Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2023; 20(2), s.550-570.

Van Yüzüncü Yıl University Journal of Education, 2023; 20(2), p. 550-570. DOI:10.33711/yyuefd.1286859

The Examination of Demographics Influences on The Digital Parenting Awareness of Parents With 3-6 Years Old Children

Taibe KULAKSIZ[1], Mehmet TORAN[2]

Abstract: This study aims to reveal the differences between digital parenting awareness by gender of the parent, age of the parent, perceived socioeconomic status of parent, daily internet usage duration of the parent, educational level of the parent, age of the child, number of children, and using a control app. Utilizing a cross-sectional survey method, the participants of the study consist of 308 parents with children ages 3 to 6. The Demographic Information Form and Digital Parenting Awareness Scale were administered and analyzed based on quantitative parametric analysis methods. Results showed that some demographics vary between mothers' and fathers' digital parenting awareness. Mothers show higher digital parenting awareness. Older parents are inclined to be digitally negligent of their children. Parents' socioeconomic and educational levels almost do not influence digital parenting awareness. Parents do not act differently in digital environments regarding their pre-school age children. One-child families protect their kids from digital risks more than three-child families. It is important to emphasize that parents using the internet daily for more than four hours tend to have less awareness. Fathers/mothers using a parental control app have higher awareness to save and monitor their children online.

Keywords: Parenting, digital parenting awareness, children, technology

3-6 Yaş Çocuğu Olan Ebeveynlerin Dijital Ebeveynlik Farkındalıkları Üzerindeki Demografik Etkilerin İncelenmesi

Öz: Bu çalışma, ebeveynin cinsiyeti, ebeveyn yaşı, ebeveynin algıladığı sosyoekonomik durumu, ebeveynin günlük internet kullanım süresi, ebeveyn eğitim düzeyi, çocuğun yaşı, çocuk sayısı, ve ebeveyn kontrol uygulaması kullanma durumuna göre dijital ebeveynlik farkındalığı konusundaki farklılıkları ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Kesitsel tarama yönteminin kullanıldığı araştırmanın katılımcılarını 3-6 yaş arası çocuğu olan 308 ebeveyn oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak Demografik Bilgi Formu ve Dijital Ebeveynlik Farkındalık Ölçeği uygulanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler, nicel parametrik analiz yöntemlerine dayalı olarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, annelerin ve babaların dijital ebeveynlik farkındalığının bazı demografik özelliklere göre değiştiğini göstermektedir. Anneler, daha yüksek dijital ebeveyn farkındalığı göstermektedirler. Ebeveynler, yaşları arttıkça çocuklarına karşı dijital olarak ihmalkar olma eğilimindedir. Ebeveynlerin sosyoekonomik ve eğitim düzeyleri, dijital ebeveynlik farkındalığını neredeyse etkilememektedir. Ebeveynler, okul öncesi dönemdeki çocuklarının yaşlarına göre dijital

Geliş tarihi/Received: 24.04.2023 Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 09.07.2023 Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

[1] Dr., Heidelberg University of Education, Institute for Arts, Music, and Media, Germany, taibekulaksiz@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-7960-7440

[2] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Istanbul Kültür University, Early Childhood Education Department, Türkiye, m.toran@iku.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3457-9113

Atıf için/To cite: Kulaksız, T. & Toran, M. (2023). The examination of demographics influences on the digital parenting awareness of parents with 3-6 years old children. *Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 20*(2), 550-570. https://doi.org/10.33711/yyuefd.1286859

ortamlarda farklı davranmamaktadırlar. Tek çocuklu aileler, çocuklarını dijital risklerden üç çocuklu ailelere göre daha fazla korumaktadır. Günde dört saatten fazla internet kullanan ebeveynlerin daha az farkındalığa sahip olduklarını vurgulamak önemlidir. Ebeveyn kontrolü uygulaması kullanan babalar/anneler, çocuklarını çevrimiçi olarak kaydetme ve izleme konusunda daha yüksek farkındalığa sahiptir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Ebeveynlik, dijital ebeveynlik farkındalığı, çocuklar, teknoloji

Introduction

Parenting having an important role in children's development and providing environmental facilities to children has been discussed for a long time among researchers (Bornstein & Lansford, 2010; Brooks, 2013). Studies on parenting (Abidin, 1992; Belsky, 1984; Coleman & Karraker, 1998) defines it as taking the responsibility of meeting physical needs such as nutrition, health, and physical care along with providing appropriate environment and stimuli in order to support children developmentally (Collins et al., 2000; Dix, 1991). Although the concept of parenting is used together with the concepts of both motherhood and fatherhood, it is not a concept that can be completely reduced to them (Sanchez & Thomson, 1997) due to the fact that parenting is purely related to caring for the child's vital needs. Additionally, parenting is also considering these definitions also emphasize the importance of the parenting role on the children's well-being, resilience, and academic success (Bradshaw, 2019). Because parenting can also be defined as the parent-child relationship regardless of the nature of the relationship. These definitions are also affected by some factors caused by parents, children, and their social and physical environment. All these factors lead to the parenting style which determines the parent-child relationship quality.

Parenting styles have a significant role in parent-child relationships. Because the parent-child relationship is not only a biological bond that begins from birth and continues throughout life but is also a socialization progress that includes psychological and social processes (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). While altering parenting styles affects parent-child relationship quality, it is also determined by child development (Holden & Edwards, 1989). Baumrind (1980; 1991), who has vital studies on parenting styles, states that there are three parenting styles such as democratic, permissive, and authoritarian have different consequences on child development. It is stated that parental styles can be effective in children's being compatible, creative, self-confident, independent, and responsible (Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019), as well as in feeling obedient, aggressive, indecisive, insecure, antisocial, depressed, and inadequate (Smetana, 2017). Therefore, these parenting styles, which are also accepted as the quality of parenting, are influenced, and determined by many factors such as family, environmental, cultural, social, etc. (Kagitcibasi, 2005; Murray & Mulvaney, 2012; Sarwar, 2016). Moreover, it is mentioned that factors such as the child's birth order, prenatal experiences (Nijhof & Engels, 2007), the number of children, the child's characteristics, the child's school life, family relations, family culture (Erkan & Toran, 2010), parents' working life, economic level of family (Beyer, 1995), and value of child (Kağitçibaşi,1982) have an impact on parenting styles. Apart from these factors, studies' results (Choi et al., 2017; Dufva & Dufva, 2019; Hatuka et al., 2021; Hristova, 2018) indicate that the digital environment has dominated a major part of daily actions that alter the life of individuals, families, and communities in the current world. Surely, parenting that is affected by technological advancements has been caused to reconceptualize parenting as digital parenting (Modeck et al., 2022).

Digital parenting has been discussed among scholars since the technological facilities affected and determined family life, especially for parents who care for children. Therefore,

scholars have tried to redefine parenting with the concept of digitalization. In this sense, digital parenting can be defined as parental practices to understand, regulate, and support children's activities in digital environments (Fidan & Seferoğlu, 2020). Research on digital parenting pointed out that parents' role as a "mediator" of children's digital activities by using digital technologies (Benedetto & Ingrassia, 2021). With this regard, parenting evolves to digital parenting, and is assumed that it also could be affected by an altering environment. Hence, digital parenting can be re-evaluated as a conscious effort to mediate between the digital world and children due to exposure to digital tools more than adults. Therefore, adults should redefine their role in the children's world or environment (Kavitha & Sikandar, 2021). In this regard, parental mediation indicators are the parents' digital literacy efficiency and how to offer digital technology to their children (Mascheroni et al., 2018). These indicators give us to understand parenting in digital surroundings. Because the digital world has surrounded the whole life of children from leisure time to school-based life and parents worry and feel inefficient about it (Siibak, 2019). From this perspective, there are both internal and external various factors influencing digital parenting and parents' mediation skills. While internal factors are mostly related to the parents' technology usage efficacy, external factors are related to the demographics such as parents' level of education, income, number of family members, number of children, age, sex, children's age, etc. (Yaman et al., 2022).

Digital parenting is an ongoing process that requires adaptation as technology evolves. However, this process is also determined by the factors experienced by parents who use technology, and vice versa (Head, 2020; Walker & Hong, 2017). Studies showed that factors related to demographics, parental awareness, and parents' usage of digital tools have an impact on digital parenting and parents' mediation skills. Yaman et al. (2022) researched the effects of demographics on digital parenting with parents, who have children in middle school, and revealed that perceived high digital parenting changes regarding the parental role, educational level, parents' age, number of children, and internet usage experience. Likewise, Fidan and Seferoğlu (2020) stated that parents use restrictions and prohibitions to keep their children from cyberbullying. This statement also shows us how parents' behaviors or strategies change in terms of online risks. Similarly, Willett (2015) revealed that parents positioned themselves as evaluators, selectors, and monitors of children's (mostly between 5-14 ages) online activities, and virtual world games. Additionally, parenting styles changed with the digital world, and they become more monitoring and limit-setting parents and they put efforts to learn how to guide their children in the digital world (Rosen et al, 2008). Ihmeideh and Shawareb (2014), found that the parenting style is associated with kindergarten, 1st-grade, and 2nd-grade children's ages involvement in the digital world and the parental style mostly evolved into the authoritarian parenting style. Despite Álvarez et al. (2013) showing that parent education programs help parents, who have primary or secondary school children, not only discover risks but also the opportunities for learning and leisure time that the internet opens to the family. Additionally, Huang et al. (2018) found that parents with children under 18 years old living in the same households, who engaged in children's school activities strongly affected digital parenting self-efficacy. Therefore, parenting positioning themselves in the digital area has challenges and opportunities to learn and offer digital tools to children. This leads parents to mediate between parenting and digital environments. With this perspective, digital parenting is still discussed among scholars and this discussion is based on how digital parenting is constructed and what affects it. Certainly, these discussions will help to understand parenting in the digital world. This research aims to be part of these discussions and reveal how external factors influence digital parenting awareness of mothers and fathers with 3-6 years old children. With this aim, we sought to following questions:

Are there any meaningful differences between digital parenting awareness in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage by

1. gender of the parent
2. age of the parent
3. perceived socioeconomic status of the parent
4. daily internet usage duration of the parent
5. educational level of the parent
6. age of the child
7. number of children
8. using a parental control app?

Method

Research Design

This study was built upon a quantitative paradigm using a survey methodology. The cross-sectional survey approach indicates a collection of information from a certain population at approximately the same time and once at a time (Fraenkel et al., 2012). Our sample consisted of parents having a 3-6-old child and we collected data just once from the same participants cross-sectionally.

Participants

Participants of this study were parents with 3–6-year-old-child. Convenience sampling, a group of individuals suitable for such research (Fraenkel et al., 2012), was utilized in this study. Parents were reached out to join the study via digital social platforms (Facebook, WhatsApp, Twitter, LinkedIn) and all attendees were informed about the aim of the study and gave consent to participation. In this study, 336 people filled out the survey. However, the numbers were reduced to 308 due to missing information and outliers. Therefore, the final sample size includes 308 parents (N_{mother}=268, N_{father}=40). The average age of the participants was 34.7. As shown in Table 1, 82.8% of parents (N=255) use computers for more than 5 years. Almost all participants have mobile (98.1%, N=302) and home internet (90.6%, N=279).

Table 1

Demographics Of The Participants

		N	%
Gender	Female	268	87.0
	Male	40	13.0
Computer use in years	Less than 1 year	46	14.9
	1-5	4	1.3
	More than 5 years	255	82.8
Having mobile internet	Yes	302	98.1

	No	6	1.9
Having home internet	Yes	279	90.6
	No	29	9.4
Total		308	100

Instrumentation

The survey was composed of a demographic information form and a Digital Parental Awareness (DPA) Scale. At the beginning of the survey, an instruction for the survey and a consent form were located. The demographic information form includes questions about gender, age, home-mobile internet access, computer use in years, socioeconomic status, educational level, number of children, child age, daily internet usage duration of the parents, and parental control app usage.

DPA Scale was developed by Manap and Durmuş (2020) consisting of 16 items with 5 Likert-response-type. The scale has four factors named efficient usage, protecting from risks, being a negative role model, and digital negligence. Exploratory and confirmatory analyses showed good validity values. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients for the reliability of the factors were reported as .717, .634, .799, and .785 respectively (Manap & Durmuş, 2020). Cronbach's alpha reliability values in this study were calculated in order of .544, .554, .584, .689. All factors are calculated independently. The lower points from being a negative role model and digital negligence dimensions; and the higher points from efficient usage and protecting from risks dimensions indicate higher digital parenting awareness of the parents.

Data Collection and Analysis

The mode of data collection was chosen web-based survey (Fraenkel et al., 2012). A questionnaire was created on Google Forms. This form was disseminated to related target groups on social media, and to researchers' social media accounts. Eventually, 336 parents answered the survey. However, the numbers were reduced to 310 due to missing information and the exclusion of parents not having a child out of 3-6 years old. If parents have more than one child between 3-6 years old, the elder child's age would be accepted as a data item for this study. Two people were also removed from the dataset because of being outliers for statistical analysis. Therefore, the final sample consists of 308 parents. Before performing statistical analysis, the normality assumption was met. Skewness and kurtosis values were between +1 and -1, which indicates normal distribution (Hair et al., 2017). Descriptive statistics, independent t-test, Pearson correlation, and one-way ANOVA were calculated regarding research questions.

Findings

This study's main purpose is to reveal how external factors influence the digital parenting awareness of mothers and fathers with 3-6 years old children. The findings of each research question were presented below respectively.

The differences between digital parenting awareness in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage were presented by the gender of the parent in Table 2.

Table 2

DPA Differences By Gender Of Parents

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	p
Negative Role Model	Female	268	7.2127	2.46236	-4.523	306	.000*
	Male	40	9.1750	3.14510			
Digital Negligence	Female	268	8.0224	2.71207	-2.396	306	.017*
	Male	40	9.1500	3.18289			
Efficient Usage	Female	268	17.4664	2.43161	3.510	306	.001*
	Male	40	16.0000	2.67946			
Protecting from Risks	Female	268	15.7799	3.31607	3.380	306	.001*
	Male	40	13.8500	3.70412			

The independent t-test was run to see whether there was a significant difference between parents' DPA scores regarding their gender. The results revealed that there were meaningful differences in each sub-factor of DPA ($p < .05$). Fathers' being negative role model ($t_{(306)} = -4.523$, $p = .000$) and digital negligence ($t_{(306)} = -2.396$, $p = .017$) scores were significantly higher than mothers. On the contrary efficient usage ($t_{(306)} = 3.510$, $p = .001$) and protecting from risks ($t_{(306)} = 3.380$, $p = .001$) sub-factor scores of mothers were higher than fathers.

The relationship between parents' age and digital parenting awareness in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage were presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Relationship Between DPA And Parents' Age

	Negative Role Model	Digital Negligence	Efficient Usage	Protecting from Risks
Age	.036	.145*	-.047	-.103

Calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient in Table 3, there was a weak positive relationship with digital negligence ($r = .145$). There was no significant correlation between being negative role model, efficient usage, and protecting from risks sub-dimensions of DPA by parents' age.

The differences between the perceived socioeconomic status of parents and digital parenting awareness in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage were presented in Table 4.

Table 4

DPA Differences By The Perceived Socioeconomic Status Of Parents

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Diff.
Negative Role Model	1	17	7.4118	2.82973	Between Groups	.264	2	.132	.019	.981	
	2	229	7.4847	2.64343	Within Groups	2138.411	305	7.011			
	3	62	7.4194	2.61489	Total	2138.675	307				
Digital Negligence	1	17	7.7647	2.96920	Between Groups	5.450	2	2.725	.347	.707	
	2	229	8.1441	2.72758	Within Groups	2397.771	305	7.862			
	3	62	8.3710	3.03117	Total	2403.221	307				
Efficient Usage	1	17	18.2353	1.82104	Between Groups	17.754	2	8.877	1.413	.245	
	2	229	17.2533	2.53684	Within Groups	1915.788	305	6.281			
	3	62	17.0968	2.54603	Total	1933.542	307				
Protecting from Risks	1	17	17.4706	2.55239	Between Groups	70.395	2	35.197	3.041	.049*	1-2
	2	229	15.3668	3.49761	Within Groups	3530.342	305	11.575			
	3	62	15.5968	3.23130	Total	3600.737	307				

(1) Low level; (2) Middle level; (3) High level

One-way ANOVA was conducted to reveal the differences in DPA by the perceived socioeconomic status of parents as shown in Table 4. Negative role model, digital negligence, and efficient usage sub-factors of the DPA showed no differences based on parents' socioeconomic status perceptions ($p>.05$). Only protecting from risks scores of the parents differ from each other. For further examination, Scheffe's post-hoc test results indicated that parents with low socioeconomic status have slightly higher significant scores compared to parents with middle socioeconomic status ($F_{(2-305)} = 3.041$, $p < .05$).

The differences between the daily internet usage duration of the parents and digital parenting awareness in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage were presented in Table 5.

Table 5

DPA Differences By Daily Internet Usage Duration Of Parents

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Diff.
Negative Role Model	1	63	6.7143	2.70858	Between Groups	133.074	3	44.358	6.724	.000*	1-3, 1-4, 2-3
	2	159	7.2201	2.46404	Within Groups	2005.602	304	6.597			
	3	56	8.4821	2.63536	Total	2138.675	307				
	4	30	8.4667	2.68756							
Digital Negligence	1	63	7.3968	2.59366	Between Groups	131.089	3	43.696	5.846	.001*	1-3, 1-4, 2-3
	2	159	7.9371	2.71584	Within Groups	2272.131	304	7.474			
	3	56	9.1786	2.74430	Total	2403.221	307				
	4	30	9.1333	3.08202							
Efficient Usage	1	63	17.6032	2.29684	Between Groups	35.686	3	11.895	1.905	.129	-
	2	159	17.4088	2.36058	Within Groups	1897.856	304	6.243			
	3	56	16.9821	2.80578	Total	1933.542	307				
	4	30	16.4333	2.97905							
Protecting from Risks	1	63	16.2381	3.18623	Between Groups	120.658	3	40.219	3.513	.016*	1-4
	2	159	15.6226	3.52510	Within Groups	3480.079	304	11.448			
	3	56	15.3750	3.22807	Total	3600.737	307				
	4	30	13.8333	3.29140							

(1) 1 hour or less; (2) 2-3 hours; (3) 4-5 hours; (4) 6 hours or more

Calculating one-way ANOVA in Table 5, the results of the analysis showed the differences in DPA by parents' daily internet usage duration of parents. Significant differences were detected in the sub-dimensions of negative role model, digital negligence, and protecting from risks ($p<.05$). In order to clarify the source of differences Scheffe's post-hoc test was utilized. Parents using daily

internet 4-5 hours and 6 and more hours become more negative role models compared to those who use 1 hour or less; furthermore, parents using daily internet for 4-5 hours become more negative role models compared to those who use 2-3 hours ($F_{(3-304)} = 6.724$, $p < .05$). Parents using daily internet more than 4 hours have significantly higher digital negligence score than who uses 1 hour or less; also, parents using daily internet 4-5 hours become more digitally negligent comparing to who uses 2-3 hours ($F_{(3-304)} = 5.846$, $p < .05$). Parents who use the internet daily one hour or less protect more their children from risks than the one use internet daily 6 hours or more ($F_{(3-304)} = 3.513$, $p < .05$). Lastly, There was no difference regarding daily internet usage of parents on efficient usage ($F_{(3-304)} = 1.905$, $p>.05$).

The differences between the educational levels of the parents and digital parenting awareness in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage were presented in Table 6.

Table 6

DPA Differences By Educational Level Of The Parents

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Negative Role Model	1	13	7.5385	2.22169	Between Groups	43.047	5	8.609	1.241	.290
	2	21	6.7619	2.23394	Within Groups	2095.629	302	6.939		
	3	80	7.3250	2.52970	Total	2138.675	307			
	4	47	7.2340	2.57254						
	5	104	7.4808	2.80769						
	6	43	8.2791	2.73710						
Digital Negligence	1	13	8.8462	2.91108	Between Groups	31.011	5	6.202	.790	.558
	2	21	8.3810	3.02450	Within Groups	2372.210	302	7.855		
	3	80	7.7375	2.75931	Total	2403.221	307			
	4	47	8.0638	2.54869						
	5	104	8.2404	2.88449						
	6	43	8.6047	2.80424						
Efficient Usage	1	13	16.7692	2.45472	Between Groups	24.783	5	4.957	.784	.562
	2	21	16.8571	2.53546	Within Groups	1908.759	302	6.320		
	3	80	17.3500	2.67714	Total	1933.542	307			
	4	47	17.6596	2.36162						
	5	104	17.3846	2.32466						

	6	43	16.8140	2.79673						
Protecting from Risks	1	13	15.9231	2.43110	Between Groups	78.322	5	15.664	1.343	.246
	2	21	15.4286	3.57171	Within Groups	3522.415	302	11.664		
	3	80	16.0375	3.56652	Total	3600.737	307			
	4	47	16.0426	3.21652						
	5	104	15.2500	3.42677						
	6	43	14.6279	3.47113						

(1) Elementary school or less; (2) middle school; (3) high school; (4) associate degree; (5) bachelor degree; (6) postgraduate degree

One-way ANOVA was used for analyzing the difference in DFA subfactors by the educational level of the parents (Table 6). Based on the analysis, there were no statistically different results among all DPA sub-categories regarding parents' educational levels (p>.05)

The differences between the age of the child and digital parenting awareness of their parents in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage were presented in Table 7.

Table 7

DPA Differences By Age Of Children

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Negative Role Model	3	36	6.8611	3.10900	Between Groups	32.738	3	10.913	1.575	.195
	4	108	7.4722	2.59207	Within Groups	2105.937	304	6.927		
	5	127	7.4252	2.54334	Total	2138.675	307			
	6	37	8.1892	2.54774						
Digital Negligence	3	36	8.1389	3.05336	Between Groups	15.186	3	5.062	.644	.587
	4	108	8.3796	2.79759	Within Groups	2388.034	304	7.855		
	5	127	7.9213	2.72731	Total	2403.221	307			
	6	37	8.4324	2.82391						
Efficient Usage	3	36	16.5278	3.44330	Between Groups	27.056	3	9.019	1.438	.232

	4	108	17.3704	2.29828	Within Groups	1906.486	304	6.271		
	5	127	17.2913	2.48203	Total	1933.542	307			
	6	37	17.6757	2.04198						
Protecting from Risks	3	36	16.3333	3.43927	Between Groups	45.342	3	15.114	1.292	.277
	4	108	15.7130	3.22389	Within Groups	3555.395	304	11.695		
	5	127	15.3150	3.53598	Total	3600.737	307			
	6	37	14.9459	3.55079						

3 years old; 4 years old; 5 years old; 6 years old

Table 7 shows one-way ANOVA results of DFA based on the age of the parent's child. There were no statistically different results in terms of parents' being negative role model, digital negligence, efficient usage, and protecting from risks by children's ages (p>.05)

The differences between the number of children and digital parenting awareness of their parents in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage were presented in Table 8.

Table 8

DPA Differences By The Number Of Children

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Diff.
Negative Role Model	1	132	7.3788	2.82446	Between Groups	2.203	3	.734	.105	.957	
	2	130	7.5077	2.50347	Within Groups	2136.472	304	7.028			
	3	37	7.5946	2.24177	Total	2138.675	307				
	4	9	7.6667	3.57071							
Digital Negligence	1	132	7.9470	2.82658	Between Groups	35.570	3	11.857	1.522	.209	
	2	130	8.2000	2.77139	Within Groups	2367.651	304	7.788			
	3	37	9.0000	2.61406	Total	2403.221	307				
	4	9	7.5556	3.24465							
Efficient Usage	1	132	17.3788	2.37843	Between Groups	34.629	3	11.543	1.848	.138	
	2	130	17.3385	2.47954	Within Groups	1898.913	304	6.246			
	3	37	16.4595	2.97764	Total	1933.542	307				
	4	9	18.2222	2.38630							

Protecting from Risks	1	132	16.1742	3.23270	Between Groups	137.718	3	45.906	4.030	.008	1-3
	2	130	15.3308	3.37889	Within Groups	3463.019	304	11.392			
	3	37	14.1622	3.40354	Total	3600.737	307				
	4	9	14.5556	5.05250							

(1) Parents with 1 child; (2) parents with 2 children; (3) parents with 3 children; (4) parents with 4 children

DPA differences of parents by the number of children were calculated via one-way ANOVA test. As shown in Table 8, results pointed out that there was no meaningful difference in being negative role model, digital negligence, and efficient usage sub-dimensions of DPA regarding the number of children parents have ($p>.05$). It was found that parents with single child protect their children from risks of technology more than parents who have three children based on Scheffe's post-hoc analysis results ($F_{(3-304)} = 4.030$, $p<.05$).

The differences between the parents' using a control app and digital parenting awareness in terms of being a negative role model, digital negligence, protecting from risks, and efficient usage were presented in Table 9.

Table 9

DPA Differences By Using A Parental Control App

	Using a parental control app	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	p
Negative Role Model	Yes	141	7.4681	2.59547	.003	306	.997
	No	167	7.4671	2.68370			
Digital Negligence	Yes	141	8.0496	2.80134	-.686	306	.493
	No	167	8.2695	2.79939			
Efficient Usage	Yes	141	17.5106	2.55124	1.511	306	.132
	No	167	17.0778	2.46419			
Protecting from Risks	Yes	141	16.5816	2.94025	5.158	306	.000*
	No	167	14.6407	3.55884			

The independent t-test was performed to see whether there was a significant difference between parents' DPA scores by using a parental control app (Table 9). The findings showed that there was a meaningful difference in only protecting from risks in favor of app users ($t_{(306)} = 5.158$, $p = .000$). Negative role model, efficient usage, and digital negligence scores did not differ significantly if a parent uses a parental control app or not ($p>.05$).

Discussion

This research aimed to reveal how external factors such as demographics influence digital parenting awareness of mothers and fathers with 3-6 years old children. According to statistical

analysis, some parents' demographics influence and make a difference in digital parenting awareness. The results will be discussed in light of the current literature, theories, and research under this title respectively.

It is found that digital parenting awareness which consists of subfactors such as efficient usage, protecting from risks, being a negative role model, and digital negligence differed with respect to the parent's gender. While negative role model and digital negligence were found in favor of the fathers, efficient usage and protecting from risks were found in favor of the mothers. This result can be discussed with the demographics of parents such as taking care of children mostly by mothers and caring for home economically by fathers (Ihmeideh & Shawareb, 2014; Rahayu & Haningsih, 2021). Also, Tosun and Mihci (2020) found that parents' gender has a role in digital parenting attitude, and parents' gender determines the low level of digital parenting attitude. Similarly, Yaman et al. (2022) revealed significant differences between parents' gender in the dimensions of digital parenting, and mothers reported higher levels of self-efficacy than fathers in digital parenting.

This research analysis revealed that there was a positive relationship between parents' age and digital negligence which is one of the digital parenting awareness factors, whereas there was no relationship between other factors and parents' age. It is considered that as the age of the parents increases, the increase in digital neglect might be due to the parents' weak digital literacy in their later ages (Baker et al., 2017), as well as a lack of knowledge of how to present it to their children (Toran et al., 2016). This result is also supported by Yaman et al. (2022). They found that weak negative relationship between the parents' age and digital parenting self-efficacy perceptions.

The results also showed that protecting from risks differed slightly by low and middle-perceived socioeconomic status. In contrast, negative role model, digital negligence, and efficient usage did not differ at all levels of the perceived socioeconomic status of the parents. Perceived low and middle socioeconomic status gives us important clues about parents' competence in digital usage and literacy. The socioeconomic status of parents plays a crucial role in shaping their digital competencies, as it can influence their access to technology, educational opportunities, and digital literacy training. Even though parents from lower socioeconomic backgrounds may have limited access to internet connectivity, devices, and relevant digital resources, they try to protect their children from digital risks. They may also have fewer opportunities for acquiring the necessary skills and knowledge to effectively use digital technologies. Parents who lived in disadvantaged situations have limited access to digital environments (Huang et al., 2018) and tools and they do not know how to use the digital tools and offer them to their children (Goedhart et al., 2019). Additionally, parents' digital usage and literacy competence are also affected by socioeconomic levels. Anderson (2016) stated that using digital tools affected parent-child relationships according to family income. Increased family income negatively affected the parent-child relationship in light of digital parenting.

The analysis also showed that increased daily internet usage over four hours affected digital parenting awareness negatively. According to the results, when parents' daily internet usage increased, being a negative role model and digital negligence of the parents stood out. Moreover, it is revealed that while daily internet usage increased, parents' protection from risks level decreased. Studies (Hammer et al., 2021; Yaman et al., 2021) have shown that parents who spend more time surfing on the internet, playing games, and using social media neglect their children and

meet their needs inadequately. Additionally, parents' low level of internet usage ensures the protection of children from risks (Amankwa, 2021).

Interestingly, we found that there were no differences between parents' educational levels according to digital parenting awareness. This might be caused by most of the parents having mobile and home internet connections, and they spend more time on the internet. Also, they may have similar levels of digital literacy. This result was also supported by research (Tosun & Mihci, 2020) which revealed that there was no effect of educational background on digital parenting skills. Despite this result, Pratiwi et al. (2022) pointed out that parents with higher educational backgrounds show efficient digital parenting and adapt themselves easily to the digital environment.

Parental attitudes and awareness are different concepts from each other. Therefore, even if parental attitudes differ according to variables arising from children, parental awareness may not differ according to these variables. In this context, we assume that digital parenting awareness does not differ according to the variables arising from children. Indeed, this research revealed that children's age does not have any effect on digital parenting skills. This might be caused due to parents taking care of their children of all ages or vice versa (Goedhart et al., 2019; Wu, 2014).

Having more than one child revealed some concerns related to digital parenting, especially protecting from risks. Because parents who have their first children can behave more protective than relaxed due to being novice parents. With these findings parallelly, this research analysis revealed that parents with one child show more protective behavior in a digital environment risk than those with two or more children. Ólafsson et al. (2018) found that the siblings' presence is associated with an increase in daily internet use. In other words, children introduce technology to each other earlier than expected. Yaman et al. (2022) stated that the number of children in a family significantly affects the parents' digital parenting self-efficacy perceptions.

Due to the widespread use of digital technologies in daily life, parents need to use applications to protect, control and review their children's activities on technological devices. In this sense, companies developed and offered many parental control applications to parents to monitor their children's digital activities. In this research, we also aimed to understand how digital parenting awareness changed by using parental control applications. The results showed that parents using control applications are more protective from digital risks than those who don't. This result is not surprising because previous research (Hammer et. Al., 2021; Huang et al., 2018; Toran et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2014) showed that parents tracked their children manually or digitally by using applications to protect their children from unwanted consequences of technology.

Conclusion

In conclusion, mothers' and fathers' digital parenting awareness vary in some demographics. Mothers show higher awareness of DPA in all aspects. Older parents are inclined to be digitally negligent of their children. Besides, parents' socioeconomic and educational levels almost do not influence DPA individually. On the other hand, parents do not act differently regarding their pre-school age children in digital environments; however, one-child families protect their kids from digital risks more than three-child families. It is also important to emphasize that parents using the internet daily for more than four hours tend to become digital negative role models to their children, neglect their children due to technology, and are not able to guard their kids

against the potential damage of the digital world. Lastly, fathers/mothers using a parental control app have higher awareness to save and monitor their children online.

Limitation

There are some limitations in this study, which could also guide future research. The self-reported daily internet usage of parents has been taken into account. Therefore, their actual daily usage may be different. So, it is strongly recommended for future studies to include data logs from mobile phones or computers regarding internet access duration for extending the objectivity of parent opinions. If parents have more than one child between 3-6 years old, the elder child's age was accepted as a data item for this study, which could threaten specific case representations for those who had more than one preschool child. Furthermore, interactions between demographic variables were excluded from this study.

Some sub-dimensions of the DPA scale showed poor internal consistency values (Taber, 2018). Therefore, we recommend that future studies consider reduplicating the reliability of the DPA scale. The differences between groups number in the statistical analyses might have affected the findings slightly due to the distribution of the participants' demographics as we applied a convenience sample strategy. Finally, a convenience sample was preferred due to the social and emotional effects on people of the heartbreaking earthquake experienced in February 2022 in Türkiye.

Ethical Committee Permission Information: The ethics committee approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Istanbul Kültur University (Number: 2023/42).

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest and no funding received within the scope of the study.

Authors' Contribution: TK: Conceptualization, Methodology, Data collection, Data analysis, Writing. MT: Conceptualization, Methodology, Literature Investigation, Data collection, Writing.

References

Abidin, R. R. (1992). The determinants of parenting behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, *21*(4), 407-412.

Álvarez, M., Torres, A., Rodríguez, E., Padilla, S., & Rodrigo, M. J. (2013). Attitudes and parenting dimensions in parents' regulation of Internet use by primary and secondary school children. *Computers & Education*, *67*, 69-78.

Amankwa, E. (2021). Relevance of cybersecurity education at pedagogy levels in schools. *Journal of Information Security*, *12*(4), 233-249.

Anderson, M. (2016). Parents, teens and digital monitoring: parents monitor their teen's digital behavior in a number of ways, but using technical means like parental controls is less common. Pew Research Center. http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/01/07/parents-teens-and-digital-monitoring.

Baker, S., Sanders, M. R., & Morawska, A. (2017). Who uses online parenting support? A cross-sectional survey exploring Australian parents' internet use for parenting. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *26*, 916-927.

Baumrind, D. (1980). New directions in socialization research. *American Psychologist*, *35*(7), 639-652. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.35.7.639

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *11*(1), 56-95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431691111004

Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*, *55*(1), 83–96. https://doi.org/10.2307/1129836

Benedetto, L., & Ingrassia, M. (2021). Digital parenting: Raising and protecting children in media world. In L. Benedetto, & M. Ingrassia (Eds.), *Parenting - studies by an ecocultural and transactional perspective* (pp.127-148). IntechOpen.

Beyer, S. (1995). Maternal employment and children′ s academic achievement: Parenting styles as mediating variable. *Developmental Review*, *15*(2), 212-253.

Bornstein, M. H., & Lansford, J. E. (2010). Parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of cultural developmental science* (pp. 259–277). Psychology Press.

Bradshaw, S., Bem, D., Shaw, K., Taylor, B., Chiswell, C., Salama, M., Bassett, E., Kaur, G., & Cummins, C. (2019). Improving health, wellbeing and parenting skills in parents of children with special health care needs and medical complexity–a scoping review. *BMC pediatrics*, *19*(1), 1-11.

Brooks, J. (2013). Parenting is a process. In J. Brooks (Ed.), *The process of parenting* (9th ed., pp. 2– 32). McGraw-Hill.

Choi, M., Glassman, M., & Cristol, D. (2017). What it means to be a citizen in the internet age: Development of a reliable and valid digital citizenship scale. *Computers & Education*, *107*, 100-112.

Coleman, P. K., & Karraker, K. H. (1998). Self-efficacy and parenting quality: Findings and future applications. *Developmental Review*, *18*(1), 47-85.

Collins, W. A., Maccoby, E. E., Steinberg, L., Hetherington, E. M., & Bornstein, M. H. (2000). Contemporary research on parenting: The case for nature and nurture. *American Psychologist*, *55*(2), 218.

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *113*(3), 487- 496. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487

Dix, T. (1991). The affective organization of parenting: Adaptive and maladaptative processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.3

Dufva, T., & Dufva, M. (2019). Grasping the future of the digital society. *Futures*, *107*, 17-28.

Erkan, S., & Toran, M. (2010). Child acceptance-rejection behaviors of lower and upper socioeconomic status mothers. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *38*(3), 427-432. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2010.38.3.427

Fidan, A., & Seferoğlu, S. S. (2020). Online environments and digital parenting: An investigation of approaches, problems, and recommended solutions*. Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education, 9*(2), 352-372.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.

Goedhart, N. S., Broerse, J. E., Kattouw, R., & Dedding, C. (2019). 'Just having a computer doesn't make sense': The digital divide from the perspective of mothers with a low socio-economic position. *New Media & Society*, *21*(11-12), 2347-2365.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage publications.

Hammer, M., Scheiter, K., & Stürmer, K. (2021). New technology, new role of parents: How parents' beliefs and behavior affect students' digital media self-efficacy. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *116*, 106642.

Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. (1995). Culture and parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting, Vol. 2. Biology and ecology of parenting* (pp. 211–234). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Hatuka, T., Zur, H., & Mendoza, J. A. (2021). The urban digital lifestyle: An analytical framework for placing digital practices in a spatial context and for developing applicable policy. *Cities*, *111*, 102978.

Head, E. (2020). Digital technologies and parental involvement in education: The experiences of mothers of primary school-aged children. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 41*, 593- 607.

Holden, G. W., & Edwards, L. A. (1989). Parental attitudes toward child rearing: Instruments, issues, and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, *106*(1), 29-58. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.1.29

Hristova, M. (2018). The digital sociology as a new practice and standard in teaching of sociology. *Nauchni Trudove, 1*, 111-123.

Huang, G., Li, X., Chen, W., & Straubhaar, J. D. (2018). Fall-behind parents? The influential factors on digital parenting self-efficacy in disadvantaged communities. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *62*(9), 1186-1206.

Ihmeideh, F. M., & Shawareb, A. A. (2014). The association between Internet parenting styles and children's use of the Internet at home. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *28*(4), 411-425.

Kağitçibaşi, Ç. (1982). Old-age security value of children: Cross-national socioeconomic evidence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *13*(1), 29-42.

Kagitcibasi, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *36*(4), 403-422.

Kavitha, K., & Sikandar, B. J. (2021). Digital parenting: Issues, challenges and nursing implications. *Journal of Pediatric Surgical Nursing*, *10*(3), 100-104.

Kuppens, S., & Ceulemans, E. (2019). Parenting styles: A closer look at a well-known concept. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *28*(1), 168-181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1242-x

Manap, A., & Durmuş, E. (2020). Development of Digital Parental Awareness Scale. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 21*(2), 978-993.

Mascheroni, G., Ponte, C. & Jorge, A. (2018). Introduction. In G. Mascheroni, C. Ponte, & A. Jorge (Eds.), *Digital parenting: The challenges for families in the digital age* (pp. 9-16). Nordicom.

Modecki, K. L., Goldberg, R. E., Wisniewski, P., & Orben, A. (2022). What is digital parenting? A systematic review of past measurement and blueprint for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *17*(6), 1673-1691.

Murray, R. G., & Mulvaney, M. K. (2012). Parenting styles, socialization, and the transmission of political ideology and partisanship. *Politics & Policy*, *40*(6), 1106-1130.

Nijhof, K. S., & Engels, R. C. (2007). Parenting styles, coping strategies, and the expression of homesickness. *Journal of Adolescence*, *30*(5), 709-720.

Ólafsson, K., Green, L., & Staksrud, E. (2018). Is big brother more at risk than little sister? The sibling factor in online risk and opportunity. *New Media & Society*, *20*(4), 1360-1379.

Pratiwi, H., Hasanah, N. I., Purnama, S., Ulfah, M., & Saripudin, A. (2022). Adaptation to digital parenting in a pandemic: A case study of parents within higher education. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, *12*(1), 1-12.

Rahayu, N. W., & Haningsih, S. (2021). Digital parenting competence of mother as informal educator is not inline with internet access. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, *29*, 100291.

Rosen, L. D., Cheever, N. A., & Carrier, L. M. (2008). The association of parenting style and child age with parental limit setting and adolescent MySpace behavior. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *29*(6), 459-471.

Sanchez, L., & Thomson, E. (1997). Becoming mothers and fathers: Parenthood, gender, and the division of labor. *Gender & Society*, *11*(6), 747-772.

Sarwar, S. (2016). Influence of parenting style on children's behaviour. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, *3*(2), 222-249.

Siibak, A. (2019). Digital parenting and the datafied child. In T. Burns, & F. Gottschalk (Eds.), *Educating 21st century children: Emotional well-being in the digital age* (pp. 103-120). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/313a9b21-en.

Smetana, J. G. (2017). Current research on parenting styles, dimensions, and beliefs. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *15*, 19-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.02.012

Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education, 48,* 1273-1296.

Toran, M., Ulusoy, Z., Aydın, B., Deveci, T., & Akbulut, A. (2016). Çocukların dijital oyun kullanımına ilişkin annelerin görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, *24*(5), 2263-2278.

Tosun, N., & Mihci, C. (2020). An examination of digital parenting behavior in parents with preschool children in the context of lifelong learning. *Sustainability*, *12*(18), 7654.

Walker, S.K., & Hong, S. (2017). Workplace predictors of parenting educators' technology acceptance attitudes. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 45*, 377-393.

Willett, R. J. (2015). The discursive construction of 'good parenting' and digital media–the case of children's virtual world games. *Media, Culture & Society*, *37*(7), 1060-1075.

Wu, C. S. T., Fowler, C., Lam, W. Y. Y., Wong, H. T., Wong, C. H. M., & Yuen Loke, A. (2014). Parenting approaches and digital technology use of preschool age children in a Chinese community. *Italian Journal of Pediatrics*, *40*(1), 1-8.

Yaman, F., Çubukçu, A., Küçükali, M., & Yurdakul, I. K. (2021). An investigation of parents' use of digital media. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, *10*(1), 76-88.

Yaman, F., Yurdakul, I. K., Akbulut, Y., & Dönmez, O. (2022). An examination of the digital parenting profiles in Turkey. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 1-10.

Geniş Türkçe Özet

Giriş

Anne-babalığın çocuk gelişiminde önemli bir role sahip olması ve çocuklara çevresel olanaklar sağlaması uzun süredir araştırmacılar arasında tartışılmaktadır (Bornstein & Lansford, 2010; Brooks, 2013). Dijital ebeveynlik, teknolojik imkanların özellikle çocuklara bakan ebeveynler için aile hayatını etkilemesi ve belirlemesi nedeniyle araştırmacılar tarafından dikkatle izlenmektedir. Dijital ebeveynlik, çocukların dijital ortamlardaki aktivitelerini anlamak, düzenlemek ve desteklemek için olan ebeveyn uygulamaları olarak tanımlanabilir (Fidan & Seferoğlu, 2020). Dijital ebeveynlik üzerine yapılan araştırmalar, ebeveynlerin dijital teknolojileri kullanarak çocukların dijital aktivitelerinde "arabulucu" rolü oynadığına işaret etmektedir (Benedetto & Ingrassia, 2021). Araştırmalar, demografik değişkenlerin dijital ebeveynlik ve ebeveynlerin arabuluculuk becerileri üzerinde etkisi olduğunu göstermektedir. Yaman ve arkadaşları (2022), demografik değişkenlerin dijital ebeveynlik üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmış ve algılanan yüksek dijital ebeveynliğin ebeveyn rolü, eğitim düzeyi, ebeveynlerin yaşı, çocuk sayısı ve internet kullanım deneyimine göre değiştiğini ortaya koymuştur. Aynı şekilde Fidan ve Seferoğlu (2020), ebeveynlerin çocuklarını siber zorbalıktan korumak için kısıtlama ve yasaklama stratejilerini kullandıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Bu ifade aynı zamanda ebeveynlerin davranışlarının veya stratejilerinin çevrimiçi riskler açısından nasıl değiştiğini de göstermektedir.

Alanyazın incelendiğinde, dijital ortamın çocuklara dijital araçları öğrenme ve onlara sunma konusunda zorluklara ve fırsatlara sahip olduğunu göstererek ebeveynleri dijital dünya ve çocukları arasında arabuluculuk yapmaya yönlendirmektedir. Bu bakış açısıyla, dijital ebeveynliğin nasıl inşa edildiği ve onu neyin etkilediği ön plana çıkmaktadır. Bu tartışmaların dijital dünyada ebeveynliği anlamaya yardımcı olacağı düşünülmektedir. Bu araştırma, bu tartışmaların bir parçası olmayı ve 3-6 yaş çocuğu olan anne ve babaların dijital ebeveynlik farkındalıklarını dış faktörlerin nasıl etkilediğini ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu doğrultuda mevcut araştırma aşağıdaki sorulara yanıt vermeyi amaçlamaktadır:

Olumsuz rol model olma, dijital ihmal, risklerden korunma ve verimli kullanım açısından dijital ebeveynlik farkındalığı ile

1. ebeveynin cinsiyeti,
2. ebeveynin yaşı,
3. ebeveynin algıldığı sosyoekonomik durumu,
4. ebeveynin günlük internet kullanım süresi,
5. ebeveynin eğitim düzeyi,
6. çocuğun yaşı,
7. çocuk sayısı,
8. ebeveyn kontrol aplikasyonu kullanımı arasında anlamlı farklılıklar var mıdır?

Yöntem

Bu çalışma, anket metodolojisi kullanılarak nicel bir paradigma üzerine inşa edilmiştir. Kesitsel tarama yaklaşımı, belirli bir popülasyondan yaklaşık olarak aynı zamanda ve her seferinde bir bilgi toplanmasını ifade etmektedir (Fraenkel vd., 2012). Bu çalışmanın katılımcıları, 3-6 yaş

arası çocuğu olan ebeveynlerdir. Bu çalışmada, uygun örnekleme yöntemi kullanılmıştır (Fraenkel vd., 2012). Veri toplama araçları, Demografik Bilgi Formu ve Dijital Ebeveyn Farkındalığı (DPA) Ölçeği'nden oluşmaktadır. Dijital sosyal platformlar (Facebook, WhatsApp, Twitter, LinkedIn) aracılığıyla veriler toplanmıştır. Eksik bilgi ve aykırı değerler nedeniyle, 308 katılımcıdan oluşan veri seti normal dağılım göstermektedir. Bu doğrultuda veri analizi için tanımlayıcı istatistikler, bağımsız t-testi, Person korelasyonu ve tek yönlü ANOVA hesaplanmıştır.

Sonuç ve Tartışma

Bu araştırma, 3-6 yaş çocuğu olan anne ve babaların demografik özellikleri gibi demografik faktörlerin dijital ebeveynlik farkındalıklarını nasıl etkilediğini ortaya koymayı amaçlamıştır. İstatistiksel analizlere göre, ebeveynlerin bazı demografik özellikleri dijital ebeveynlik farkındalığını etkilemekte ve anlamlı farklılıklar göstermektedir. Anneler her açıdan DPA konusunda daha yüksek farkındalık göstermektedir. Tosun ve Mihci (2020) da ebeveynlerin cinsiyetinin dijital ebeveynlik tutumunda rolü olduğunu bulmuşlardır. Yaşı büyük ebeveynlerin çocuklarına karşı dijital olarak ihmalkar olma eğiliminde olduğu saptanmış, ancak diğer faktörler ile ebeveynlerin yaşı arasında bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Ebeveynlerin yaşı arttıkça dijital ihmalin artmasının ebeveynlerin ileriki yaşlarda dijital okuryazarlığının zayıf olmasından (Baker vd., 2017) ve çocuklarına dijital ortamda nasıl yol gösterebileceklerine dair bilgi eksikliğinden kaynaklanabileceği düşünülmektedir (Toran vd., 2016). Dijital ebeveyn farkındalığı olumsuz rol model olma, dijital ihmal, verimli kullanım açısından algılanan sosyoekonomik statüye göre farklılık göstermemekte ancak risklerden koruma boyutu farklılık sergilemektedir. Ayrıca ebeveynlerin eğitim düzeylerine göre dijital ebeveynlik farkındalığı arasında fark olmadığı görülmüştür. Bu durum, ebeveynlerin çoğunun mobil ve evde internet bağlantısının olması, internette daha fazla zaman geçirmeleri ve benzer dijital okuryazarlık niteliklerine sahip olmasından kaynaklanabilir. Bu sonuç araştırmalarla da desteklenmektedir (Tosun & Mihci, 2020). Öte yandan ebeveynler okul öncesi çağındaki çocuklarına dijital ortamlarda pek farklı davranmamakta; ancak tek çocuklu aileler çocuklarını dijital risklerden üç çocuklu ailelere göre daha fazla korumaktadırlar. İlk çocuğuna sahip anne babalar, acemi anne baba oldukları için rahatlatıcı olmaktan çok koruyucu davranabilmeleri bu sonuca yol açmış olabilir. Diğer yandan, bu araştırmanın bulguları, günde dört saatten fazla internet kullanan ebeveynlerin çocuklarına dijital ortamda olumsuz rol model olma eğiliminde olduklarını, teknoloji nedeniyle çocuklarını ihmal ettiklerini ve dijital ortamın olası zararlarından çocuklarını koruyamadıklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Bu araştırmada, hem uygulayıcıların hem de araştırmacıların bu konuya dikkati çekilmek istenmektedir. Son olarak, bir ebeveyn kontrolü uygulaması kullanan babalar/anneler, çocuklarını çevrimiçi olarak kaydetme ve izleme konusunda daha yüksek farkındalığa sahiptir.

Bu araştırmada, aynı konu ile ilgili yapılabilecek araştırmalara da yol gösterebilecek bazı sınırlılıklar da içermektedir. Ebeveynlerin beyan ettikleri günlük internet kullanımları dikkate alınmıştır. Bu nedenle, gerçek günlük kullanımları farklı olabilir. Bu nedenle, veli görüşlerinin objektifliğini artırmak için internet erişim süresine ilişkin cep telefonlarından veya bilgisayarlardan alınan veri kayıtlarının gelecekte yapılacak araştırmalara dahil edilmesi önemle tavsiye edilir. Ebeveynlerin 3-6 yaş arası birden fazla çocuğu varsa, büyük çocuğun yaşı bu çalışma için bir veri öğesi olarak kabul edilmiştir. Bu da okul öncesi dönemde birden fazla çocuğu olanlar için belirli vaka temsillerini tehdit edebilme potansiyeline sahiptir. Ayrıca, demografik değişkenler arasındaki etkileşimler bu çalışmanın dışında tutulmuştur. Son olarak Türkiye'de Şubat 2022'de yaşanan yürek burkan depremin insanlar üzerindeki sosyal ve duygusal etkilerinden dolayı uygun örneklem tercih edilmiştir.