

Examining Perceived Family Support and Family Environment under Different Boundary Conditions

Abdurrahman İLĞAN*

Düzce University College of Education, Düzce, Turkey

Mehmet Akif HELVACI

Uşak University College of Education, Uşak, Turkey

Burcu YAPAR

Master Student at Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Salih Zafer YAPAR

Teacher in İzmir, Turkey

Article history

Received:
20.05.2013

Received in revised form:
15.07.2013

Accepted:
16.07.2013

Key words:

Perceived family support,
family environment, students'
demographics

The aim of this research was to describe the family support and family environment level according to students' perceptions under socio-economic variables. The sample of the research consists of 747 middle and high school students in İzmir, Menderes town. In respect of finding out family support and environment 'family support and environment' scale has been developed by researchers. As a descriptive survey model research has revealed that students' perception about family support was in high level. In terms of perceived family support, middle school students have more positive perception than high school student. Students whose fathers don't work have less positive perception in comparison to students whose fathers are freelancers and officials; students whose mothers are alive have higher perception of family support and environment than whose mothers are dead; students whose mothers and fathers live together have higher perception of family support and environment in comparison to the others; students who live with their families have higher perception of family support and environment in comparison to the others; students who have health problems have less perception of family support and environment than those who have no health problems; students' perception of family support and environment differed according to number of brothers and sisters in the family.

Problem Statement

There are numerous factors that affecting student achievement. Individual influences of parent, teacher, and school factors on achievement are well documented in the educational

* Correspondence: Abdurrahman İLĞAN Düzce University College of Education, Düzce, Turkey, abdurrahmanilgan@gmail.com

and developmental literature (Eccles, Wigfield & Schiefele, 1998; Steinberg, 2000; as cited in Marchant, Paulson, Rothlisberg, 2001, p. 505). Heyneman and Loxley's (1982) work presented clear evidence that variation in school resource quality could matter more than variation in family inputs in producing differences in achievement among students.

A variety of family features including structure, socio-economic status, parental school involvement, parental relationship quality, and parental school aspirations have been found to predict academic achievement (Astone & McLanahan, 1991). Hung's (2007) research revealed that children's academic achievement is related to their family social status and perceptions of immediate family learning environments. It is likely that the high socio-economic status of some immigrant families play a role in the academic performance of their children. In some family background, parental encouragement, peer support, and the students' own attitudes and behaviors are all possible sources of the academic success of children from immigrant families (Fuligni, 1997, p. 352). Research has shown that family involvement is closely related with academic achievement (Callahan, Rademacher, & Hildreth, 1998). Hill and Tyson's (2009) meta-analysis research revealed that specific type of involvement, namely academic socialization, has the strongest positive relation with achievement during middle school" (p. 758). Variables related to home resources (number of books at home, availability of a place to study, having a personal computer and Internet service) led to significant differences in educational aspirations, both for the students and for their parents (Gil-Flores, Padilla-Carmona, Suarez-Ortega, 2011, p. 359). Social science research reveals the significant correlation between class (or SES) and educational achievement. The researchers also have explored differences by social background in an array of children's home and family activities. The study has found that by age 5, the average cognitive scores of children in the highest SES group were 60% greater than the scores of those in the lowest SES group (Greene & Anyon, 2010, p. 228). Socio-economic background of the family, quality of relationships with both parents and parental involvement significantly predicted offspring feelings of competence and ability overall and in academic areas. Researchers have confirmed what teachers know about the importance of family involvement and have demonstrated that such involvement has a positive impact on students' eventual success academically (Harvard Family Research Project, 2006/2007; Marcon, 1999; Miedel & Reynolds, 1999; Sanders & Herting, 2000; as cited in. Kyle, 2011, p. 11). Qualities of the family, including quality of relationships with mothers, parental educational aspirations, and parental involvement predicted expectations of academic success (Weiser, Riggio, 2010, p. 376). Parental school involvement is a major influence on students' academic outcomes. Measures of parental school involvement typically include (1) parent participation in school activities (2) communication between parents and children about school, (3) assistance with homework, and (4) supervision and monitoring of schoolwork (Mji & Mbinda, 2005).

Family support as a principal variable of this research is important aspect that effect students' academic achievement. Demaray (et al. 2005) defined family support as an individual's perception that he or she is cared for, esteemed and valued by his or her family. The research by Cheng, Ickes, and Verhofstadt (2012) revealed that the level of perceived family "social" support was important not only as a "main effect" predictor of the magnitude and stability of the students' GPA scores across three successive semesters, but also as a factor that helped female students to succeed regardless of their level of family economic support. Child support may have a unique capacity to improve family relationships that are important to the child. High child support payments may also bring about improved emotional well-being for the child, by signaling or even bringing about a high level of commitment by the father. Child support could also simply provide income through a process that lacks specific negative

consequences that might accompany income sources such as maternal earnings or welfare. (Knox, 1996, p.834). Family assistance is an important feature of adolescent daily life and provides a sense of meaning and connection to the family (Telzer, Fuligni, 2009, p. 560). Family support had positive effects on students' learning approaches reiterates the importance that Spanish culture places on family (Roman, Cuestas, & Fenollar, 2008, p. 135). Child support might have distinct effects for three main reasons. It may bring disproportionate improvements in children's material well-being; it might have important effects on family relationships; or it might simply provide income without the potential effects on children (positive or negative) of other income sources (Knox, 1996, p. 817). Home (1997) found that women who felt more supported by family and friends experienced less stress than those who did not. Emotional support as related concept with family support is defined as having someone who is available and willing to listen, talk, care, support, and empathize, while instrumental support is defined as providing hands-on assistance with such things as finances, child care, or household chores (Plageman, Sabina, 2010, p. 157). Family assistance is a particularly important aspect of family life for youth from Latin American and Asian backgrounds, especially for those from immigrant families (Hardway and Fuligni, 2006).

Steinberg et al. (1992) stated that, when parents were more involved in their child's schooling (e.g. helping with homework, helping to select courses, and keeping abreast of students' progress), children performed better academically and were more engaged in high school. Low family income, which is a meaningful proxy for economic pressure, is related to less involved, less supportive parenting (Brody, Murry, Kim & Brown, 2002). The influence of others' expectations and family support on achievement has received little attention from scholars (Roman, Cuestas, & Fenollar, 2008, p. 127). Trusty (1996) research conducted with primary and secondary school students, examined the effect of family involvement on academic achievement. Parental involvement in children's school has been defined in a number of ways, but has consistently been shown to positively impact children's achievement regardless of its form (Marchant, Paulson, Rothlisberg, 2001, p. 505). Parental involvement has positive effects on their children's academic success in school (Eccles & Harold, 1993). A research by Wiseman, Mayless, and Sharbany (2006) at higher education level, revealed that parental care was negatively associated with first-year university students' loneliness. Paulson's (1994) research has resulted with the positive relations of parents' involvement in children's schoolwork or homework and their involvement in school functions and extracurricular activities with achievement outcomes. Thompson, Alexander and Entwisle (1988) research revealed that children's academic achievement is related positively to high parental expectations and with parental values (Paulson, 1994) about achievement. Some other researchers suggest that parents' academic expectations influence their children's own academic expectations (Patrikakou 1997; Trusty 1998). Romans et al. research's (2008) found that self-esteem, others' expectations and family support – all of which have been associated with important outcomes in past research – influence academic achievement only through the key mediating variables of learning approaches. Because their parsimonious model permits no direct path from any of the three antecedents (self-esteem, others' expectations and family support) to academic achievement, it implies a central status for learning approaches.

Students' school achievement is related to their perceptions of parenting style and parental involvement (Paulson, 1994; Wentzel, 1994). Most researchers agree on the significant role of authoritative parenting styles and active parental involvement in maximizing children's academic success across grades, gender, and ethnic groups (Steinberg, 2000; as cited in Marchant, Paulson, Rothlisberg, 2001, p. 506). Romans et al. research's (2008) reveals the importance of family support affecting measures of active engagement in learning activities

such as deep processing strategies and effort. In addition, their results reveal that parents continue to be an important factor in students' self-esteem when they are enrolled at university.

Research by Caldwell and Ginther, (1996) stated that socioeconomic status (SES) is the best predictor of academic attainment, and that low-SES forecasts low attainment. SES affects school achievement in a number of ways (Greene & Anyon, 2010). Fuligni's (1997) research revealed that the higher educational levels and occupational statuses of a small portion of the success of their children. Socio-economic status, along with language use, was also associated with the ethnic variations in the effects of students' generational status. Hauser-Cram's (2009) research revealed that parents' education impacts the academic attainment of children. A study students with a Hispanic background found that high levels of parental support had a significant impact on degree completion (Sciarra & Whitson, 2007). The research conducted by Jacobs and King (2002) among White sample of females in a three-generation, parental level of education did not have a significant impact on degree completion. Plageman and Sabina (2010) state that parental influence on education extends beyond the educational level of the parents themselves to an environment of support for academic endeavors.

Increasing academic success of the student is the basic aim of all the education systems in all over the world. A lot of variables which influence students' academic success can be counted as it mentioned above. The focus point of this research is to describe students' perceptions about family support and environment. It was decided that students' own perceptions of their to what extent the level of family support, rather than perceptions of others (parents) would be assessed in this study.

It is important that chosen research sample is the town of Menderes because its academic success is not sufficient among the other towns of Izmir city. Starting from here, family support to students' academic success and finding out/describing family conditions convenience according to students' perceptions and examining them in accordance with different variables is the problem of this research. Starting from here the aim of this research was as followed: To what extent the family support and family environment level according to students' perceptions? Does this level change according to students' grades, parent's liveliness, parent's working conditions, parent's unity, family monthly incomes, health problems, the number of brothers and sisters, participating in different activities, having a license on a sport branch.

Method

In this section model of this research, population and sample of the research, developing instrument, collecting and analyzing of data take place. In connection with this research according to students' perception; because the level of family support has been tried to be understood (present situation is tried to be found out) this research is a descriptive survey research (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Descriptive research is designed to describe the characteristic or behaviors of a particular population in a systematic accurate fashion. Survey research uses questionnaires and interviews to collect information about people's attitudes, beliefs, feelings, behaviors, and lifestyles (Leary, 2011).

Research Sample

The population of the research consists of middle and high school students in Izmir, Menderes town. In these schools there were 5162 students, 3184 of these students attend to

middle schools, 1978 of them attend to high schools. The stages of determining of the sample are those: primarily schools and grades have been thought as clusters (Saifuddin, 2009) and chosen accordingly. Cluster sampling defined as a group of population elements, constitutes the sampling unit, instead of a single element of the population (Saifuddin, 2009). After each school and grade have been taken as a cluster each 6th 12th and 18th students in the class list have been taken to the sample. In case the number of class is more than 18 24th student if there isn't 24th the last student in the list has taken to the sample in that way by systematic sample technic the sample has been taken. School, class and student lists have been obtained via e-school system on the web within the permission of Menderes Direction of National Education. As a result, 747 students supposed that would be represent Menderes town have been taken to the sample. Demographic information of the students participated to research has been given in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic information of students participated to the research.

Variables	Level	N	%
School Kind	1. Primary school	91	12,2
	2. Secondary school	366	49,0
	3. High school	290	38,8
Grade	1. 6. grade	151	20,2
	2. 7. grade	144	19,3
	3. 8. grade	158	21,2
	4. 9. grade	104	13,9
	5. 10. grade	69	9,2
	6. 11. grade	71	9,5
	7. 12. grade	44	5,9
Is mother alive?	1. Yes	739	98,9
	2. No	8	1,1
Is father alive?	1. Yes	732	98,0
	2. No	15	2,0
Father's job	1. Doesn't work	70	9,4
	2. Official	112	15,0
	3. Freelancer	537	71,9
Mother's job	1. Doesn't work	500	66,9
	2. Official	40	5,4
	3. Freelancer	190	25,4
Do mother and father live together?	1. Yes	674	90,2
	2. No	53	7,1
Does the student live with family?	1. Yes	713	95,4
	2. No	17	2,3
Monthly income	1. 1-500 TL	108	14,5
	2. 501-1000 TL	263	35,2
	3. 1001-1500 TL	210	28,1
	4. 1501-3000 TL	97	13
	5. 3000 TL and over	42	5,6
Is there a health problem?	1. There is	56	7,5
	2. There isn't	669	89,6
Number of brothers and sisters	1. The only child	57	7,6
	2. Two	340	45,5
	3. Three	196	26,2
	4. Four	66	8,8
	5. Five	41	5,5
Is there a study room?	6. Six	9	1,2
	7. Seven	11	1,5
	8. Eight and over	10	1,2
	1. Yes	547	73,2
Is there a library at school ?	2. No	195	26,1
	1. Yes	601	80,5
	2. No	140	18,7

Student's number of the classroom	1. 10-20	202	27,0
	2. 21-25	234	31,3
	3. 26-30	196	26,2
	4. 31 and over	112	15,0
Have they got a sport license ?	1. Yes	176	23,6
	2. No	568	76
Do they participate school team?	1. Yes	153	20,5
	2. No	586	78,4

As it has been seen in table 1. 91 students (% 12,2) primary, 366 students (% 49) secondary, 290 students (% 38,8) are high school students; 151 of them (% 20,2) 6th grade, 144 of them (% 19,3) 7th grade, 158 of them (% 21,2) 8th grade, 104 of them (%13,9) 9th grade, 69 of them (%9,2) 10th grade, 71 of them (%9,5) 11th grade, 44 of them (% 5,9) are 12th grade students: while 739 of their (%98,9) mothers are alive 8 of their (%1,1) mothers are not alive; 732 of their (%98) fathers are alive; 15 of their (%2,0) fathers are not live; 70 of their (%9,4) fathers have no job; 112 of (%15) their fathers are official; 537 of (%71,9) their fathers are free trades; 550 of their (% 66,9) mothers don't work, 40 of their (%5,4) mothers are official; 190 of their (% 25,4) mothers are free traders; 674 of their (% 90,2) parents live together; 53 of their (% 7,1) parents live separately; 713 of them (% 95,4) live with their families, 17 of them (% 2,3) live separately from their families; 108 of them (%14,5) has around 1500 TL monthly income, 263 of them (%35,2) has 501-1000 TL monthly income; 210 of them (%28,1) has 1001-1500 TL monthly income; 97 of them (%13) has 1501-3000 TL monthly income; 42 of them (%5,6) has 3000 TL and over monthly income; 56 of them (%7,5) have health problems, 669 of them (%89,6) have no health problems; 57 of them (%7,6) have only one brother or sister, 340 of them (%45,5) have two brothers or sisters, 196 of them (%26,2) have three brothers or sisters, 66 of them (%8,8) have four brothers or sisters, 41 of them (%5,5) have five brothers or sisters, 9 of them (%1,2) have six brothers or sisters, 11 of them (%1,5) have seven brothers or sisters, 10 of them (%1,2) have eight and more brothers or sisters, 547 of them (%73,2) have a study room, 195 of them (%26,1) have no study rooms; 601 of them (%80,5) have a library at their school, 140 of them (%18,7) have no libraries at their schools; 202 of them (%27,0) have 10-20 students in their classes, 234 of them (%31,3) have 21-25 students in their classrooms, 196 of them (%26,2) have 26-30 students in their classrooms, 112 of them (%15,0) have 31 and more students in their classrooms; 176 of them (%23,6) have a sport license, 568 of them (%76) have no sport license; 153 of them (%20,5) participate in a school team, 586 of them (%78,4) don't participate in a school team. Percentages and frequency of social and cultural activities of the students who take place in the research have been given in table 2.

Table 2: Frequency and percentages of activities that students attend

Name of the activity	Activity done as I.		Activity done as II.		Activity done as III.		Activity done as IV.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No activity	273	36,5	626	83,8	697	93,3	729	97,6
Cinema/theatre	96	12,9						
Folk dances	99	13,3	18	2,4				
Chorus	35	4,7	21	2,8	4	,5		
Reading	69	9,2	22	2,9	5	,7	1	,1
Writing story/poem	17	2,3	17	2,3	14	1,9	4	,5
Painting	56	7,5	29	3,9	15	2	12	1,6
Sport	78	10,4	12	1,6	10	1,3	1	,1
Music	21	2,8	2	,3	1	,1		
Chess	3	,4			1	,1		
Total	747	100,0	747	100,0	747	100,0	747	100,0

As it can be seen in table 2. 273 of the students (% 36,5) don't take part in any social activity; 626 of them (% 83,8) don't participate in a second activity; 697 of them (% 93,3) don't take part in a 3^d. activity, 729 of them (% 97,6) don't take part in a 4th. activity. However 96 of them (%12,9) firstly participate in cinema and theatre activities; 99 of them (% 13,3) firstly participate folk dances, 18 of them (% 2,4) secondly participate in folk dances, 35 of them (% 4,7) firstly participate in chorus; while 21 of them (% 2,8) secondly participate in chorus; 69 of them (%9,2) firstly participate in reading activity while 22 of them (% 2,9) secondly, 5 of them (% ,7) thirdly, 1 of them (% , 1) fourthly do the reading activity; writing story and poem activities have been done by firstly 17 (% 2,3), secondly 17 (% 2,3), thirdly (% 1,9); fourthly 4 (% ,5) of the students sports activities have been done by firstly 56 (%7,5), secondly 29 (% 3,9), thirdly (% 2), fourthly 12 (% 1,6) of the students; sports activities have been done by firstly 78 (% 10,4) secondly 12 (% 1,6), thirdly 10 (% 1,3); fourthly 1 (% 0,1) of the students.

Music activities have been done by firstly 21 (%2,8) secondly 2 (% ,3), thirdly 1 (% 0,1) of the students; chess activities have been done by firstly 3 (% ,4) thirdly 1 (% 0,1) of the students.

Instrument

In this research in respect of finding out family support and environment 'family support and environment' scale has been improved. Instrument has been developed by the researchers by means of related literature scanning and statements gathered from the students by open-ended question compositions. Improved, instrument has been put into practice after regulated in accordance with the opinions of experts and teachers. In measuring instrument frequency of family behavior against the child has been measured by five point Likert type. Response options of instrument are as these: Never, occasionally, sometimes, usually, always. In instrument while high point is the indication of high interest and support of parents as well as a good family environment; the low point is the indication of lack of interest and support of parents as well as an unsuitable family environment. In the first form of family support and environment scale there were 29 items, 23 of them are negative, 6 of them were positive items. 9 items have been deleted from the scale because they have given low factor loadings or have given a higher factor loading under a different factor. Accordingly in scale 17 of them were positive 3 of them were negative in total 20 items used.

Before conducting the Exploratory Factor Analysis, (EFA) a preliminary check was carried out to assess whether the instrument was suitable for EFA. The three criteria for factorability were used: a correlation matrix with many inters correlations above 0.3; a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974); and a statistically significant value of Bartlett's sphericity test (Bartlett, 1954). Exploratory factor analysis revealed that KMO: ,92 and the Bartlett's test has been found significant (,000). According to this result, it can be said that data was factorable. The factor loadings of 'family support and environment' scale ranged between ,336 and ,775; item-total correlation values have ranged between ,28 and ,68. It can be said that the scale unidimensional because it explained 34,5 % of the variance. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient for the 'family support and environment' scale was ,86. According to this result it can be said that the scale is valid and reliable.

Data Analysis

Grading of items in family support and environment scale section within the context of the research are as these: between 1-1,79 never; 1.80-2.59 occasionally; 2,60-3,39

sometimes; 3.40-4.19 usually and 4.20-5.00 always. Individual information (demographic) about students participated the research has been analyzed by frequency and percentage. In describing family support and environment, school and individual factors which influence academic success, mean and standard deviation have been used: In comparing students' grades on school and individual scale to demographic variants t-test and single variance analyzing have been done.

Results

Descriptive statistics of students' perception on their family support and environment participated to research has been given in table 3.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of students' perception on their family support and environment participated to research

Family support and environment	X	SS
1. The atmosphere of my house gives me peace.	4,3608	1,033
2. My family provides my basic needs (food, accommodation, clothing, allowance)	4,7773	,671
3. My family knows my successful sides.	4,4054	,919
4. My family knows my unsuccessful sides.	4,2135	1,098
5. My family treats equally to my brother/s and sister/s	4,5832	,895
6. My family rewards we when I am successful.	3,5239	1,239
7. I get on well with my brother/s and sister/s.	4,0668	1,023
8. My family buys me helping source books (question banks, tests).	4,2503	1,151
9. My family trusts me.	4,6341	,845
10. My family supports me to go to social activities outside the school (sport, social, cultural)	4,0662	1,257
11. My family supports me to be successful.	4,7077	,714
12. My family gives importance to my needs.	4,2122	,974
13. My family watches TV (soap operas, match, movies) when I do my homework*.	2,39 / 3,56	1,395
14. I have a strong relation with my family.	4,4257	,973
15. My family criticizes me when I'm unsuccessful*.	2,77 / 3,22	1,426
16. My family doesn't understand me*.	2,30 / 3,68	1,379
17. My family attends meeting at school.	4,0218	1,210
18. I always feel the care of my family.	4,4763	,912
19. My family gives attention to my ideas.	4,2995	,982
20. I feel my self at my home.	4,4435	,965
Total	4,20	,59

* Negative items.

As it can be seen in table 3 that family support and environment of students' perception correspond to always level (X= 4,20); in other words families present the support and care according to students' perception successfully. In family support and environment scale according to students' perception the most common behaviors of families against to their children are like that; 'my family provides my basic needs (food, clothing, accommodation, pocket money)' (X= 4,78), 'my family supports me to be successful' (X= 4,71) and 'my family trusts me' (X= 4,63); the least common behaviors of families against to their children are like that 'my family criticize me when I'm unsuccessful' (X= 2,77 / 3,22), 'my family watches TV (soap operas, match, movies) when I do my homework'(X= 2,39 / 3,56), 'My family doesn't understand me' (X= 2,30 / 3,68). According to students' perception, families' rare behaviors are positive in terms of grammar, (on the contrary of other statement in measuring instrument) but if the families do the same behavior frequently they have negative meanings in terms of families support and care. Families support on providing their children's basic physiological needs in a high level, supporting their children's

success and trusting their children is a positive situation in terms of humanity and education. When the general average of the measuring instrument is viewed, -although families' incomes are relatively low- It is possible to say that families' provide enough conditions, support and psychological structure to their children for their success. In addition to this sometimes when their children are unsuccessful they can show negative behaviors in respect of their level and this may cause a negative situation but in terms of society it is a possible result.

Examining the perception of family support and environment according to demographic variables

In the following analysis, the issue if the demographic variables that belong to students (grade level, school kind, father, mother, proficiency, family unity, monthly income, health problems, number of brothers and sisters, sport license, taking place in a school team, attending social activities, living with family) affect family support and environment or not has been mentioned.

According to school and grade

Due to the research has being done on secondary and high schools between 6th and 12th grade students have taken place in the research sample. Descriptive statistic according to grade level perception of students in terms of family support and environment are like that: 6th grade (N= 151; X= 86,4; ss= 8,5); 7th grade (N= 144; X= 86,2; ss= 10,7); 8th grade (N= 158; X= 84,9; ss= 10,2); 9th grade (N= 104; X= 83,3; ss= 13,3); 10th grade (N= 69; X= 80,6; ss= 11,87); 11th grade (N= 71; X= 80,5; ss= 14,4) ve 12th grade (N= 44; X= 77,4; ss= 16,6). According to grade level if the perception of students' about family support and environment significantly differs or not has been analyzed and result showed that it is differed [$F_{(6-734)} = 6,66$; $p < .05$]. In respect of this 6th grade students in comparison to 10th, 11th, 12th grade students; 7th grade students in comparison to 10th and 12th grade students have the perception of more suitable family support and environment.

According to school level descriptive statistics on students' perception of family support and environment are like that: primary school (N= 91; X= 88,02; ss= 10); secondary school (N= 366; X= 85,2; ss= 9,75); high school (N=290; X= 81,09; ss= 13,8). It has been found out that students perception of family support and environment significantly differed according to school level [$F_{(2-744)} = 16,77$; $p < .05$]. In respect of this, graders between 6th and 8th in primary schools in comparison to middle and high school students; middle school students in comparison to high school students have the perception of more suitable family support and environment.

Related to parent socioeconomic status

According to father's job descriptive statistics on students' perception of family support and environment are like these: Doesn't work (N= 70; X= 79,8; ss= 11,34), official (N= 112; X= 85,34; ss= 11,81), and freelancer (N= 537; X= 84,2; ss= 11,65). It has been found that students' perception of family support and environment significantly differed according to father's job [$F_{(2-716)} = 5,34$; $p < .05$]. In respect of this students whose fathers don't work have the perception of insufficient family support and environment in comparison to students whose fathers are freelancers and officials.

To test the perception of family support and environment according to mother's job

because of great number differences among groups that have been compared Kruskal-Wallis test that is nonparametric test equivalent to one way anova has been carried out. Descriptive statistics related to Kruskal-Wallis test are like these: Doesn't work (N= 500; average rank = 368,37), official (N= 40; average rank = 407,81) and freelancer (N= 190; average rank = 349,03). It has been understood that student's perception of family support and environment did not differed significantly according to mother's job [$X_{(2)} = 2,87; p > .05$]. In other words student's perception of family support and environment did not differ according to mother's job.

According to family's monthly income descriptive statistics on student's perception of family support and environment are like these: Less than 500 TL (N= 108; X= 81,31; ss= 12,21), between 501-1000 TL (N= 263; X= 83,78; ss= 11,68), between 1001-1500 TL (N= 210; X= 85,2; ss= 11,47), between 1501-3000 TL (N= 97; X= 84,8; ss= 12,31) and 3001 over (N= 42; X= 82,5; ss= 11,26). One way anova test revealed that student's perception of family support and environment did not differed significantly according to family's monthly income [$F_{(4-715)} = 2,26; p > .05$].

Instead of t-test Mann-Whitney U test that is the non-parametric alternative of it has been used in comparing student's perception of family support and environment related to family unity, being alive for both mother and father, living together with the family because there have been great differences among the number of groups which have been compared.

Descriptive statistics related to Mann-Whitney U test to understand if the perception of the student's family support and environment differ or not according to mother's condition of being alive are like these: Mother alive (N= 739; average rank = 375,7), mother dead (N= 8; average rank = 215,13). U test revealed that students' whose mothers are alive have higher perception of family support and environment than whose mothers are dead (U = 1685,5; p < .05). Descriptive statistics related to Mann-Whitney U test to understand if the perception of the student's family support and environment differ or not according to father's condition of being alive are like these: father alive (N= 732; average rank = 375,04), father dead (N= 15; Sıra ort. = 323,03). U test revealed that students' perception of family support and environment did not differ significantly according to father's condition of being alive or not (U = 4725,5; p > .05).

Descriptive statistics related to Mann-Whitney U test on perception of student's family support and environment in respect of family unity are like these: If mother and father are together (N= 674; average rank= 369,57), if mother and father are separated (N= 53; average rank = 293,19). U test revealed that students whose mothers and fathers are together have higher perception of family support and environment in comparison to the others (U = 14108; p < .05).

Descriptive statistics related to Mann-Whitney U test on perception of student's family support and environment in respect of living with the family or not are like these: Students living with their families (N= 713; average rank = 369,16), students living separately from their families (N= 17; average rank = 212,09). U test revealed that students who live with their families have higher perception of family support and environment in comparison to the others (U = 3452,5; p < .05).

Related to opportunities provided by family

Descriptive statistics related to Mann-Whitney U test on perception of student's family support and environment due to the student's health problems are like these: Students who have health problems (N= 56; average rank = 294,20), students who have no health problems (N= 669; average rank = 368,76). U test revealed that students who have health problems have less perception of family support and environment than those who have no health problems ($U = 14879$; $p < .05$). In other words students who have health problems have less perception of sufficient family support and environment than those who have no health problems. Descriptive statistics related to number of brothers and sisters are like that: The only child of family (N= 57; $X = 87,74$; $ss = 12,07$), 2 brothers and sisters (N= 340; $X = 85,58$; $ss = 11,24$), 3 brothers and sisters (N= 196; $X = 83,09$; $ss = 11,45$), 4 brothers and sisters (N= 66; $X = 81,65$; $ss = 11,3$), 5 brothers and sisters (N= 41; $X = 78,91$; $ss = 13,31$), 6 brothers, sisters and over (N= 30; $X = 74,94$; $ss = 11,86$). One way anova test revealed that student's perception of family support and environment differed significantly according to number of brothers and sisters [$F_{(5-724)} = 8,5$; $p < .05$]. In another words student's perception of family support and environment differed according to number of brothers and sisters in the family. In respect of this result students who are the only child in the family higher perception of family support and environment in comparison to those who have 4, 5, and 6 brothers and sisters and over; students who have 2 brothers and sisters have higher perception of family support and environment than students who have 5 and 6 or more brothers and sisters. Students who have 3 brothers have higher perception perception of family support and environment than those who have 6 and more brothers and sisters.

Related to the activities that student participates in

Descriptive statistics related to t-test on perception of student's family support and environment in respect of having a license on a sport branch are like these: Has got a sport license (N= 176; $X = 83,78$; $ss = 12,62$) hasn't got a sport license (N= 568; $X = 83,97$; $ss = 11,55$). In the light of t-test result it has been found that student's perception of family support and environment did not differ according to having a sport license or not ($t_{(742)} = ,18$; $p > ,05$). In other words, students' sport licenses have no effect on their perception of family support and environment.

Descriptive statistics related to t-test on perception of student's family support and environment in respect of taking part in a social activity (cinema, theatre, painting, music, sport etc.) are like these: Students who do social activities (N= 474; $X = 84,45$; $ss = 11,52$) students who don't do social activities (N= 273; $X = 83,1$; $ss = 12,22$). According to t-test result it has been found that doing or not doing an activity did not differ students' perception level of family support and environment ($t_{(745)} = ,133$; $p > ,05$). In other words it has been understood that doing or not doing an activity has no effect on students' perception level of family support and environment.

Discussion and Conclusions

The findings of Marchant, Paulson and Rothlisberg (2001) research confirm the significant role of supportive relationship with parents, teachers, and peers on early adolescents' school achievement. Furthermore, it can be said that the combined effects of the family and school environments have a greater impact on students' achievement than either context alone.

A collection of ethnographies and other qualitative studies suggests that regardless of

their socioeconomic background, many immigrant students find themselves in a family environment that is strongly supportive of achievement (Fuligni, 1997, p. 352). This research revealed those students' perceptions of parental support, environment and monitoring mean was $X = 4,20$ (on a 1 to 5 point Likert scale) means that in high level. The research by Marchant, Paulson and Rothlisberg (2001) assessed students' perceptions of parents' warmth and nurturance related with the things assessed in this research in the same way showed that, parental responsiveness mean was $X = 3,95$ near but less than result of this research. Other research (Graber, Nichols, Lynne, Brooks-Gunn, Botvin, 2006, p.79) found out that parental monitoring means were for 6th grade ($X = 4,14$), for 7th grade ($X = 4,00$) and for 8th grade ($X = 3,82$) relatively consistent with this research results. The research by İlğan et al., (2012) conducted with middle school students' parents revealed that parents concern and support related to academic life of their children level were in high level ($X = 4.02$ on a 5 point Likert scale) relatively consistent with result of this research. The research conducted by Plageman and Sabina (2010) among female adult undergraduate students who were 25 years of age and older revealed that mother ($X = 4,42$) and father ($X = 4,16$) support, were in high level, students to attend the college they are enrolled. Romans et al. research's (2008) conducted with undergraduate college students revealed that students' perceived family support mean was 7,58 (on a 1 to 11 Likert scale) can be interpreted as family support was in high level. The research conducted by Weiser and Riggio (2010) with undergraduate students assessed parental involvement, same concepts with this research, how often parents inquired about school, helped with homework, and communicated with school related revealed that perceived students' parental involvement mean was ($X = 2,66$) inconsistent with result of this research. The reason for this inconsistent result may occurred for different age of participants of our and Weiser & Riggio's (2010) research. Participants of our research were middle and high school, need more support of family, whereas participants of Weiser & Riggio's (2010) research were undergraduate students, needless support of family when compared with middle and high school students. A research by Fuligni (1997) with middle and high school immigrant students assessed "parents' value of academic success" created to assess students' perception of their parents' value of academic success related with aim of this research. The Fuligni research revealed that mean for 'value of academic success' were (3.99; 4.36; 4.37; on a 5 point Likert) for Latino, East Asian and Filipino students consecutively consistent with result of this research. The importance of attitude and expectations to achievement has been investigated previously in a study by Keeves (1972; as cited in, Jacobs and Harvey, 2005) of Australian students in their final year of primary school and last year of secondary school. He found a moderate to strong association between students' mathematics and science achievement and parents' attitudes towards their children's education and ambitions for their future education and occupation (p. 432). Research of Rumberger (1995) resulted with that student 'family background is widely recognized as the most significant important contributor to success in schools'. Research conducted by Hung (2007) –consistent with Rumberger's research- revealed that parents' involvement both at home and at school, and parents' aspiration, could be thought as combine variable of this research, explained extra $R^2 = 11.68$ % in Chinese language score and extra $R^2 = 7.97$ % in mathematics achievement. The final results of Hung revealed that the associations among family social status, birth order, parents' involvement at home and in school, and parents' aspirations with Chinese language and mathematics achievement scores were all significant.

This research revealed that middle school students perceived higher perception than high school students in terms of parental support and monitoring whereas there were no significant differences among middle school graders (6th, 7th, 8th). Descriptive statistics in both grade and school level comparisons show great statistical differences for all groups. The

more grade level in increases the less students have the perception of family support and environment is a attention- getting as well it is an expected situation. Providing more support to younger students than older ones by families may cause students' dependency decrease by getting older and because of adolescence conflict between family and the child. In addition to this by the education law 4+4+4 identified as primary school and second grade school students have more perception of family support and environment then the separate secondary school students is invincible. Other research (Graber, Nichols, Lynne, Brooks-Gunn, Botvin, 2006, p.79) found out that in 6th grades, young adolescents indicated that they perceived parental monitoring as occurring most of the time (over 4 on a 1 to 5 point Likert scale) but perceptions of monitoring decreased significantly over 6th, 7th, and 8th grades relatively inconsistent with result of this research.

This research revealed that students' with single-parent family had perceived less family support than students with intact parents. Children grow up in single-parent families are more likely to drop out of school, to become unemployed, to form mother-only families, and to be poor as adults than children in intact families (Krein & Beller, 1988). Research (Amato and Keith 1991; Amato 2001; Astone and McLanahan 1991; Naevdal and Thuen 2004; as cited in, Weiser & Riggio, 2010, p. 368) indicates that family structure is linked to academic achievement as children and adolescents from intact families (families with two married parents) consistently outperform their peers from single-parent homes on a wide variety of outcomes including grades, standardized achievement test scores, high school completion, and college graduation. Some research (Downey, 1994; Pong & Ju, 2000) on children reared in single-parent families when compared to intact families consistently indicate negative effects on a child's school achievement, completion, behavior, and social development relatively consistent with result of this research. Knox's (1996) revealed that child support payments received in single-parent years improve the achievement test scores of elementary school children. The research by Lee and Kushner (2008, p.615) indicated that there are no benefits of living with same-gender parents on adolescents' academic achievement. Rather, they found advantages of living with the opposite-gender parent for girls. Videon (2002) asserted that previous research overlooks the possibilities that families managed by single fathers or single mothers might impact their sons' or daughters' academic development differently. Using national survey data, Powell and Downey (1997) investigated the same-gender hypothesis and found that there were no significant differences on the variables of view of self, relationships with others, school outcomes, parental involvement, and deviance in children reared by a single mother or single father. Whether children lived with their same-gender parent or not made no difference (as cited in, Lee, & Kushner, 2008, p. 610).

It has been understood that mother's condition of being alive affects student's perception of support and state whereas father's condition of being alive doesn't affect. Because it is assumed that the child needs great support of mother in the family, her condition of being alive affects the child's perception of family support and environment is an estimated situation. It is an estimated event that students who live separately from their families have lower perception of family support and environment than the others. Students who live together with their families-because of intimate physical contact- would have more support from their families and it is an estimated event as well. This research revealed that students whose fathers don't work have the perception of insufficient family support and environment in comparison to students whose fathers are freelancers and officials.

Statistically in all groups with the condition of not being significantly it is possible to say that student's perception of family support and environment may increase or decrease

according to number of brothers and sisters in the family. When Turkey's economic conditions have been thought a family that has a lot of children would provide their children sufficient support and care in a very big difficulty because of this, it is not possible to say that the result that has been found in this research is estimated one. Students who have health problems may perceive the level of family support and environment lower than they expect due to the sensitivity that cause their illness.

References

- Astone, N. M., & McLanahan, S. S. (1991). Family structure, parental practices and high school completion. *American Sociological Review*, 56(3), 309–320.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1954) A note on the multiplying factors for various chi square approximations, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 16(series B), 296–298.
- Brody, G. H., Murry, V. M., Kim, S., & Brown, A. C. (2002). Longitudinal pathways to competence and psychological adjustment among African American children living in rural single-parent households. *Child Development*, 73, 1505–1516.
- Caldwell, G.P., & D.W. Ginther. (1996). Differences in learning styles of low socioeconomic status for low and high achievers. *Education*. 117 (1), 141–146.
- Callahan, K., Rademacher, J. A., & Hildreth, B. L. (1998). The effect of parent participation in strategies to improve the homework performance of students who are at risk. *Remedial and Special Education*, 19(3), 131-141.
- Cheng, W., Ickes, W., & Verhofstadt, L. (2012). How is family support related to students' GPA scores? A longitudinal study. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*. 64(3), 399-420.
- Demaray, M.K., C.K. Malecki, L.M. Davidson, K.K. Hodgson, & P.J. Rebus. (2005). The relationship between social support and student adjustment: A longitudinal analysis. *Psychology in the Schools*. 42 (7), 691–706.
- Downey, D.B. (1994). The school performance of children from single-mother and single-father families: Economic or interpersonal deprivation. *Journal of Family*. 15, 129–148.
- Eccles, J.S., & R.D. Harold. 1993. Parent–school involvement during the early adolescent years. *Teachers College Record*. 94 (3), 568–587.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th ed.). PA: McGraw-Hill.
- Fuligni, A. (1997). The academic achievement of adolescent from immigrant families: The roles of family background, attitudes, and behavior. *Child Development*. 68 (2), 351-363.
- Gil-Flores, J., Padila-Carmona, M. T., & Suarez-Ortega, M. (2011). Influence of gender, educational attainment and family environment on the educational aspirations of secondary school students. *Educational Review*. 63 (3), 345-363.
- Graber, J. A., Nichols, T., Lynne, S. D., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Botvin, G. J. (2006). A longitudinal examination of family, friend, and media influences component versus problem behaviors among urban minority youth. *Applied Developmental Science*. 10 (2), 75-85.
- Greene, K., & Anyon, J. (2010). Urban school reform, family support, and student achievement. *Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties*. 26(3) 223-236.
- Hardway, C., & Fuligni, A. J. (2006). Dimensions of family connectedness among adolescents with Chinese, Mexican, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 1246–1258. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.42.6.1246.

- Hauser-Cram, P. (2009). Education from one generation to the next: Mechanisms of mediation. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 55(3), 351–360.
- Heyneman, S. P., & Loxley, W. A. (1982) “Influences on academic achievement across high and low income countries: A re-analysis of IEA data. *Sociology of Education*. 55 (1) 13–21.
- Hill, N., & Tyson, D. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analysis assessment of strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(3), 740-763.
- Home, A. (1997). Learning the hard way: Role strain, stress, role demands, and support in multiple-role women students. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 33(2), 335–346.
- Hung, C. L. (2007). Family, schools and Taiwanese children’s outcomes. *Educational Research*. 49 (2), 115-125.
- İlğan, A., Erdem, M., Yapar, B., Aydın, S. & Aydemir, Ş. Ş. (2012). Veli ilgisi ve ilköğretim öğrencilerinin seviye belirleme sınavlarını (SBS) yordama düzeyi [Parents care and regression level of primary state school students level determination exam (SBS) score]. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi – The Journal of Researchers on Education Sciences* , 2 (2), 1–17. <http://ebad-jesr.com/>
- Jacobs, J. A, & King, R. B. (2002). Age and college completion: A life-history analysis of women aged 15–44. *Sociology of Education*, 75, 211–230.
- Jacobs, N., & Harvey, D. (2005). Do parents make different to children’s academic achievement? Differences between parents of higher and lower achieving students. *Educational Studies*. 31 (4), 431-448.
- Kaiser, H. (1970) A second generation Little Jiffy, *Psychometrika*, 35, 401– 415.
- Knox, V. W. (1996). The effects of child support payments on developmental outcomes for elementary school-age children. *The Journal of Human Resources*. 31(4), 816-840.
- Krein, S. F., & Beller, A. H. (1988). Educational attainment of children from single-parent families: differences by exposure, gender, and race. *Ethnography*. 25(2), 221-234.
- Kyle, D. W. (2011). Families’ goals, school involvement, and children’s academic achievement: A follow-up study thirteen years later. *The School Community Journal*, 21 (2), 9-24).
- Leary, M. R. (2011). *Introduction to behavioral research methods*. (6th ed.). London: Pearson Education:
- Lee, S. M, & Kushner, J. (2008). Single-parent families: the role of parent’s and child’s gender on academic achievement. *Gender and Education*. 20 (6), 607-621.
- Marchant, G. J., Paulson, S. E., & Rothlisberg, B. A. (2001). Relations of middle school students’ perceptions of family and school contexts with academic achievement. *Psychology in the schools*. 38 (6), 505-519.
- Mji, A., & Mbinda, Z. (2005). Exploring high school science students’ perceptions of parental involvement in their education. *Psychological Reports*, 97, 325–336.
- Patrikakou, E.N. (1997). A model of parental attitudes and the academic achievement of adolescents. *Journal of Research & Development in Education* 31, 7–26.
- Paulson, S.E. (1994). Relations of parenting style and parental involvement with ninth grade students’ achievement. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 14, 250–267.
- Plageman, P. M. & Sabina, C. (2010). Perceived family influence on undergraduate adult female student. *The journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 58, 156-166. DOI: 10.1080/07377363.2010.491768
- Pong, S., & D.B. Ju. (2000). The effects of change in family structure and income on dropping out of middle and high school. *Journal of Family Issues* 21, 147–169.

- Roman, S., Cuestas, P. J., & Fenollar, P. (2008). An examination of the interrelationship between self-esteem, others' expectations, family support, learning approaches and academic achievement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(2), 127-138.
- Rumberger, R. W. (1995) Dropping out of middle school: a multilevel analysis of students and schools, *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 583–625.
- Saifuddin, A. (2009). Methods in sample surveys: Cluster sampling. John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.
<http://ocw.jhsph.edu/courses/statmethodsforsamplesurveys/PDFs/Lecture5.pdf>.
- Sciarra, D., & Whitson, M. (2007). Predictive factors in postsecondary educational attainment among Latinos. *Professional School Counseling*, 10(3), 307–316.
- Steinberg, L., S.D. Lamborn, S.M. Dornbusch, & N. Darling. 1992. Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development*. 63, 1266–1281.
- Telzer, E. H. & Fuligni, A. J. (2009). A longitudinal daily diary study of family assistance and academic achievement among adolescent from Mexican, Chinese, and European backgrounds. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*. 38, 560-571.
- Thompson, M.S., Alexander, K.L., & Entwisle, D.R. (1988). Household composition, parental expectations, and school achievement. *Social Forces*, 67, 424– 451.
- Trusty, J. (1996). Relationship of parental involvement in teens' career development to teens' attitudes, perceptions and behavior. *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 30 (1), 63–69.
- Trusty, J. (1998). Family influences on educational expectations of late adolescents. *The Journal of Educational Research*. 91, 260–270.
- Videon, T.M. (2002). Parent–child relations and children's psychological well-being: Do dads matter? *Journal of Family Issues*. 26, 55–79.
- Wentzel, K.R. (1994). Relations of social goal pursuit to social acceptance, classroom behavior, and perceived social support. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 173–182.
- Weiser, D. A., & Riggio, H. R. (2010). Family background and academic achievement: does self-efficacy mediate outcomes? *Social Psychology of Education*. 13(3), 367-383.
- Wiseman, H., O. Mayseless, & R. Sharbany. (2006). Why are they lonely? Perceived quality of early relationships with parents, attachment, personality predispositions and loneliness in first year university students. *Personality and Individual Differences* 40, 237–248.