
mother exposures media from television and print media were positively and formal online media were negatively related.

For mothers competitive attitudes, childrearing information on each media genre were statistically significantly predictors; television ($\beta = .108, t(1017) = 2.17, p < .05$), informal online media ($\beta = .14, t(1017) = 2.53, p < .05$), formal online media ($\beta = -.21, t(1017) = -3.65, p < .001$), print media ($\beta = -.11, t(1017) = -3.11, p < .01$), interpersonal communications ($\beta = .09, t(1017) = 2.71, p < .05$). On the other hand, celebrity mother exposures on television ($\beta = .09, t(1017) = 2.07, p < .05$), and print media ($\beta = .17, t(1017) = 3.31, p < .01$) were significant predictors but informal online ($\beta = .02, t(1017) = .31, p > .05$) and formal online media ($\beta = -.13, t(1017) = -1.75, p > .05$) were not. Childrearing media exposures on television, informal online, and interpersonal communications were positively, formal online and print media were negatively related with competitiveness. Television and print media celebrity mother exposures were positively associated with the criterion.

Intensive motherhood ideology was statistically significantly predicted by childrearing information on each media genre; television ($\beta = .11, t(1017) = 2.90, p<.01$), formal online media ($\beta = -.14, t(1017) = -2.30, p < .01$), print media ($\beta = -.09, t(1017) = -2.33, p < .05$), interpersonal communications ($\beta = .12, t(1017) = 3.39, p < .01$), except informal online media ($\beta = .11, t(1017) = 1.87, p > .05$). On the other hand, celebrity mother exposures from only formal online media was statistically significantly predicted intensive motherhood ($\beta = -.59, t(1017) = -1.97, p < .05$) unlike the others; television ($\beta = .16, t(1017) = .82, p > .05$), informal online media ($\beta = .01, t(1017) = .13, p > .05$), print media ($\beta = .06, t(1017) = 1.22, p > .05$). The signs of beta values for significant predictors revealed that the increase in childrearing information exposures on television and interpersonal communications results in increase in the ideology; however, the ideology decreases when childrearing information exposures on formal online, print media and celebrity mother exposures on formal online media increases.
Table 4.18.

*Follow-Up Univariate Regressions for RQ 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Comparison Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal online</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>4.185</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal online</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-3.323</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>-2.948</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal communication</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>8.012</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>2.940</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal online</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal online</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-2.149</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>2.984</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>2.168</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal online</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal online</td>
<td>-0.214</td>
<td>-3.647</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-3.109</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal communication</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>2.710</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal online</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal online</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-1.750</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensive Motherhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>2.898</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal online</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>1.866</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal online</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-2.298</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>-2.334</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal communication</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>3.388</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal online</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal online</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>-1.971</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.4. Validation and Diagnosis

To apply the validation process of CCA, sensitivity analysis of the predictor variable set was conducted (Hair et al., 2010). Table 4.19 includes the result of such a sensitivity analysis in which the structure coefficients were investigated for stability when individual predictor variables were deleted from the analysis. According to the analysis, the canonical loadings in the all analysis with a predictor omitted (childrearing information television exposure, celebrity mother exposure on informal online media and on print media) were remarkably stable as well as canonical correlations.

Table 4.19.

*Sensitivity Analysis of the Canonical Correlation Results to Removal of a Predictor Variable for RQ 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results after Deletion of</th>
<th>Complete Variate</th>
<th>R_TV</th>
<th>C_informal</th>
<th>C_print</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R_c )</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_c^2 )</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childrearing Info</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Formal Online</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Formal Online</th>
<th>Print</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.466*</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>-.467</td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.608*</td>
<td>-.608</td>
<td>-.617</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>-.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.370*</td>
<td>-.381</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>-.391</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.747</td>
<td>-.384*</td>
<td>-.470</td>
<td>-.723</td>
<td>-.714</td>
<td>-.474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Celebrity</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Formal Online</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.395</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>-.398</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.404*</td>
<td>-.601*</td>
<td>-.601</td>
<td>-.610</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variate</th>
<th>SCO</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>IMI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.974*</td>
<td>-.979</td>
<td>-.974</td>
<td>-.982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.602*</td>
<td>-.588</td>
<td>-.602</td>
<td>-.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.404*</td>
<td>-.379</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* R_TV: Childrearing information exposure on television; C_informal: Celebrity mother exposure on informal online media; C_print: Celebrity mother exposure on print media
Figure 4.7. Canonical Correlation Model for RQ 4
4.3.3. Prediction of Media Exposures, Social Comparisons, and Competitiveness to Intensive Mothering

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to assess the ability of four control measures (media exposure to childrearing information and celebrity mothers, social comparison orientations and competitive attitudes) to predict levels of intensive mothering ideology, after controlling for the influence of age, the number of children they have, the recency of birth, graduation, monthly family income, work status. Socio-demographic characteristics were entered at Step 1, explaining 5% of the variance in the ideology. After entry of the control measures at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 22%, $F(10, 1016) = 28.70, p < .001$. The four control measures explained an additional 17.2% of the variance in the ideology, after controlling for socio-demographic characteristics, $R^2_{change} = .17$, $F_{change}(4, 1016) = 56.002, p < .001$.

Table 4.20.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls/Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s age</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation_dummy</td>
<td>-.119**</td>
<td>-.083*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Family Income_dummy</td>
<td>-.075*</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Child</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recency of Birth</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.168**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.332**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrearing Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.081*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>8.637</td>
<td>56.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .001
In the final model, the four variables were statistically significant, with education level (\(beta = -.08, p < .05\)), social comparison orientation (\(beta = .17, p < .001\)), competitive attitudes recording the highest beta value (\(beta = .332, p < .001\)), and media exposure to celebrity mothers than (\(beta = -.08, p < .05\)) (See Table 4.20).
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The current study investigated maternal engagement in their children’s education in a comprehensive way. In this chapter, the findings of the analysis were interpreted in light of literature. Then, potential implications are presented to improve the collaboration of schools, families, and community for the enhancements in early childhood education. The future recommendations were spread out the overall discussions as well as provided separately in the third section. After that, the limitations of the study were discussed.

5.1. Discussion of the Findings

This study aimed to investigate the determinants of the motivators of mother’s engagement decisions into their children’s education in relation to motherhood related variables. Specifically, the purposes of the current study were to examine the association of mothers’, with children attending a preschool institution, media exposures and belief systems with the motivators of their engagement decisions; and to assess the operation of the mechanisms of maternal belief systems (SCO, CA, IMI) and media exposures through which investigating the prediction ability of media exposures in maternal belief systems and assessing IMI’s possible predictors.

5.1.1. The General Patterns of Mothers’ Engagement Motivators, Belief Systems, and Media Exposures

In general, the patterns of participants’ degrees regarding each variable were divided almost into half, moderate and high degrees, with an exception of celebrity mother exposures reported as low. Specifically, the mothers reported possessing high levels on motivational beliefs, with its constitutive determinants of role activity and self-efficacy beliefs. Their general invitation perceptions from others were perceived as moderate as well as specific invitation perceptions from child and teacher; but, only
school invitation perceptions were observed as high degrees. The participants’ general life context perceptions had the highest degrees, with its determinants of perceived time, energy, and desire, and perceived skills and knowledge. All of results regarding the degrees of the engagement motivators of the participants were quite same with the reported degrees of mothers in Ertan’s (2017) study.

Looking at media exposure variables in general, the participants reported moderate media exposure levels regarding childrearing information but low exposure degrees to celebrity mothers. The item-based exposures revealed a range of exposure degrees ranging from low to high. In detail, the degrees of the participants regarding celebrity mother exposures on all kind of media genres were quite low, which was similar with Chae’s (2015) study results. On the other hand, there were both moderate (informal online, formal online childrearing information) and high (childrearing information on television, print media, and interpersonal communication) exposure degrees unlike Chae’s (2015) results with low exposures, except interpersonal communication genre with moderate.

Moreover, all of the maternal belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness, and intensive mothering were reported as moderately by the participants. The results were quite similar with participating mothers (i.e. Korean mothers) in Chae’s (2015) study. However, a slight difference regarding the competitive attitudes of mothers in favor of Chae’s study participants. In conclusion, it could be stated about the overall patterns of the variables that the participants’ observed degrees, clustered around moderate and high ones, were compatible with the two studies’ results using the same scales in the sample of mothers with young children (Ertan, 2017; Chae, 2015).

5.1.2. Association of Media Exposures and Maternal Belief Systems of Interest with Motivators of Mother’s Engagement Decisions

Parental beliefs are related with parental practices, or behaviors (McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 1980; Debaryshe, 1995) like media having a power on people’s beliefs and behaviors (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). Thus, it was hypothesized in the current study
that the combination of mothers’ media exposures and their belief systems of social comparisons, competitiveness and intensive motherhood would be significantly associated with their engagement motivators regarding their children’s education process, being strong predictors for their engagement practices for their children’s success at school. The results proved the hypothesis.

5.1.2.1. Overarching Motivators of Mother’s Engagement Decisions

As it was expected, primarily the association between the participants’ intensive motherhood ideology and their motivational beliefs dominated the model. Intensive mothering was discussed as child-centered, labor intensive, expert-guided model believing in strong responsibilities regarding the child’s education and development (Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004). On the other hand, the motivational beliefs correspond to one’s beliefs about his/her responsibilities and capabilities towards their children’s education process (Walker et al., 2005). In line with the definitions, the current study results supported that the participants’ intense ideological beliefs related to their responsibilities toward their children’s development correlated with the personal psychological beliefs regarding their position in children’s school success.

Although the aforementioned variables’ impact was stronger in the model, especially the roles of participants’ media exposures to childrearing information, competition attitudes, and social comparison orientations (practically weak) alongside of the intensive mothering in the prediction ability on the three motivators (i.e. motivational beliefs, perceptions of invitations for involvement from others, and perceived personal life context) were significant. To begin with, mass communication is a significant tool for parents to access childrearing information (Rothbaum, Martland, & Jannsen, 2008; Plantin & Daneback, 2009). Information about children’s education process was included in the content of mass media (Douglas & Michaels, 2004; Yazıcı & Özel, 2017). According to Wall (2013), the media messages have been focused on the mothers’ duties regarding preschools in which their children attend since 2000s. The current study suggested empirical evidence that such media
portrayals, together with the maternal belief systems of interest, have a role in explaining the motivators of mothers’ engagement decisions in their children’s school related education. In detail, it was empirically evidenced that such portrayals significantly explained the participating mothers’ perceptions toward what they should do and can do, their perceptions of the invitations from others, and their perceptions of available resources, which was proved in the combined correlation model and follow-up univariate analysis.

Moreover, the mothers’ competitive attitudes and social comparison orientations significantly loaded on the correlational model as it was hypothesized. The results were partially compatible with literature that mothers’ competitive attitudes stem from the belief toward motherhood as an individual achievement (Horovitz, 2007; Douglas & Michaels, 2004), accelerated by social comparisons to become better mother than others for her child’s outcomes (Wall, 2010). Thus, within the achievement context, both psychological and contextual motivators of Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler’s model, directly promoting engagement behaviors of mothers influencing children’s success, would have been expected to be explained by mothers’ competitions and comparisons. However, looking at follow-up regression analysis, the interesting result was that competitiveness explained only contextual motivator of perceived invitations from others while social comparison did not uniquely correlate with any motivators. It may be inferred from the results that although the participants ratified the interpersonal nature of competition (Smither and Houston, 1992) within their engagement motivators, they did not apply its intrapersonal dimension of achievement within the personal psychological and life-context motivators.

One of the most interesting findings of the current study was ineffectiveness of celebrity mother exposures on media on the final models with respect to the mother’s motivators to be engaged in their children’s education, specifically school related. Celebrity mother representations have been the most powerful media form imposing the desired maternal beliefs and behaviors (Douglas & Michaels, 2004), especially with the increase of social media platforms being a kind of tool creating a new type
of celebrity, i.e. microcelebrity (See Section 2.5.1.1), which is an opportunity for ordinary ones to become a celebrity sharing how they perform their motherhood (Chae, 2017). According to this notion, celebrity mothers were hypothesized as significant predictors of engagement motivators. However, the results were surprisingly inconsistent with what was assumed. The issue could be discussed in three points of view; cultivation theory, audiences perceived reality of media representations, and cultural impact.

First of all, cultivation theory suggests that the likelihood of influence of mass media portrays increases when the frequency of exposure increases (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). Since the reported celebrity mother exposures of the participants were quite low (See Section 4.2.2.2), its correlation strength regarding the engagement motivators might be weakened.

Secondly, individuals believing in the social realism of media messages, meaning “the perceived similarity or usefulness of the media representation to one’s own life”, are more likely to apply such messages into their lives (Harris & Sanborn, 2014, p.70). Social realism can be enhanced (Harris & Sanborn, 2014) by individuals’ tendency toward monitoring and judging the reliability of sources providing information (Johnson, 2007). Contrary to the aim of celebrity mother profiles of reinforcing one’s feeling of commonality, they advocate unrealistic and impossible standards of parenting duties to apply in ones’ own lives (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Thus, compatible with Uğurlu’s (2013) study participants, the current study participants might perceive celebrity messages socially unrealistic, too.

Thirdly, there are conceptual sub-dimensions of the definition of parent in Turkish culture with respect to the context. In fact, there is a Turkish word ‘veli’, referring that the person who is the student's mother/father or who undertakes the student's legal responsibility in education institutions (MONE PTO Regulation, 2012: Act 4), and ‘ebeveyn’, referring a mother or father of a person (Turkish Language Society [TLS], 2018). Although they were defined like synonyms of each other in several dictionaries (TLS, 2018; Ministry of Justice Legal Dictionary, 2018) as equivalents of ‘parent’ in English, the former word virtually utilized in school community while
the latter one used in referring general meaning of parent. Applied to celebrity mother exposures’ significance on the model for mother’s engagement motivators, such representations might not be considered by the participants in terms parenting in school community, but just in general personal parenting. In other words, perceived messages obtained from celebrity messages would not attribute to the school community parenting identity, but to general parenting identity.

To sum up, the combinations of media exposures and maternal belief systems of interest significantly correlated and explained participating mothers’ engagement motivators. In the final correlation model, all three maternal belief systems and childrearing information exposure on media variables on one side of the equation, and all three motivators of maternal engagement on the other side were significantly loaded on beside the dominations of intensive motherhood and motivational beliefs, which were quite compatible with literature. Then, the findings of deeper analysis regarding the constitutive motivators of maternal engagement were discussed in the following part.

5.1.2.2. Constitutive Motivators of Mother’s Engagement Decisions

Surprisingly, the results revealed that the statistical significance of media exposure variables dropped from the equation with constitutive motivators of mothers’ engagement although childrearing information exposure on media had a significant role on the equation with overarching motivators. Indeed, social comparison and competition variables’ impact suppressed the media exposure ones while the intensive motherhood ideology’s role stayed almost the same. However, the existence of its impact uniquely on almost all of the constitutive motivator variables, except teacher invitation perceptions, observed in follow up analysis. In sum, the three maternal belief systems were significantly associated with constitutive motivators of parental engagement.

It was observed from the findings that the dominating association between intensive motherhood and the mothers’ motivational beliefs regarding their engagement was
stemmed from the role activity beliefs of the participants, not from their self-efficacy beliefs regarding helping their child succeed in school. The relation between role activity beliefs and intensive mothering has been expected. That is why, parent’s role beliefs correspond to their socially constructed beliefs including their responsibilities, rights, and obligations towards childrearing and children’s development (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2004) while intensive motherhood ideology defines child-centered mothering roles of women (Hays, 1996).

Although the participants’ perceived self-efficacies did not significantly load on the model, follow-up regression analysis revealed its significant inverse relation with social comparisons and competitiveness and positive relation with media exposures and intensive mothering, being different than it was hypothesized. Intensive ideologies and media representation cultivate the feel of guilt and being incompetent underachiever (Douglas & Michaels, 2004) since their perfection seeking standards which are inescapable and unattainable at the same time (Henderson, Harmon, & Newman, 2016). Thus, several researchers evidenced their association with low self-efficacies in terms of general psychological wellbeing of the mother (Henderson et al., 2016) and their perceived child-rearing capabilities (Teke, 2014). Partially consistent with literature, the current study revealed that such inverse impact on self-efficacies stemmed from the participants’ competitiveness and comparative attitudes when children’s school related development in consideration.

The most important finding of the study was perceived invitation motivator of engagement. Contemporary motherhood ideologies, including competition and comparison attitudes, stand their beliefs and behaviors upon expert discourses (Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004). In the school community, the experts are generally administrators and teachers. With this rational, it was hypothesized that the maternal belief systems of interests would be highly associated to the invitation perceptions of the participants. That is why, they would have a tendency to detect and give meaning to the invitations of the school community experts as well as the invitations coming from the child in line with their beliefs for excessive child-centeredness and intense sense of responsibility. However, according to the current
study findings, only child invitations strongly and teacher invitations weakly loaded
on the model while school invitations had no significant play on the equation
although they reported high levels on school invitation perceptions and medium
levels on the other two (See Section 5.1.1).

Many researchers have indicated that children are perceived as passive, vulnerable,
and absence of agency and independence in the public area within the current context
of intensive parenting (Lareau, 2003; Rosier & Kinney, 2005; Caputo, 2007;
Rutherford, 2009; Hoffman, 2010), which stressed the second (the responsibility of
individual mother) and third (the intensive methods of childrearing) domain of the
ideology (See Section 2.6.2.3.). Parallely, there have been variety of articles on the
Internet, giving messages to mothers to take precautions and make risk-management
plans regarding the danger and possible harms that could come from/in preschools to
their children since 2000s (Wall, 2013). Additionally, there have been some mass
media messages, providing a message to mothers to anticipate all of the
developmental needs of their children by themselves, which requires to be child-
development expert, a teacher, a gatekeeper to others around the child (Douglas &
Michaels, 2004). To sum up, such notions would reinforce two interrelated attituded
of intensive parenting, contributing to their invitation perceptions from children, not
from others (school or teacher). They become alert to possible signs of neediness to
be supported developmentally or to be protected, or “shielded from the world’s
troubles” (Walls, 2016, p.1). As a result, they perform gatekeeping behaviors to
ignore the others being stakeholders in the child’s education process.

Looking at competition and comparison attitudes of participants, which highly
loaded on the equation for constitutive motivators, follow-up analysis was valuable
to give meaning on the findings regarding invitation perceptions. Only competitive
attitudes of participants were significantly related with child and teacher invitations.
The mothers’ competitive drives stand for their attitudes toward showing other
mothers how they perform mothering to prove their achievement and superiority
(Kruglanski & Mayseless, 1990; Wall, 2010). In consideration with school
community nature, the results revealed that the interpersonal feature of competition
was practiced with intermediary role of teachers and children. In other words, there is evidence on the findings that the participating mothers directed their competition with other mothers in the school community according to their discussions with children and teachers, being the ones with which the mothers can easily and frequently form direct interactions. It was so surprising that teacher invitations uniquely predicted only by competition, which additionally evidences the aforementioned expert disregarding.

5.1.3. Association of Media Exposures with Maternal Belief Systems of Interest

The current study investigated the variables; social comparisons, competitiveness, intensive motherhood, frequently discussed in the same content within the Social Comparison Theory framework in a combined way, under maternal belief systems umbrella term, to assess the detailed associational model with media exposures. In literature, there were some studies examining the relation of mass media exposures, or message, with social comparison (Coyne et al., 2017), competition (Horovitz, 2007), and intensive motherhood (Chae, 2015). Among them, some revealed their interconnections (e.g. Mchenry & Schultz, 2014; Garcia et al., 2013). Chae (2015) firstly discussed them in the same article but mostly in a distinctive way.

The current study contributed the literature by investigating their combinations. Indeed, as it was hypothesized, the findings revealed that the combination of the three maternal belief systems were positively correlated with the combination of media exposure of childrearing information and celebrity mothers. The finding was consistent with the cultivation theory telling the power of repeated exposure to media on shaping individuals’ worldview (Harris & Sandborn, 2014).

In the final exploratory model, the domination of social comparison orientations and childrearing information exposures from interpersonal communications were revealed. In addition, competitiveness and intensive ideology with childrearing information on TV and informal online (weak), and celebrity mother exposure on
TV, print media, informal online, and formal online (weak) were significantly contributed to the model.

In communication process, encompassing encoding and decoding of the messages between transmitter and receiver, transmission functions best when applied two-way (Watson, 1998). Mass media communication is often considered as one-way (Harris & Sanborn, 2014) though it has been evolving day by day with the increase of interactive social media tools. Still, the dominance of interpersonal relations as a first referenced source regarding childrearing might be explained within the strength of two-way communications in the decoding process of related information. That is why, studies founded parents’ information seeking attitudes mainly from familial and proximal sources (Berkule-Silberman, Dreyer, Huberman, Klass, & Mendelsohn, 2010; Montesi & Bornstein, 2017; Cochran & Niego, 2002).

In addition, this study revealed that competitiveness is associated to even comparisons with messages taken from media although the closer community still perceived as the first source. The finding slightly supported by literature that the kind of social comparisons are tended to be upward than the type that requires face-to-face contact with the target to be compared (Buunk & Gibbons, 2007; Chae, 2015).

Moreover, celebrity mother exposures on media was worth to discuss. To begin with, the findings were compatible with literature which evidenced the prediction ability of celebrity portrayals on social comparisons and competition (Chae, 2015; 2017) and intensive ideology (Chae, 2015). Additionally, Douglas and Michaels (2004) claimed that “celebrity mother profiles aim to make ordinary mothers feel commonality, i.e. thinking as “she is like me”, by comparing themselves with the celebrities” (p. 114). Moreover, Festinger (1954) reported that individuals compare themselves with similar others. Thus, it could be inferred that the findings evidenced Douglas and Michaels’s (2004) proposal.

Furthermore, in the final model, celebrity mother exposure variables’ role was greater than childrearing information exposures in terms of both in quantity and in loading strength despite the reported lower degrees. In this regard, cultivation theory
focuses on cumulative effect of media exposures; at the same time, it proposes the superiority of the impact of some images on the mainstreaming process regarding one’s world view (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). As repeatedly mentioned throughout the thesis, celebrities are powerful genres in shaping individuals’ viewpoints (Douglas & Michaels, 2004), which was supported by the current study findings.

Additionally, Linney, Linden, and Campbell (2017) suggested a bidirectional relationship model to maternal engagement in competition between proactive (instigative) or reactive (responding in kind to the competitiveness of another mother) competition behaviors. Although the current study did not investigate responsive behaviors of participants, but rather their derived tendencies with respect to mass media communication, the findings displayed some clues supporting Linney and her colleagues’ theory. In fact, mainly participants’ celebrity mother exposures and interpersonal relations, triggering impacts on their comparative attitudes followed by competitions, might be originated from their reactive competitions. Social comparisons might be a moderator between reactive attitudes and celebrity exposures. In literature, variety of scholars discussed the mass media influencers’ drive to portray their superiority, their achievement regarding mothering; however, they mostly investigated the issue from the viewpoint of the ones subjected to such images. The current study necessitated further analysis the assess the relationships between viewpoints of both the influencers and followers in comparison and competition process with structural equation modeling.

Lastly, the absence, or weakness, of childrearing information, particularly informal online (weak), formal online, and print genres, in the association model with belief systems should be discussed. Unexpectedly, information exposures weakly explained their maternal belief systems of interest although they reported medium to high degrees as presented above. The findings challenge Chae (2015), reporting Internet’s practical, but not ideological function (referring intensive mothering) for mothers in a way that not just childrearing information from Internet but also from print media functions practically for their maternal belief systems including comparisons, competitions, and intensive ideologies.
Going deeper into practical usages and belief formational functions, formal online media sources in both information and celebrity exposures were not influentially associated with combined belief systems. However, their inverse, significant and unique explanatory impact on separate beliefs were observed in follow-up analysis. Thus, the suppression of interpersonal communications and celebrity exposures on formal online resources was interesting when each media exposure variables and each belief related variables were combined within their groups in the model. This finding may be due to the fact that the participants rely firstly on the messages acquired from families and proximal sources and from celebrities, being perceived as powerful and proven themselves to the society, rather than experts’ messages displayed on media channels while they are in belief formation process.

At this point, the thing being noteworthy to discuss is the perceptions of participants with respect to experiential and scientific knowledge regarding parenting. Based on the findings, it could be stated that experiential knowledges were more essential than scientific ones in the parental belief formation process within the current study sample. Indeed, they weakly referred experts’ scientific knowledge while comparing their motherhood to others, competing with them, forming intensive ideologies. Reminding that the current motherhood beliefs were proposed as scientifically expert driven (Hays, 1996), it was possible that the participants’ definitions of experts concentrated on experiences rather than science unlike the other studies’ participants perceiving them as supplementary (Cochran & Niego, 2002) or complementary (Montesi & Bornstein, 2017) to each other.

In conclusion, the thing grasping attention was that there were some compatible (i.e. expert disregarding) and contradictory (i.e. media exposures) debates regarding the first model, including the association of media exposures and maternal belief systems with motivators of mother’s engagement decisions, and the second model, presenting association of media exposure with maternal belief systems of interest. First of all, a compatible finding was that the participants had a tendency to underestimate expert’s messages being derived from scientific knowledge in both contents; formation process regarding motivators of their engagement in their children’s education and
regarding personal parental belief systems. Secondly, the explanatory strength of
celebrity mother exposures differentiated in a way that they had no association
between the motivators of parental engagement; however, their role was quite strong
in explaining maternal belief systems. Such contradiction evidenced that celebrities’
power depended on content-based beliefs, or perceptions, of individuals.

5.1.4. Predictors of Intensive Motherhood Ideology

As mentioned before, the contemporary motherhood ideology, prompted by media, is
dominated by intensive beliefs and practices, in which the ones were required to be
better in mothering with respect to others (Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004;
Ennis, 2014). Although there were no empirical studies in the issue, the debates
framed in the sense that mothers with intensive ideologies compare themselves to
others to be better which led them to compete. Indeed, the dominant assumption was
prediction ability of intensive mothering in comparison and competition. On the
other hand, some scholars discussed maternal competitiveness as an individual trait
(Smither & Houston, 1992), triggering the viewpoint regarding motherhood as an
individual achievement (Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Thus, it was hypothesized in
the current study that competitions, comparisons as the way of practicing it, and
media exposures would predict intensive mothering ideology after controlling for
demographic variables.

The hypothesis was proved by significant $R^2$ change of 17 %. The most powerful
contributor to intensive mothering was competitiveness, followed by social
comparison orientation. Suggesting that the mothers’ individual attribute to form a
competitive relationship with others, either proximal ones or media figures as
discussed above, is a factor explaining the intensive beliefs regarding their role as a
mother. As the current study suggested, competitiveness is not just a way of
performing intensive maternal beliefs in order to show others how good they are with
respect to societal scripts (Mchenry & Schultz, 2014), but also what leads them to
endorse such beliefs.
Looking at media exposure variables, celebrity mother exposure was significant determinant of the ideology while childrearing information was not. The finding supports the discussions built in the previous model like power of celebrities, and mostly practical usages of childrearing information.

One of the most interesting finding of the current model was the inverse prediction of celebrity mother exposures to intensive mothering ideology although the positive relation between them was suggested in the follow-up analysis of the previous model. Reminding that the beta values of the final model indicates the unique contribution of each variable after statistically removal of the overlapping impacts of all other variables (Pallant, 2011), it could be inferred that the negative outcomes of celebrity portrayals on motherhood ideologies is originated from the comparison and/or competition tendencies of mothers, which powerfully induce their ideologies.

The result contradicted with Chae (2015) reporting a positive relation between celebrity exposure and intensive motherhood in her study. Since there were no analysis assessing social comparisons and competitiveness predictions on intensive ideology, yet the three variables were all separately dependents while media exposures were independents for each, it is reasonable to observe a shape shifting of the associations when other powerful factors included in the models. Still, detailed evidences are required within other samples via hierarchical regression analysis in which comparison and competition variables included in the model as the third block variables after media exposures.

When the control variables were investigated, only education level had a significant role in differentiating the ideology, consistent with the findings of Walls et al. (2016). The mothers’ exposures to different attitude of mind with involvement in higher education result in the perceptions regarding their opportunities to pursue different roles in society alongside of mothering (Walls et al., 2016). Keeping in mind that intensive mothering underscores the achievement orientation of mothers, higher education might bring them in new ways of potential success. Even, they might recognize the positive outcomes of representing a powerful and successful mother portray on their children. To illustrate, Blair-Loy (2003) reported participants
sustaining their professional careers and rising their child at the same time with beliefs about the positivity of their employment for the development of their children. In a qualitative way, the underlying aspects of higher education levels benefiting balanced motherhood beliefs, in which equally meeting one’s personal and children’s needs should be investigated in future analysis especially in Turkey.

In conclusion, it was observed that dynamics of variables in the final model was in-between the model regarding maternal belief systems and media exposures prediction of family engagement motivators and the one about the maternal belief systems explained by media exposures. That is, intensive motherhood ideology (independent variable) was dominant in the former one while comparisons and competitions (dependent variables) were prevailing in the latter. Also, celebrity mother exposures did not play crucial role on differentiating family engagement motivators. On the other hand, the final model suggested that social comparisons, competitions, and celebrity mothers was influential factors predicting the ideology. Combining the findings by focusing on engagement motivators, celebrity mother exposures might have an indirect impact through all three maternal belief systems while social comparison orientations moderates the relationship between intensive motherhood and engagement motivators. This requires assessment via structural equation modeling in further studies.

5.2. General Discussion

Motherhood is based on idealized beliefs regarding motherwork in social environment; thus, motherhood ideologies correspond to the discourses of what mothers should and shouldn’t do in society (Parmaksiz, 2012). Intensive motherhood is a dominant ideology among contemporary mothers, which requires full devotion of women to mothering in order to be good mothers and to be fulfilled as women (Hays, 1996). In this sense, children’s development and education is one of the duties of mothering. As the findings implied, mass media has a power and role on imposing these social roles. The current study findings evidenced these notions within family

Family engagement is an indispensable part of children’s education. It is even more significant factor than school quality for children’s academic achievement (Dufur, Parcel, & Troutman, 2013). Indeed, its benefits have been well documented in literature. Thus, being motivated to behave in accordance with the responsibilities toward children’s education process is crucial for both children and the stakeholders of education, being families, teachers, schools, larger community. After all, quality education does not have just individualistic purposes, but also collectivist ones, too. That is, if the education quality increases within individualistic efforts, children with quality education benefits the society at large.

Looking in this perspective, the significant association of contemporary motherhood beliefs and media exposures with family engagement might indicate positivity at first glance. However, the findings indicated some barriers for quality family engagement process. In dominant culture, mothers are perceived as the primary ones in childrearing. This idea, which reverberated in the policies, has been reinforced even by the Prime Minister of Turkey (Parmaksız, 2012). Also, in the media, the messages for mothers repeating the protection of children in public, even in preschool settings, were prevailing (Wall, 2013). It might be reasonable to say that these cultural beliefs and media discourses result in mothers’ attitudes putting children in a so-called bell jar, where they can easily control the dynamics around their children. Even the teachers’ and schools’ decisions and attitudes, risen by their scientific knowledges regarding their profession, may be subjected to the filter of intensive mothers.

This distrust and gatekeeping toward the early childhood professions might be the signs of the prestige of early childhood profession in the society. That is why, these beliefs of intensive parenting were predicted, or reinforced, socially by comparison and competition drives of mothers alongside of celebrity mothers in media within the current study. Although the proximal sources are the first reference tools to gather information to utilize them in comparison and competition, media representations are influential in this process too. These comparison would result in pressures
toward accepting the dominant cultural messages in media. The perceptions toward
the prestige of early childhood profession might be considered within this scope.
That is, there might be a lack of respect within the society for the profession. To
better assess the issue, media contents should be investigated with respect to the
place of early childhood field.

The aforementioned gendered and harmful beliefs and their negative, even
dangerous, reflections might indicate even more dangerous consequences to the
society. According to McLuhan (1964), the world has turned out to be a global
village, which connects the societies with each other all over the world. Although the
current study findings may be generalized only to the population of Manisa, this
globalization may indicate the spread of such harmful beliefs. Supporting this notion,
intensive motherhood ideologies’ components and media representations role on the
issue have been proven in variety of nations like Korean (Chae, 2015), Canadian
(Wall, 2013), English (Pederson, 2016), Turkish (Uğurlu, 2013; the current study).

It is not to wholly discredit the globalization, but to warn about the risky sides of it.
Afterall, being motivated to engagement in children’s education in would be
beneficial for children, education, and eventually the larger society. This might be
the first step of family engagement within the parents’ side. However, in the second
step, as the study findings implied, the nature of the engagement of the contemporary
mothers might be in an undesirable way with respect to the field professionals.

### 5.3. Educational Implications for Practice

Family engagement has a multidimensional and interactive nature. Although
generally schools, teachers, and families are discussed as the main counterparts of
the engagement process, the study findings suggested that larger society have
influence in the process with media representations in today’s global and
technological world. In other words, education of children includes the stakeholders
from wider societal systems, making contributions to children’s outcomes within the
framework of family engagement. The core question is whether these contributions
are always positive and beneficial. In the current study, the question was based on
the facilitators of motivators of mothers’ engagement decisions.

The contemporary motherhood belief systems, which is mainly constructed by media
representations, reinforce the motivators of why mothers engage in the education of
children. That is, contemporary mothers have tendency to act in accordance with
their responsibility to be committed to work with other stakeholders in the education
of their children, which indicates positive developmental outcomes for children. In
detail, they may be aware of their roles and importance in the process. This
awareness would increase the quality of family engagement if it is perceived by
teachers and schools. Moreover, according to the findings, social comparison and
competition attitudes of mothers are associated with low self-efficacies indicating
their doubt toward being effective in assisting their children’s learning and toward
making positive difference in the process. Since their low self-efficacy would result
in the decrease in the incidences of their engagement behaviors, teachers should be
alert to the parents who compare themselves with other parents in school. When such
parents were recognized, teachers’ role in contributing their self-efficacy levels
would be empowering those parents to focus on their own strengths in family
engagement process. Teachers might accomplish this role in communicating with
them, arranging some activities that would show the parent how valuable their efforts
are, etc.

Furthermore, mainly school administrators and teachers are emphasized as the ones
that should make efforts to invite and assist families to involve the education process
of children. Even in the case of child invitations, Walker et al. (2005) and Hoover-
Dempsey et al. (2005b) discussed the role of schools’ and teachers’ encouragements
to children to trigger their invitations for their families to engage in. However, the
findings suggested that some parent characteristics like intensive motherhood beliefs
might be a factor initiating a tendency to disregard schools’ and teachers’ invitations
no matter how they effort to work with families. That is, families might not utilize
the invitations of schools and teachers even if they recognized them. As discussed
before, there is a good chance that some of the contemporary parents underestimate
the early childhood profession and even have distrust toward schools and teachers. These beliefs may be crucial barriers for quality education that should be overcome immediately.

As it was discussed before, mass media has an impact on homogenization of the perceptions of the society (Harris & Sanborn, 2014), which might be evidenced in the findings of the current study within the association model of media exposures with contemporary motherhood beliefs. Hence, the underestimation or distrusting beliefs might be a danger for the wider society although there is a need to assess such issue in detail within a nationwide study. Thus, it might be difficult to overcome the barriers resulting from these beliefs by only school-based efforts. In fact, the projects whose target group are wider society, and the projects conducted in schools might be worthy efforts for the improvements in education quality, which would eventually contribute to the development of the whole society. In the projects, the value of early childhood profession, the duties, responsibilities and capabilities of teachers, how the education programs are constructed and implemented should be provided to target group in order to empower them to reform their perceptions regarding the experts in early childhood institutions.

Additionally, preservice early childhood teachers should be empowered to hold-on the prestige of their own profession. That is why, teachers are the primary ones who can directly display the importance of their both scientific and experiential knowledges regarding their field to the parents. Thus, it is crucial to equip preservice teachers, as the teachers of the near future, in accordance with how to show and maintain their stance regarding the professionality of their jobs as their stance might be perceived by parents and change their attitudes.

As discussed before, contemporary dominant motherhood beliefs perceive children as passive, vulnerable, and absence of agency and independence in the public area (Lareau, 2003; Rosier & Kinney, 2005; Caputo, 2007; Rutherford, 2009; Hoffman, 2010), which was associated with mothers’ responsiveness to child invitations among other school and teacher invitations. This perspective might impede the social development of children, referring the process of learning interacting and
communicating with others, handling the conflict with peers, understanding the sense of self in social environment, etc. (Berk, 2008). In preschool institutions, the teachers should be aware of such beliefs of contemporary parents and include the issue into their communication agenda with parents when they realized some parents with similar perspective.

The last thing grasping attention is that the results evidenced that media representations have a role in family engagement. Unfortunately, the obsession of media in terms of childrearing issues is motherhood, not the fatherhood. However, it was well proven in literature that fathers’ engagement is crucial (Bulanda, 2004; Rane & McBride, 2000). Moreover, intensive motherhood is a gendered belief of society (Hays, 1996), which possibly result in gatekeeping behaviors toward fathers. Thus, media representations and mothers’ attitudes might be a barrier for father engagement, which should be investigated in further studies.

Overall, the study suggested policy makers, teachers and schools to be aware of a paradox of the globalization with mass media: the contemporary mothers have a desire to be committed to engage in their children’s education; at the same time, they have tendencies to be gatekeepers for other stakeholders of education like teachers, schools, or fathers. Within this sense, it is important to regenerate the role beliefs of mothers with the dominant societal ideologies. This could be achieved with some role construction projects parents in which the parents’, especially mothers’, engagement enthusiasm is canalized a more collaborative and respective behaviors toward other stakeholders to achieve quality family engagement which increase strength of education.

5.4. Recommendations for Future Studies

The first aim of the study was to validate the Turkish versions of the scales regarding media exposures to celebrity mothers and childrearing information and maternal belief systems of social comparison, competitiveness and intensive motherhood. The scales are properly applicable to the participants living in Manisa, for some of the scales in
Etimesgut, Ankara. A further study could be conducted from other regions of Turkey in order to generalize the utilization of the scales to mothers in Turkey.

The study was conducted to explore the relationship of the media exposures and maternal belief systems of interest with the motivators of family engagement as well as the operation of the internal mechanism of media and maternal belief systems. The canonical correlation models revealed the nature of the relationships between the variables. A further study could be conducted combining the canonical results of the study in a structural equation model, whose paths were discussed throughout the discussion section.

In order to better understand the possible reasons of the findings of the study, some qualitative analyses might be conducted. To begin with, a content analysis assessing the childrearing information and celebrity mother messages on media might contribute to literature to better understand the content related differences in the current study findings like celebrity mother impact. Moreover, in-depth case studies might be conducted to confirm and deeply examine the implications of the findings. The difference between school community parenting identity and general parenting identity, parents’ teacher disregarding tendencies, maternal beliefs systems role on the engagement motivators, teachers’ experiences with respect to parents’ intensive, competitive and comparison attitudes, and the underlying aspects of higher education levels affecting unintensified motherhood beliefs might be investigated in further case studies.

The analysis regarding the predictors of intensive motherhood revealed a change in the direction of celebrity mother exposures compared to other studies in literature (e.g. Chae, 2015). A three block hierarchical regression analysis might be utilized in further studies. The demographic variables might be in the first block, the media exposures might be in the second block and comparison and competition might be in the third block of the analysis.

As discussed before, the findings of the study implied potential barriers to family engagement process like low self-efficacies driven by comparison and competition
attitudes, gatekeeping behaviors toward father engagement, distrusts toward teachers and schools. Thus, mix method design might be utilized to assess such barriers in detail.

Throughout the thesis, media’s impact on homogenization of the societies’ viewpoint repeatedly mentioned. A cross-cultural study within different regions of Turkey and within international samples might provide more direct and valuable information on the issues regarding media’s impact on family engagement process and maternal belief system formation process.

5.5. Limitations of the Study

The current study had several limitations that should be taken into consideration while evaluating the results. Since the data collected in the province of Manisa, Turkey, the findings could not be generalized other cities of Turkey. Also, convenient sampling technique would limit the representativeness of the sample. Furthermore, self-reported assessment tools were utilized for data collection, which might include biased responses of some participants.

Moreover, some overlap might exist between celebrity mother exposure and childrearing information exposure variables. To illustrate, the exposures of celebrity mothers might contain childrearing information at the same time. In addition, the definition of celebrity mothers may not be clearly comprehended by some of the participants. Any content they exposed, regarding their motherhood such as how beautiful they are after several months from birth, was meant to assess exposure to celebrities, including writers, singers, social media influencers, etc. However, some of the representations might be subliminal and participants may not be aware of them since their focus would be entertaining roles of celebrities.

Lastly, intensive mothering ideology is connected with neoliberalism underscoring social investment as well as risk management (Brabazon, 2014; Wall, 2013); that is why, good investment perceived as empowering children to reach their full potential to turn them into good citizens and prevent the society from possible future risks
coming from them (Jenson, 2001). This perspective has directed people to the market instead of preventing them for social safety (Jensen & Saint-Martin, 2003). In this sense, one of the market branches have become education (Caputo, 2007; Wall, 2013), whose clients especially the parents with beliefs regarding intensive parenting performances (Caputo, 2007). Thus, the parents with children attending private kindergartens was likely to endorse intensive ideologies. As discussed in Section 3.3.1, the majority of data collected from public schools due to involuntary attitudes of private schools to participate. The findings should be interpreted within the consideration of this limitation.
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APPENDICES

A: ORIGINAL VERSIONS OF MATERNAL BELIEF SYSTEM SCALES

Mother’s Social Comparison Orientation Scale (Chae, 2015); Response Anchors: from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

1) I often compare how my little one is doing with how other kids are doing
2) I always pay a lot of attention to how I do as a mother compared with what other mothers do.
3) If I want to find out how well I have done as a mother, I compare what I have done with what other mothers have done
4) I often like to talk with other mothers about mutual opinions and experiences
5) I always like to know what other mothers in a similar situation would do
6) If I want to learn more about mothering, I try to find out what other mothers think about it.

Mother’s Social Comparison Orientation Scale (Chae, 2015); Response Anchors: from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

1) It is important to me to perform better than other mothers
2) I feel winning is important in mothering
3) It annoys me when other mothers perform better than I do
4) I try harder when I am in competition with other mothers

Endorsement of Intensive Mothering Ideology Scale (Chae, 2015); Response Anchors: from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

1) Women are the best primary caretakers of children
2) Women have to devote all her time and energy to her children
3) Childrearing requires expert level knowledge
4) Childrearing requires high cost
5) Giving up one’s career to become a better mother is rewarding
6) I feel guilty for not being a better mother
B: ORIGINAL VERSIONS OF FAMILY ENGAGEMENT SCALES

PARENTS’ MOTIVATIONAL BELIEFS REGARDING THEIR INVOLVEMENT

Parental Role Construction for Involvement in The Child’s Education Scale

Part 1. Parental Role Activity Beliefs for Involvement in the Child’s Education Scale

Instructions to respondent

Please indicate how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each of the following statements. Please think about the current school year as you consider each statement.

Response format

All items in the scale use a six-point response format (disagree very strongly to agree very strongly):

1 = Disagree very strongly;
2 = Disagree;
3 = Disagree just a little;
4 = Agree just a little;
5 = Agree;
6 = Agree very strongly.

I believe it is my responsibility to…

1. …volunteer at the school.
2. …communicate with my child’s teacher regularly.
3. …help my child with homework.
4. …make sure the school has what it needs.
5. …support decisions made by the teacher.
6. …stay on top of things at school.
7. …explain tough assignments to my child.
8. …talk with other parents from my child’s school.
9. …make the school better.
10. …talk with my child about the school day
Part 2. Valence toward School

People have different feelings about school. Please mark the number on each line below that best describes your feelings about your school experiences when you were a student.

Items

My school
Disliked 1 2 3 4 5 6 liked
My teachers:
were mean 1 2 3 4 5 6 were nice
My teachers:
ignored me 1 2 3 4 5 6 cared about me
My school experience:
bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 good
I felt like:
an outsider 1 2 3 4 5 6 I belonged
My overall experience:
failure 1 2 3 4 5 6 success

Parental Self-Efficacy for Helping the Child Succeed in School Scale

Instructions to respondent

Please indicate how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each of the following statements. Please think about the current school year as you consider each statement.

Response format

All items in the scale use a six-point response format (disagree very strongly to agree very strongly):

1 = Disagree very strongly;
2 = Disagree;
3 = Disagree just a little;
4 = Agree just a little;
5 = Agree;
6 = Agree very strongly.

Items

1. I know how to help my child do well in school.
2. I don't know if I'm getting through to my child. (reversed)
3. I don't know how to help my child make good grades in school. (reversed)
4. I feel successful about my efforts to help my child learn.
5. Other children have more influence on my child’s grades than I do. (reversed)
6. I don’t know how to help my child learn. (reversed)
7. I make a significant difference in my child’s school performance.

PARENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF INVITATIONS FOR INVOLVEMENT FROM OTHERS

Parental Perceptions of General Invitations for Involvement from the School Scale

Instructions to respondent

Please indicate how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each of the following statements. Please think about the current school year as you consider each statement.

Response format

All items in the scale use a six-point response format (disagree very strongly to agree very strongly):

1 = Disagree very strongly;
2 = Disagree;
3 = Disagree just a little;
4 = Agree just a little;
5 = Agree;
6 = Agree very strongly.

Items

1. Teachers at this school are interested and cooperative when they discuss my child.
2. I feel welcome at this school.
3. Parent activities are scheduled at this school so that I can attend.
4. This school lets me know about meetings and special school events.
5. This school’s staff contacts me promptly about any problems involving my child.
6. The teachers at this school keep me informed about my child’s progress in school.
Parental Perceptions of Specific Invitations for Involvement from the Child Scale

Instructions to respondent

Please indicate HOW OFTEN the following have happened SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THIS SCHOOL YEAR.

Response format

All items in the scale use a six-point response format (never to daily):

1 = never;
2 = 1 or 2 times;
3 = 4 or 5 times;
4 = once a week;
5 = a few times a week;
6 = daily.

Items

1. My child asked me to help explain something about his or her homework.
2. My child asked me to supervise his or her homework.
3. My child talked with me about the school day.
4. My child asked me to attend a special event at school.
5. My child asked me to help out at the school.
6. My child asked me to talk with his or her teacher.

Parental Perceptions of Specific Invitations for Involvement from the Teacher Scale

Instructions to respondent

Please indicate HOW OFTEN the following have happened SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THIS SCHOOL YEAR.

Response format

All items in the scale use a six-point response format (never to daily):

1 = never;
2 = 1 or 2 times;
3 = 4 or 5 times;
4 = once a week;
5 = a few times a week;
6 = daily.
Items

1. My child's teacher asked me or expected me to help my child with homework.
2. My child's teacher asked me or expected me to supervise my child's homework.
3. My child's teacher asked me to talk with my child about the school day.
4. My child's teacher asked me to attend a special event at school.
5. My child's teacher asked me to help out at the school.
6. My child's teacher contacted me (for example, sent a note, phoned, e-mailed).

PARENTS’ SELF-PERCEIVED LIFE CONTEXT

Parental Perceptions of Personal Time and Energy Scale

Instructions to respondent

Please indicate how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each of the following statements with regard to the current school year.

Response format

All items in the scale use a six-point response format (disagree very strongly to agree very strongly):

1 = Disagree very strongly;
2 = Disagree;
3 = Disagree just a little;
4 = Agree just a little;
5 = Agree;
6 = Agree very strongly.

Items

I have enough time and energy to…
1. … communicate effectively with my child about the school day.
2. … help out at my child's school.
3. … communicate effectively with my child's teacher.
4. … attend special events at school.
5. … help my child with homework.
6. … supervise my child's homework.
Parental Perceptions of Personal Knowledge and Skills Scale

Instructions to respondent

Please indicate how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each of the following statements with regard to the current school year.

Response format

All items in the scale use a six-point response format (disagree very strongly to agree very strongly):

1 = Disagree very strongly;
2 = Disagree;
3 = Disagree just a little;
4 = Agree just a little;
5 = Agree;
6 = Agree very strongly.

Items

1. I know about volunteering opportunities at my child's school.
2. I know about special events at my child's school.
3. I know effective ways to contact my child's teacher.
4. I know how to communicate effectively with my child about the school day.
5. I know how to explain things to my child about his or her homework.
6. I know enough about the subjects of my child's homework to help him or her.
7. I know how to communicate effectively with my child's teacher.
8. I know how to supervise my child's homework.
9. I have the skills to help out at my child's school.
C: TURKISH VERSIONS OF THE SCALES

1. Yaşınız: …………

2. Mezuniyet dereceniz nedir?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Okur-yazar değil</th>
<th>İlkokul</th>
<th>Ortaokul</th>
<th>Lise</th>
<th>Üniversite</th>
<th>Yüksek Lisans ve Doktora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Çalışma durumunuz nedir?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çalışıyorum</th>
<th>Çalışmyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Allenizin aylık ortalama gelir düzeyi nedir?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1000 TL den az</th>
<th>1001-2000 TL arası</th>
<th>2001-3000 TL arası</th>
<th>3001-5000 TL arası</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Sahip olduğunuz çocuk sayısı belirtiniz:………

6. Çocuklarınızın (çocuğunuzun) doğum yıllarını yazınız: ………… (Bu durumda birden fazla çocuğunuz varsa anketi tek bir çocuğunu düşünerek yanıtlayınız.)

7. Okul öncesi eğitim kurumuna devam eden çocuğunuzun yaş: …………

1. ANNELİK DAVRANIŞLARI VE OLUŞUM SÜREÇLERİ

(Yönerge: Lütfen, SON 6 AY içinde aşağıdaki ifadeleri NE SIKLIKLA gerçekleştirdiğinizi HIÇBİR ZAMAN ile HER ZAMAN arasında size uygun olan dereceye göre belirtiniz. (1=Hiçbir zaman, 2=Nadiren, 3=Ara sıra, 4=Sık sık, 5=Her zaman)


1. İnternette çocuk yetiştirme için faydali olabilecek bilgiler dikkatine çeker.

2. Yazılı basında (dergi, gazete, vb.) çocuğunu yetiştirirken yararlı olabilecek yazılardaki yorumlara okurum.

3. İnternette çocuklara ilgili bilgileri annelerin blogları, facebook/twitter/instagram gibi sosyal paylaşım platformları gibi kaynaklardan edinirim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiçbir zaman</th>
<th>Nadiren</th>
<th>Ara sıra</th>
<th>Sık sık</th>
<th>Her zaman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Televizyon programlarında çocuk yetiştirirken kullanabileceğim bilgiler veren yayınlar **dikkatimi çeker.**

5. Internette çocuk yetiştirmek için faydalı olabilecek bilgileri uzmanların siteleri, resmi kuruluşların resmi web sayfaları gibi kaynaklardan **edinirim.**

6. Radyoda çocuk bakımı ile ilgili bilgiler veren programları **dinlerim.**

7. İrtibat halinde olduğum insanlarla çocuk bakımı ile ilgili konularda iletişim **kurarım.**

8. Çocuklarla ilgili bilgiler veren televizyon programlarını **izlerim.**

**Bölüm 2: ÜNLÜ ANNELER**

sosyal medya, TV, internet, radyo gibi medya kanalları aracılığıyla meşhur olan, toplumda birçok kişi tarafından bilinen annelerdir (sanaçlar, yazarlar, eğitimciler, modaclar, sosyal medya ünlüleri, vb).

1. Ünlü annelerin olduğu televizyon programlarını **izlerim.**

2. İnternet ortamında ünlü annelerin bulduğu içerikler dikkatimi **çeker.**

3. Sosyal paylaşım platformlarında (instagram, facebook, vb.) ünlü anneleri **takip ederim.**

4. Çocuklarla ilgili **uzmanlığa sahip** ünlü annelerin internetteki içeriklerini (makaleler, videolar, vb.) **incelerim.**

5. Ünlü annelerin blog yazlarını **okurum.**

6. Çocuklarla ilgili **uzmanlığa sahip** ünlü annelerin internetteki içeriklerini **takip ederim.**

7. Yazılı basında ünlü annelerle ilgili yazılanları **okurum.**

8. Yazılı basında (gazete, dergi, kitap, vb.) ünlü annelerle ilgili içerikler **dikkatimi çeker**

9. Ünlü annelerin konuk olduğu radyo programlarını **dinlerim.**

**Yönerge:**

Lütfen, aşağıdaki ifadelere ne ölçüde **KATILDIĞINIZI ya da KATILMADIĞINIZI belirtiniz.** (1: Kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 2: Katılmıyorum, 3: Kararsızım, 4: Katılıyorum, 5: Kesinlikle katılıyorum)

1. Kendi çocuğumun yaptıklarını diğer çocukların yaptıklarıyla sık sık karşılaştırırım.
2. Başka annelere bakarak neyse anlamanınشرف ederim.
3. Eğer ne derecede iyi bir anne olduğunu anlamanı istersem, kendi yaptıklarımı diğer annelerin yaptıklarıyla karşılaştırırım.
4. Diğer annelerle ortak fikirlerimiz ve deneyimlerimiz hakkında sık sık konuşmayı severim.
5. Diğer annelerin benim karşlaştığım duruma benzer durumlarla karşılaştıklarında ne yaptıklarını her zaman bilmek isterim
6. Annelik hakkında daha çok şey öğrenmek istersem, diğer annelerin annelikle ilgili ne düşündüğünü anlamaya çalışırım.
**Bölüm 2:** Bu ölçek çevrenizdeki diğer annelere bakış açısını anlamak amacıyla hazırlanmıştır.

1. Yaptığım işi diğer annelerden daha iyi yapmak benim için önemlidir.
2. Annelik söz konusu olduğunda, diğer annelere kıyaslara daha başarılı olmak önemlidir.
3. Diğer anneler bir şeylerı benden daha iyi yaptığında gergin hissedermem.

**Bölüm 3:** Bu ölçek, sizlerin annelik inanılarınızı anlamayı amaçlamaktadır.

1. Kadınlar, çocukların bakımını sağlayan en iyi ve en önemli kişilerdir.
2. Kadınlar bütün zamanlarını ve enerjilerini çocuklarına adamaktadır.
3. Üstaca çocuk yetiştirme, araştırma yapmak ve bilgi edinmek gerektirir.
4. Çocuk yetiştirme mesrafı bir birدير.
5. Daha yeterli bir anne olabilmek için kariyerinden vazgeçmek istenir.
6. Anneler daha iyi bir anne olamadıkları için kendilerini suçlu hissederler.

---

2. **ANNELERİN AİLE KATILIMI İLE İLGİLİ GÜDÜSEL İNANÇLARI**

(Açıklaması bir sonraki sayfada verilen soruları da, aşağıdaki yönergiyi kullanarak cevaplayınız.)

**Yönerge:**
Lütfen, ÇOCUĞUNUZUN şu anki yaşantısını göz önünde bulundurarak aşağıdaki her bir ifadeye ne ölçüde KATILDIĞINIZIN ya da KATILMADIĞINIZIN belirtiniz.

**Bölüm 1:** Çocuğun Okulda Başarısına Yardımcı Olmak İçin Anne-Baba Özyeterlik Ölçeği

1. Çocuğuma okulda başarılı olması için nasıl yardım edebileceğimi biliyorum.
2. Çocuğumla etkili iletişim kurabildiğimden emin değilim.
3. Okulda başarılı olabilmek için çocuğuma nasıl yardımcı olacağımı biliyorum.
5. Çocuğumun okulda başarılı olması için saygısını ve hürmetini benimle paylaştığını biliyorum.
6. Çocuğum okul performansında önemli bir fark yaratıyorum.

**Bölüm 2:** Aile Katılımı için Annelik-Babalık Rolünün Çocuğun Eğitiminde Etkinlik Derecesi İnançları Ölçeği

1. Okulda gösterdiği performansı, çocukumun benim sorumluﲣ olduğunu inanıyorum.
2. Çocuğumun öğrenme ve gelişiminde etki etmesi, benim sorumluخلق olduğunu inanıyorum.
3. Çocuğuma verilen ev etkinliklerine (ev ödevlerine) yardımcı olmamın benim sorumluخلق olduğunu inanıyorum.
4. Okulun ihtiyaç duyduğu şeylere sahip olup olmadığını bilmenin benim sorumluluğuma inanıyorum.
5. Öğretmen tarafından alınan kararları desteklemenin benim sorumluluğunu inanıyorum.
6. Okula olan bireyler hakkında bilgi sahibi olmanın benim sorumluluğunu inanıyorum.
7. Zor ev etkinliklerini (ev ödevlerini) çocuğuma açıklamanın benim sorumluluğunu inanıyorum.
8. Öğretmen tarafından alınan kararları desteklemenin benim sorumluluğunu inanıyorum.
10. Okulda geçirdiği gün hakkında çocukumla konuşmanın benim sorumluluğunu inanıyorum.

(Açıklaması bir sonraki sayfa başında verilen soruları da, aşağıdaki yönergeyi kullanarak cevaplayınız.)

**Yönerge:**
Lütfen, **ÇOCUĞUNUZUN** şu anki okul yaşantısını göz önünde bulundurarak aşağıdaki her bir ifadeye ne ölçüde **KATILDIĞINIZI** ya da **KATILMADIĞINIZI** belirtiniz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zaman</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Çocuğumla okulda geçirdiği günle ilgili etkili bir biçimde iletişim kurmak için yeterli zamanım var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Çocuğuma okulunda yardımcı olmak için yeterli zamanım var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Çocuğumun öğretmeniyle etkili bir biçimde iletişim kurmak için yeterli zamanım var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Okulda düzenlenen çeşitli özel etkinliklere katılmak için yeterli zamanım var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Çocuğuma verilen ev etkinliklerinde (ev ödevlerinde) yardım etmek için yeterli zamanım var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Çocuğum, verilen ev etkinliklerini (ev ödevlerini) yaparken yanında olmak ve yaptıklarını kontrol etmek için yeterli zamanım var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enerji</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Çocuğumla okulda geçirdiği günle ilgili etkili bir biçimde iletişim kurmak için yeterli enerjim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Çocuğuma okulunda yardımcı olmak için yeterli enerjim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Çocuğumun öğretmeniyle etkili bir biçimde iletişim kurmak için yeterli enerjim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Okulda düzenlenen çeşitli özel etkinliklere katılmak için yeterli enerjim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Çocuğuma verilen ev etkinliklerinde (ev ödevlerinde) yardım etmek için yeterli enerjim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Çocuğum, verilen ev etkinliklerini (ev ödevlerini) yaparken yanında olmak ve yaptıklarını kontrol etmek için yeterli enerjim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İstek</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Çocuğumla okulda geçirdiği günle ilgili etkili bir biçimde iletişim kurmak için yeterli isterim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Çocuğuma okulunda yardımcı olmak için yeterli isterim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Çocuğumun öğretmeniyle etkili bir biçimde iletişim kurmak için yeterli isterim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Okulda düzenlenen çeşitli özel etkinliklere katılmak için yeterli isterim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Çocuğuma verilen ev etkinliklerinde (ev ödevlerinde) yardım etmek için yeterli isterim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Çocuğum, verilen ev etkinliklerini (ev ödevlerini) yaparken yanında olmak ve yaptıklarını kontrol etmek için yeterli isterim var.</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kararsızım</td>
<td>Katılıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bölüm 4: Anne-Babaların Kişisel Bilgi ve Becerilerine Yönelik Algıları Ölçeği**
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1. Çocuğumun okulundaki günlük çalışma olanaklarını biliyorum.
2. Okulda düzenlendenen çeşitli özel etkinliklerden haberim var.
3. Çocuğumun öğretmeniyle iletişimin kurmak için etkili yollar hakkında bilgi sahibiyim.
4. Çocuğumla okulda geçirdiği günle ilgili konuşmak için nasılsındaki iletişim kurulumun bilinir.
5. Verilen ev etkinlikleri (ev ödevleri) ile ilgili şeylerini çocuğuma nasıl açıklayacağı biliyorum.
6. Verilen ev etkinliklerindeki (ev ödevlerindeki) konular hakkında çocuğuma yardımcı etmek için yeterince bilgi sahibiyim.
7. Çocuğumun öğretmeniyle etkili bir iletişimin nasıl kurulacağını bilinir.
8. Verilen ev etkinliklerini (ev ödevlerini) çocuğum yaparken nasıl yardımcı ve yardımcı olmak için kontrol edeceğini bilinir.
9. Çocuğuma okulunda yardımcı olmak için becerilerim var.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bölüm 5: Anne Babaların Okuldan Gelen Aile Katılımı Daveti Alışverisi Olçüğü</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bu okulda öğretmenler çocuk hakkında benimle görüşürken ilgi ve işbirliğine açktır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bu okulda hayatı karşılandımı hissedirim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bu okulda öğretmeniyle önceden planlanmış zamanlarda yapıldığı için katılabiliriz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bu okulun personeli çocuklara ilgili herhangi bir problemde benimle hemen iletişimi kurar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bu okulusunda öğretmenler çocukunun okulda olduğu sürece ilgili beni sürekli olarak bilgilendirir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yönergeler:**
Lütfen, bu eğitim yılının başlangıcından itibaren, aşağıdakilerin NE (Hiçbir zaman, 1= 1-2 defa, 2= 4-5 defa, 3= Haftada 1 defa, 4= Haftada birkaç defa, 5= her gün) gerçekleştiğini belirtiniz.

| Bölüm 1: Anne Babaların Özel Olarak Çocuklardan Gelen Aile Katılımı Daveti Alışverisi Olçüğü |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Çocuğum, verilen ev etkinlikleri (ev ödevleri) hakkında bir şeyi açıklamak için yardımımı istedi. |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Çocuğum verilen ev etkinlikleri (ev ödevleri) yaparken yanında olmamı ve yaptıkları kontrol etmemi istedi. |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Çocuğum okulda geçirdiği gün ile ilgili benimle konuştu. |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Çocuğum benden okulda özel bir etkinliğe katılmasını istedi. |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Çocuğum okula ona yardımcı etmemi istedi. |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Çocuğum öğretmeni ile konuşmasını istedi. |  |  |  |  |

**Bölüm 2: Anne Babaların Özel Olarak Öğretmenden Gelen Aile Katılımı Daveti Alışverisi Olçüğü**

| Çocuğunun öğretmeni... |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Çocuğum verilen ev etkinliklerine (ev ödevlerine) yardımcı etmemi istedi. |  |  |  |
| 2. Beni çocuku verilen ev etkinliklerine (ev ödevlerine) yaparken çocuğumun yanında olmamı ve yaptıklarını kontrol etmemi istedi. |  |  |  |
| 3. Beni çocuku verilen ev etkinliklerine (ev ödevlerine) yaparken çocuğumun yanında olmamı ve yaptıklarını kontrol etmemi istedi. |  |  |  |
| 4. Beni çocuku özel bir etkinliğe davet etti. |  |  |  |
| 5. Okula işlere yardımcı olmamı istedi. |  |  |  |
D: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR PILOT STUDY SAMPLE

Table A.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>494</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32.94</td>
<td>4.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recency of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employed</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Family Income</td>
<td>less than 1000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3001-5000</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5001 and more</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 479
### E: FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS OF PILOT DATASET

**Table A.2.**

**EFA Results for Media Exposure to Childrearing Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Component Matrix</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mREAR1</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.337</td>
<td>41.717</td>
<td>41.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR2</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>13.816</td>
<td>55.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR3</td>
<td><strong>.271</strong></td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>10.279</td>
<td>65.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR4</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>9.123</td>
<td>74.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR5</td>
<td><strong>.290</strong></td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>8.720</td>
<td>83.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR6</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>7.062</td>
<td>90.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR7</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>4.797</td>
<td>95.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR8</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>4.486</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A.3.**

**EFA Results for Competitive Attitudes Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Component Matrix</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP1</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.954</td>
<td>48.860</td>
<td>48.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP2</td>
<td><strong>.185</strong></td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>25.244</td>
<td>74.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP4</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>11.834</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A.4.**

**EFA for Endorsement of Intensive Motherhood Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix</th>
<th>Structure Matrix</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE1</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td><strong>.514</strong></td>
<td><strong>.450</strong></td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>34.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE2</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>17.321</td>
<td><strong>51.758</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE3</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE4</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>13.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE5</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>11.630</td>
<td>90.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE6</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>9.121</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## F: RELIABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS

Table A.5.

*Childrearing Information Exposure Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mREAR1</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>24.964</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR2</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>27.017</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR3</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>27.894</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR4</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>26.381</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR5</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>25.592</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR6</td>
<td>23.39</td>
<td>27.569</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR7</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>26.856</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR8</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>26.622</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.6.

*Celebrity Mother Exposure Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM1</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>36.693</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM2</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>34.024</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM3</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>34.670</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM4</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>33.940</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM5</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>37.865</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM6</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>33.172</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM7</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>34.950</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM8</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>34.563</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM9</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>34.482</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table A.7.

*Mother’s Social Comparison Orientation Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</td>
<td>Squared Multiple Correlation</td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO1</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>16.437</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO2</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>13.492</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO3</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>14.378</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO4</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>16.280</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO5</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>16.244</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO6</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>14.978</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.8.

*Mother’s Competitive Attitudes Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</td>
<td>Squared Multiple Correlation</td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP1</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>6.219</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP2</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>8.376</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP3</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>7.657</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP4</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>5.852</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.9.

**Intensive Motherhood Ideology Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Pilot Study)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Tot al Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Inter-Item Correlations Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE1</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>14.246</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE2</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>11.686</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE3</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>12.194</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE4</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>13.214</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE5</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>11.780</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE6</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>14.381</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.10.

**Childrearing Information Exposure Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Tot al Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Inter-Item Correlations Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mREAR1</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>27.261</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR2</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>28.466</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR3</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>27.258</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR4</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>27.863</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR5</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>26.321</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR6</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>30.159</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR7</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>29.391</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mREAR8</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>28.766</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.11.

**Celebrity Mother Exposure Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM1</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>51.806</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM2</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>48.973</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM3</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>47.823</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM4</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>47.703</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM5</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>47.301</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM6</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>47.360</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM7</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>49.197</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM8</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>48.770</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mFAMOM9</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>53.989</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.12.

**Mother’s Social Comparison Orientation Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCO1</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>16.469</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO2</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>14.574</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO3</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>14.748</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO4</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>17.980</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO5</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>16.235</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO6</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>15.675</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table A.13.

*Mother’s Competitiveness Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMP1</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>9.557</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP2</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>9.284</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP3</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>11.619</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP4</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>10.019</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.14.

*Intensive Motherhood Ideology Scale’s Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE1</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>13.518</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE2</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>11.687</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE3</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>13.463</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE4</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>13.289</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE5</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>12.763</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSE6</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>13.142</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.15.

*Motivators of Family Engagement Scales’ Reliability Analysis Results (Main Study)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G: TABLES AND FIGURES REGARDING ASSUMPTIONS

**Figure A. 1.** Histograms and Normal Probability Plots of the Media Exposure Variables
Figure A.2. Histograms and Normal Probability Plots of the Maternal Belief System Variables
Figure A.3. Histograms and Normal Probability Plots of the Family Engagement Variables
Figure A.4. Bivariate Plots for RQ 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>invitation</th>
<th>TefTENSE_nom</th>
<th>TedSCC_com</th>
<th>TedCOMP_nom</th>
<th>TedSELFE_nom</th>
<th>TedSELFJ_nom</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Invitation</th>
<th>Life Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure A.5. Bivariate Plots for RQ 3.2
Figure A.6. Bivariate Plots for RQ 4

Table A.16.

Bivariate Correlations for RQ3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Famom</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SCO</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COMP</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.109**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IMI</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. MOT</td>
<td>.139**</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.066*</td>
<td>.094**</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. INV</td>
<td>.086**</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.109**</td>
<td>.191**</td>
<td>.152**</td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. LC</td>
<td>.178**</td>
<td>.089**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.124**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Pearson Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Pearson Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Rear: Childrearing Information Exposure; Famom: Celebrity Mother Exposure; SCO: Social Comparison Orientation; COMP: Competitiveness; IMI: Intensive Motherhood; MOT: Motivational Beliefs; INV: Invitation Perceptions; LC: Life Context Perceptions
Table A.17.

**Bivariate Correlations for RQ3.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Rear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Famom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.SCO</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.COMP</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.IMI</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.RA</td>
<td>.113**</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.173**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.SE</td>
<td>.101**</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.147**</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.147**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.SI</td>
<td>.109**</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.082**</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.074**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.196**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.CI</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.094**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.166**</td>
<td>.113**</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.120**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.TI</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.073**</td>
<td>.170**</td>
<td>.092**</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.TED</td>
<td>.141**</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.106**</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>.451**</td>
<td>.124**</td>
<td>.129**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.KS</td>
<td>.203**</td>
<td>.102**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.123**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.565**</td>
<td>.130**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>.569**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Pearson Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Pearson Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

RA: Role activity Beliefs; SE: Self Efficacies; SI: School Invitation; CI: Child Invitation; TI: Teacher Invitation; TED: Time-Energy-Desire Perception; KS: Perceived Knowledge and Skills

Table A.18.

**Bivariate Correlations for RQ4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Rear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Famom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.IMI</td>
<td>.411**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.R_TV</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>.088**</td>
<td>.091**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.R_IO</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.R_FO</td>
<td>.086**</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.453**</td>
<td>.810**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.R_P</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.R_IC</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.093**</td>
<td>.094**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.R_FV</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.147**</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.F_IO</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.098**</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.680**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.F_FO</td>
<td>.151**</td>
<td>.066**</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.562**</td>
<td>.523**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>.881**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.F_P</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.387**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.272**</td>
<td>.639**</td>
<td>.739**</td>
<td>.704**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Spearman's rho Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Spearman's rho Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

R_TV: Information exposure on TV; R_IO: Information exposure on informal online; R_FO: Information exposure on formal online; R_P: Information exposure on print; R_IC: Information exposure on Interpersonal Communication; F_TV: Celebrity exposure on TV; F_IO: Celebrity exposure on informal online; F_FO: Celebrity exposure on formal online; F_P: Celebrity exposure on print
Figure A.7. Histogram, Probability Plot and Scatterplot for RQ 5

Table A.19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mother's Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. grad_dummy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>.131**</td>
<td>.403**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. income_dummy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td>-1.151**</td>
<td>-1.174**</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recency of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>-1.132**</td>
<td>-1.090**</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.607**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TotRear_nom</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.136**</td>
<td>.180**</td>
<td>-1.148**</td>
<td>-1.122**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TotSCO_nom</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.066**</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TotCOMP_nom</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.104**</td>
<td>-.207**</td>
<td>-.142**</td>
<td>-.189**</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. IM</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.066**</td>
<td>-.192**</td>
<td>-.133**</td>
<td>-.164**</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.064*</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Log_Famom</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.072**</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.065**</td>
<td>.123**</td>
<td>-.149**</td>
<td>-.153**</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.109**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Bivariate Correlations for RQ 5
### H: The Item-Based Frequencies of Media Exposure Variables

Table A.20.

**Item Frequencies of Childrearing Information Exposure on Media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. On the Internet, information that may be useful for raising children attracts my attention.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In print media (magazines, newspapers, etc.), I read information that may be useful for raising children when I see them.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On the internet, I obtain information regarding children from mothers’ blogs, social media platforms like Facebook/ Twitter/Instagram, etc.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In television, broadcasts giving information that I can utilize while raising children grasp my attention.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. On the Internet, I obtain information from beneficial information regarding childrearing from experts’ webpages, formal organizations’ formal web pages, etc.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I communicate with people who I am in contact with regarding childrearing the issues.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I watch television programs giving information about children.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table A.21.

*Item Frequencies of Celebrity Exposure on Media*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I watch television shows with celebrity mothers.</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Web contents including celebrity mothers attract my attention.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I follow celebrity mothers on social media platforms (Instagram, Facebook, etc.)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. On the Internet, I examine the contents (articles, videos, etc.) belong to celebrity mothers who have expertise in children.</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I read the blog posts of celebrity mothers.</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I follow the web contents of celebrity mothers being specialized in children.</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In print media, I read articles about celebrity mothers.</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In print media, articles about celebrity mothers attracts my attention.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I: CONSENT FORM

ARAŞTIRMAYA GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU


Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir?

Araştırma, annelerin sahip oldukları, toplumsal olarak şekillenen annelik ideolojisi ve anelik özellikleri ile okullarda içerisinde bulundukları aile katılımı süreçlerinin ilişkisini incelemek amacıyla yapılmaktadır.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz?

Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz, sizden yaklaşık 25 dakika sürecek olan, anelik davranışlarınızı ve çocuğunuzun eğitimine katılım sürecini belirteceğiniz anketi doldurmanız beklenmektedir.

Sizden Topladığı Bilgileri Nasıl Kullanacağız?


Katılımınızla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:

Çalışma, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular veya uygulamalar içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendini rahatsız hissederseniz çalışmayı yarıda bırakmaktan serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda çalışmayı uygulayan kişi anketi tamamladığınızını söylemek yeterli olacaktır.

Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak istersemiz:

Çalışmanın sonunda, bu çalışmaya ilgili sorularınızı cevaplayacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Temel Eğitim Bölümü öğretim üyelerinden Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hasibe Özlen Demircan (E-posta: dozlen@metu.edu.tr) ya da yüksek lisans öğrencisi Rabia Filik Uyanık (E-posta: rabia.filik@metu.edu.tr) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılmıyorum.

(Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).
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**GİRİŞ**


1995 ve 1997'de Hoover-Dempsey ve Sandler, ailelerin çocukların eğitimlerine katılma nedenlerini, onların katılım türlerini ve katılımın sonucunda edinilen öncelikleri olumlu kazançlar sağlammanın yollarını açıkladıkları bir aile katılım modeli önermişlerdir (Walker, Wilkins, Dallaire, Sandler & Hoover-Dempsey,

Modelin ilk seviyesinde Hoover-Dempsey ve meslektaşları, ailelerin rollerine ve algılara ilişkin verilen kararların toplumsal olarak belirlediği kaynaklarını ya da motivasyonlarını, özellikle de 1) ailelerin motivasyonel inançlarını, 2) diğerlerinden algılanan katılım davetini ve 3) hayat şartları algılarını incelemişlerdir (Walker vd., 2005; Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2007). Bu üç motivasyon kaynakları üst boyutlar olarak incelenirken, bu boyutları oluşturan kaynaklar da modelde şu şekilde sunulmuştur; 1) ailelerin motivasyonel inançlarını oluşturan kaynaklar olarak ailelerin rolü oluşumu, ailelerin öz-yeterliği, 2) diğerlerinden algılanan katılım davetini oluşturan kaynaklar olarak okul, çocuk ve öğretmenlerden algılanan davetleri ve 3) hayat şartları algılarını oluşturan kaynaklar olarak ise, çocukların eğitimi konusuna dair sahip olduklarını zaman, enerji, istek ve bilgi ve becerileri.

deneyimi ile değil, aynı zamanda ailelerin, okulların, toplumun, medyanın vb. ilişki içinde olduğu daha geniş bir sistem ile ilişkilidir.

Daha önce de tartıştığı gibi, medya temsilleri sosyal rollerin uygulamalarını içeren davranışları, inançları ve tutumları şekillendirirken; toplumun sosyal yapıları sosyal ideoloji modellerini, normları ve rolleri içerir. Birlikte ele alındığında, medyanın sosyal yapılar oluşturma gücüne sahip olduğu söylenebilir. Bireylerin medya ile yaşadıkları deneyimler, dünyanın dinamikleri hakkında bilgi edinmelerini sağlar ve bu da daha sonra kişinin tutum ve davranışlarının önemli bir temelini oluşturur (Harris & Sanborn, 2014).


literatüründen yola çıkılarak, medya betimlemelerinin baskı annelik inanışlarına daire olan kültürü yetiştirileceği düşünülebilir.


Sonuç olarak, sosyal karşılaştırmalar, rekabetçilik, yoğun ideolojiler ve medya maruziyetleri arasındaki ilişkiler açıkça.

**Çalışmanın Amacı**

Bu çalışmanın amacı, annelerin çocuklarının eğitim motivasyonlarını belirleyen anlilikle ilişkili faktörleri değerlendiren bir model ortaya koymaktır. Ayrıntılı olarak, çalışma iki ana hedefe odaklanmıştır. Öncelikle, bir okul öncesi eğitim kuruma devam eden 36-72 aylık çocukların anneleri olan annelerin, medya maruziyetleri ve inanç sistemlerinin katılım kararlarının motivasyonlarıyla ilişkisini araştırılmak amaçlanmıştır. İkinci olarak, çalışmanın amacı, sosyal karşılaştırma oryantasyonu, rekabetçi tutumlar ve yoğun anlilik ideolojisi gibi anne inanç sistemleri ve medya maruziyetleri mekanizmalarının kendi içerisindeki işleyişini değerlendirirektir. Amaca uygun olarak, anlilik inanç sistemlerinde medya maruziyetinin belirleyici etkisi ve yoğun anlilik ideolojisinin olası yordayıcıları değerlendirilmiştir. Bu amaçlara uygun olarak, çalışma kapsamında aşağıdaki temel araştırma soruları incelenmiştir:

1. Medya maruziyetleri, sosyal karşılaştırmalar, rekabetçilik ve yoğun anlilik inanç sistemleri kombinasyonu, annelerin katılım kararını motivasyonlarıyla ne ölçüde ilişkilidir?

   1.1. Medya maruziyetinin ve sosyal karşılaştırmaların, rekabet gücünün ve yoğun anlilik ingin inanç sistemlerinin kombinasyonu, annelerin katılım kararının kapsayıcı güdüleyicileri ile ne ölçüde ilişkilidir?
1.2. Medya maruziyetinin ve sosyal karşılaştırmaların, rekabet gücünün ve yoğun annelik inanç sistemlerinin kombinasyonu, annelerin katılım kararının oluşturulan güdüleyicileri ile ne ölçüde ilişkilidir?

2. Sosyal karşılaştırmalar, rekabet gücü ve yoğun annelik inanç sistemlerinin kombinasyonu ile, annelerin medyadaki ünlü annelere ve medyada çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerine maruz kalmaları ile ne ölçüde ilişkilidir?

3. Yoğun annelik ideolojisini, annelerin medyada maruz kaldıkları ünlü annelere ve çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerinden, annelerin sosyal karşılaştırmalarından ve rekabetçi tutumlarından, demografik özelliklerin etkisi kontrol edildikten sonra ne derecede yordamaktadır?

**Çalışmanın Önemi**


Bu durumu göz önünde bulundurarak, maruziyet ve inanç sistemleri; çocukların başarısını arttırmak için annelerin diğer paydaşlarla aktif olarak iş birliği yapma motivasyonlarını yordayacaktır. Özellikle, yoğun anlak inanç sisteminin ve rekabetin sağlıklı doğasını nedeniyle (Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004), analiz sonuçları aile bağlılığının dair olması engelleri işaret edebilir.
YÖNTEM

Çalışmanın Deseni


Örneklem

Bu çalışmaya, Manisa ilinin Yunus Emre, Şehzadeler, Salihli, Turgutlu, ve Kula ilçelerinde 36-72 ay aralığında özel ya da devlet bağımsız okul öncesi eğitim kurumuna devam eden çocukları olan 1046 anne katılmıştır, ancak 1027 katılımcı analizlere dahil edilmiştir. Örneklem, ulaşımın kolaylığı ve gönüllülük ilkesine göre kolayda örneklem yöntemiyle seçilmişdir.

Veri Toplama Araçları

Veri Analizi


BULGULAR

Üst Boyut Katılım Kararları Motivasyonları ile Medya Maruziyet ve Anelik Înanç Sistemleri Arasındaki İlişki

Yapılan KKA’nın sonuçlarına göre, bir annenin medyaya maruz kalmasının ve anelik inanç sistemleri ile annelerin motivaşyonel inançlarının, değerlendirdiğimiz katırm davetlerinin ve hayat şartları algılarının arasında kanonik korelasyon değeri \( R_c .32 \) (yaklaşık %10 örtüşen varyans) olan anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu bulunmuştur (Wilks’s \( \lambda \) = .867, \( F(15, 2813.41) = 9.94, \ p < .001 \)). Artıklik endeksi değerine göre \( R_d \), annelerin katırm kararlarının üç üst boyut değişkenlerinin kombinasyonunun %5.2 varyansı, anelik inanç sistemleri ve medya maruziyetleri kombinasyonu tarafından açıklanmaktadır. Değişkenlerin bu ilişki modelinde yük değerlerine göre, katırm kararlarının üst boyut güdüleyicilerinin her biri birincil yük değerlerine sahiptir \( r_c > .60 \).

Yordayıcı değişkenler arasında, büyük katkı oluşturur yoğun anne ideolojisi \( rs = .84 \), çocuk yetiştirme bilgisine maruz kalma \( rs = .51 \) ve rekabete yönelik tutumlar \( rs = .49 \) birincil katkı yapan değişkenler olmuştur. Sosyal karşılıştırma oryantasyonu ikincil bir katkı \( rs = .31 \) yaparken, medyada ünlü anelere maruz
kalma durumları (rs = .22), kanonik değişken ile anlamlı bir varyans paylaşmamaktadır. Anlamlı yükleme yükleyici değişkenlerinin bulguları, varyantla pozitif ilişkilerini göstermiştir.

Kriter ve yordayıcı değişkenlerin birlikte incelenmesi göstermiştir ki, annelerin yüksek düzeyde rekabet sistemleri, yoğun inanısları, sosyal karşılaştırmalara sahip olmaları ve sık sık çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerine maruz kalmaları durumunda, katılım kararları motivasyonlarına yönelik düzeylerinin arttığı gözlenmiştir.

Üst Boyutu Oluşturulan Katılım Kararları Motivasyonları ile Medya Maruziyeti ve Annelik İnanç Sistemleri Arasındaki İlişki

Katılım kararlarının motivasyonlarını oluşturan değişkenlere yönelik yapılan KKA’ne göre, bütün modelde kriter ve yordayıcı değişken setleri arasında kanonik korelasyon değeri (Rc) .39 (yaklaşık %15 örtüsten varyans) olan anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu bulunmuştur (Wilks’s λ = .763, F (35, 4272.15) = 8.12, p < .001). Artículo endeksinin (Rd) göre, annelerin katılım kararlarının oluşturucu değişkenlerinin kombinasyonunun %3.2 varyansı, anelik inanç sistemleri ve medya maruziyetleri kombinasyonu tarafından açıklanmaktadır. Kriter değişkenleri arasından, annelerin rol etkinliği inançları (r=.85), çocuktan algılanan davet (r=.54), öğretmenden algılanan davet (r=.39), bilgi ve beceri algıları (r=.36) ve zaman/enerji/istek algıları (r=.33) kanonik değişkenle anlamlı olarak yüklenmektedir.

Yordayıcı değişkenler arasında, yoğun anlansal inanısları (r=.86), rekabetçilik tutumları (r=.72) ve sosyal karşılaştırma olayları (r=.56) anlamlı olarak kanonik değişkenle yüklenirken, medyada çocuk yetiştirmeye bilgilerine (r=.29) ve ünlü anılere (r=.20) maruz kalmaları kanonik değişkenle anlamlı olarak ilişkili değildir.

Tüm modele göre, annelerin bağlılık motivasyonlarından olan rol etkinlik inançlarına, çocuktan algılanan davetlere, öğretmenlerden algılanan davetlere, bilgi
ve becerilere yönelik algılara ve zaman / enerji / istek algılarına yönelik olumu tutumları, yüksek düzeydeki anne inanç sistemleri ile ilişkilidir.

**Annelik İnanç Sistemlerinin Medya Maruziyeti İle İlişkisi**

Annelik inanç sistemlerinin medya maruziyeti ile ilişkisini incelemek amacıyla yapılan KKA’ne göre, bütün modelde kriter ve yordayıcı değişken setleri arasında kanonik korelasyon değeri \( R_c = .39 \) (yaklaşık %15 örtüşen varyans) olan anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu bulunmaktadır (Wilks’s \( \lambda = .812 \), \( F(27, 2964.97) = 6.95, p < .001 \)). Artıklık endeksine \( R_d \) göre, annelerin katılım kararlarının oluşturucu değişkenlerinin kombinasyonunun %7.5 varyansı, annelik inanç sistemleri ve medya maruziyetleri kombinasyonu tarafından açıklanmaktadır. Kriter değişkenleri arasından, sosyal karşılaştırma oryantasyonları \( r_s = - .97 \), rekabetçilik tutumları \( r_s = - .60 \) ve yoğun annek inanısları \( r_s = - .41 \) kanonik değişkene anlamlı olarak yüklenmektedir.

Yordayıcı değişkenler arasından, çocuk yetiştirme ile ilgili kurulan kişiler arası iletişim, televizyonda ve yazılı basınında ünlü annelere maruz kalma, çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerine televizyonda maruz kalma, kanonik değişkene birincil katkıda bulunmaktadır \( (r_s > .40) \), hem ünlü annelere hem de çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerine resmi olmayan çevrimiçi ortamda maruz kalmak ikincil katkı sağlamaktadır \( (r_s > .30) \).

Birlikte ele alınındığında, sosyal karşılaştırma oryantasyonları, rekabetin ve yoğun annek inanıklığın yüksek düzeyleri, çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerine televizyon, resmi olmayan çevrimiçi, kişilerarası iletişim medya türlerinden ve ünlü annelere televizyon, resmi olmayan çevrimiçi ve yazılı basın türlerinde siklikla maruz kalınması ile ilişkilidir.

**Yoğun Annelik İdeolojisinin Yordayıcıları**

Yoğun anne ideolojinin demografik değişkenlerin (annenin yaşı, sahip olduğu çocuk sayısı, doğumdaği süslik, eğitim durumu, aylık aile geliri, çalışma durumu) etkisi kontrol edildikten sonra, medyada çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerine ve ünlü annelere maruz kalma, sosyal karşılaştırma oryantasyonları ve rekabetçilik tutumları değişkenlerinin yordayıcı etkisini tahmin etmek için HR kullanılmıştır. Yoğun
annelığın toplam %5 varyansını açıklayan demografik değişkenler ilk adımda modele dahil edilirken; medya, sosyal karşılaştırma ve rekabetçilik değişkenlerinin ikinci adımda modele eklenmesi ile yoğun annelığın toplam %22 varyansı açıklanmıştır, $F(10, 1016) = 28.70$, $p < .001$. İkinci adım değişkenleri, sosyo-demografik özellikleri kontrol ettikten sonra, ideolojideki varyansın %17,2'sini açıklamıştır, $R^2_{\text{change}} = .17$, $F_{\text{change}}(4, 1016) = 56.002$, $p < .001$.

Son modelde, ikinci adım değişkenlerinin yordayıcılığı istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir şekilde bulunmuştur. Diğer tüm değişkenlerin etkisi kontrol edildiğinde, sırası ile rekabetçilik tutumları ($\beta = .332$, $p < .001$), sosyal karşılaştırma oryantasyonları ($\beta = .17$, $p < .001$), ve ünlü annelere medyaya maruz kalma durumları ($\beta = -.08$, $p < .05$) istatistiksel olarak anlamli bir şekilde yoğun annelik ideolojisini açıklamaktadır.

**TARTIŞMA**

**Annelerin Katılım Kararları Motivasyonları İle Medya ve İnanç Sistemlerinin İlişkisi**

Ebeveyn inançlarının, ebeveyn davranışları üzerinde bir güce sahipken (McGillicuddy-De Lisi, 1980; Debaryshe, 1995), medya da insanların inanış ve davranışları üzerinde bir güce sahiptir (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). Buradan yola çıkarak bu çalışmada, annelerin medyaya maruz kaldıkları ve onların sosyal karşıştırma, rekabet ve yoğun annelik inanç sistemlerinin, annelerin çocuklarının eğitim sürecine katılım kararlarına yönelik motivasyonlarını anlamli olarak açıklayacağı varsayılmıştır. Çalışmanın bulgularına göre bu varsayım kanıtlanmıştır.

Öncelikle katılımcıların yoğun annelik ideolojisini ile motivasyonel inançları arasındaki ilişki modelde baskındır. Yoğun annelik, çocuğun eğitim ve gelişimine ilişkin güçlü sorumlulukla ve yoğun bir emeğe inanan, çocuk merkezi, uzman rehberli bir model olarak ele alınmıştır (Hays, 1996; Douglas & Michaels, 2004). Diğer taraftan, motivasyonel inançlar annelerin, çocuklarının eğitim süreçlerine karşı olan sorumluluklarına ve yeteneklerine olan inançlarına karşılık gelmektedir (Walker
Tanımlara göre, mevcut çalışma sonuçları, katılımcıların çocuklarının gelişimine karşı sorumlulukları ile ilgili ideolojik inançlarının, çocukların okul başarısındaki rollerine ilişkin kişisel psikolojik inançları ile ilişkili olduğu yönündeki fikri de desteklemektedir.


Çalışmanın en önemli bulgularından biri, ailelerin diğerlerinden algıladıkları davet motivasyonlarına yönelik olarak bulunmuştur. Rekabet ve karşılaştırma tutumları da dahil olmak üzere çağdaş annelik ideolojileri, uzman söylemleri ve tavsiyeleri

**Annelik İnanç Sistemlerinin Medya İle İlişkisi**

Modelde, sosyal karşılaştırma oryantasyonları ile çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerine kişilerarası iletişimde maruz kalma değişkenlerinin hakimiyeti gözlemmiştir. Bunların yanında, rekabetçilik ve yoğun anlak ile çocuk yetiştirme bilgilerine televizyondan ve resmi olmayan çevrimiçi kaynaklardan maruz kalma ve ünlü annelere televizyonda, yazılı basında, resmi olmayan çevrimiçi kaynaklarda ve resmi çevrimiçi kaynaklarda (zayıf) maruz kalma değişkenleri de modele önemli ölçüde katkıda bulunmuştur.

İletişim sürecinde, verici ve alıcı arasındaki mesajların kodlanması ve çözümlemesi işlemleri, iki yönlü iletişim kurulduğunda daha iyi işlemektedir (Watson, 1998). Sosyal medya kullanımının artışıyla birlikte medya iletişimi daha interaktif bir hal almasına rağmen, kitle iletişim hala tek yönlü olarak düşünülmektedir (Harris & Sanborn, 2014). Dolayısıyla, yakınsal kaynaklarla kurulan kişilerarası iletişim annelerin çocuk yetiştirmeye yönelik ilk başvuru kaynaklardır.

Bu modelin bulgularında dikkat çekici bir diğer unsur ise, resmi çevrimiçi kaynakların annelik inanç sistemleri ile ilişkili olmayışıdır. Bu bulguya dayanarak, annelerin inanç oluşumu sürecinde uzmanların bilimsel bazı söylemlerinden çok, diğer annelerin deneyimleri odaklı bir oluşum süreci izledikleri söylenebilir.
Yoğun Annelik İdeolojisinin Yordayıcıları


Bu modelin önemli bir bulgusu, annelerin medyada ünlü anelere maruz kalma durumlarının yoğun aneklilik üzerindeki negatif yönlü anlamlı ilişkisidir. Bu bulgudan yola çıkarak, ünlü annelerin yoğun aneklilik üzerindeki pozitif yordayıcı etkisinin, bu annelerin ünlülerle arasında kurduğu sosyal karşılaştırma ve rekabetçilik odaklı ilişkiden kaynaklandığı söylenebilir.

Uygulamaya Yönelik Öneriler

Öte yandan, çalışmanın bulguları kapsamında, yoğun annelik inanışları gibi bazı ebeveyn özellikleri nedeniyle, ailelerin öğretmenlerden ve okullardan algılandıkları davetleri göz ardı etme eğiliminde olabileceği anlaşılktadır. Yani, aileler okullardan ve öğretmenlerden gelen davetleri algısalara bile, katılım motivasyonlarında kullanamayabilirler. Bu eğilimin, günümüz ebeveynlerinin bir kısmının okul öncesi öğretmenliği mesleğini hafife almalarından ve hatta okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarına ve öğretmenlere karşı güvensizliklerininamasından kaynaklanma şansa yüksektir. Dolayısıyla, günümüzün bu inanışları, kaliteli eğitim için üstesinden gelinmesi gereken çok önemli engeller olabilir.

Çalışmanın Sınırlılıkları

M: TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics
Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : FİLİK UYANIK
Adı / Name : Rabia
Bölümü / Department : Okul Öncesi Eğitimi

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : Motivators Of Mothers’ Engagement In Their Preschoolers’ Education Regarding The Influence Of Media

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master ☒ Doktora / PhD ☐

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☐

   2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two year. * ☒

   3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. * ☒

   * Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature ........................... Tarih / Date 18.09.2018

SKB-SA02/F01 Rev:03 06.08.2018