World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues

Volume 13, Issue 4, (2021) 546-573

www.wj-et.eu

Examining the relationship between multidimensional parenting styles and digital parenting awareness levels of parents

Akkaya Sumeyra [*], Inonu University Ringgold standard institution - Faculty of Education, Malatya, Battalgazi, Turkey

Gezer Sen Burcu, Firat University Ringgold standard institution, Elazig, Turkey

Kapıdere Metin, Inonu University Ringgold standard institution - Faculty of EducationMalatya, Battalgazi Turkey

Suggested Citation:

Sumeyra, A., Burcu, E., & Metin, K., (2021). Examining the relationship between multidimensional parenting styles and digital parenting awareness levels of parents. *World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues*. *13*(4), 546-573. https://doi.org/10.18844/wjet.v13i4.6132

Received from; May 30, 2021; revised from June 15, 2021; accepted from September 25. 2021
Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Servet Bayram, Yeditepe University, Turkey.

Abstract

This article provides an overview of the relationship between parents' multidimensional parenting styles and digital parenting awareness levels. The article summarizes the structure of parenting styles that exist with the social changes in the 21st century and the research findings on parents' awareness levels. In the study, the relational screening model was used to examine the relationship between parents' multidimensional parenting styles and their digital parenting awareness levels. As a result of examining the multidimensional parenting styles of the participants in the study, it was determined that the proactive average had the highest value. A positive correlation was found between total digital parenting awareness and proactive, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, and cordial relationship. In addition, it was determined that hostility and low control decreased the total level of digital parenting awareness, while positive reinforcement increased the total level of digital parenting awareness. Another result of the research is that hostility reduces the level of protection from risks, while positive reinforcement increases the level of protection from risks.

Keywords: Multidimensional parenting styles; digital parenting; primary education.

[*] ADDRESS OF CORRESPONDENCE: Akkaya Sumeyra, Inonu University Ringgold standard institution - Faculty of Education, B Blok 231 Malatya, Malatya, Battalgazi 44280 Turkey
Email address: sumeyra.akkaya@inonu.edu.tr , smyrkky@gmail.com / +905546895453

INTRODUCTION

Human is the smallest element that makes up society and the most important factor that brings people into society is their family. Behaviors and characters of individuals are shaped according to the attitudes of their families from the moment they are born. It is known that parental attitudes affect the individual socially and emotionally positively or negatively (Adıgüzel et al., 2020).

In order for children to be psychologically and socially healthy individuals, some of their basic needs must be met. These needs can be expressed as being able to express their feelings and needs, play, autonomy, secure attachment, and a sense of identity (Young et al., 2003). When these needs are not met due to excessive authoritarian, overprotective or inconsistent parental attitudes, emotionally and socially unhealthy individuals can grow up.

Since the way parents treat their children shapes their personality, a healthy personality development is seen in children thanks to the right parental attitudes. Likewise, wrong attitudes exhibited by parents can negatively affect personality development (Parlar ve Özbuk, 2018).

In the century we live in, digitalization has begun to show its presence in all areas of life. Considering that especially young age groups adapt to technology and digital environments faster than adults, digital parenting can be expressed as one of the competencies that today's parents should have.

With digitalization, the individual and social roles of people have also begun to change. When we look at the previous periods in the use of the Internet, the individual was only the receiver of information, but today he has started to produce content by interacting on the Internet and has moved from a passive position to an active position. Social transformations have also taken place, and people have begun to meet their socialization needs through digital environments and join new groups (Yaman et al., 2020). However, digital literacy has now become a necessity for individuals. Individuals need to be able to use digital tools actively and correctly and be conscious of the negative effects of the digital environment.

In the constantly changing and developing world with technology and digitalization, each generation has different lifestyles and interests. Especially today, with technology and internet becoming increasingly indispensable in the flow of life, children's interests are also focused on the digital environment. The advancement of technology day by day, the constant change of the world and the fact that digital environments attract children more and more every day make it necessary for parents to constantly improve themselves, to follow the developments in technology and to be good media literates. Today's parents need to inform their children about the digital environment and guide them correctly. While parents encourage the use of technology, which has become an indispensable part of life, they also worry about the negative effects of technology (Karaboğa, 2019).

It is a fact that technology and internet facilitate individuals' lives and access to information, and provide communication between people without the concept of time and space. However, although children growing up in this digital age are good users, they can be exposed to the negative aspects of the digital environment if they are not made aware and controlled.

Unconscious use of technology by children leads to technology and internet addiction. When internet use is analyzed according to parenting styles, three approaches are seen. The first of these is the active approach in which the child is communicated and informed. Another is the restrictive approach in which the rules about the usage areas and duration of the internet dominate. The negligent approach, on the other hand, is the approach in which parents do not set limits and guide their children on the use of the Internet (Özparlak ve Karakaya, 2020). According to Yaman et al. (2020), there are four different parenting styles regarding the use of digital media: authoritarian parents, democratic parents,

permissive parents and negligent parents. While authoritarian parents do not want digital tools to be used and set strict rules, democratic parents determine the rules for the use of digital media together with their children and follow the rules together. Permissive parents can bend their rules. Negligent parents, on the other hand, release their children in the digital environment. It will not be right to completely remove children from the digital environment, and leaving them completely free will harm their spiritual, physical and social development. Based on this information, this study aims to examine the relationship between parents' multidimensional parenting styles and digital parenting awareness levels.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Children and Digital Media

Children's digital media culture is rapidly taking its place on the internet. This new digital media culture encompasses a rich range of websites created for children, shaped by technological and economic forces. Many nonprofits play an important role in developing online content for children by providing opportunities for children to explore the world. Educational sites are often overshadowed by commercial sites sponsored by media conglomerates and toy companies. Taking advantage of the interactive features of the Internet, companies encourage children to become consumers from a very young age to create brand awareness. Efforts are made to create safe zones for children so that children are not exposed to inappropriate content, aggressive advertisements and even dangerous contacts with strangers on the Internet. Projects continue to be carried out to develop a quality media culture that will support children's development and learning and help them become good citizens and responsible consumers (Montgomery, 2000).

In today's global culture and economy, where individuals can always access information at their fingertips, digital and media literacy is essential for participation in social life. It is important for parents and educators to act consciously to ensure that children become digital and media literate. Learning happens anytime, anywhere. The productivity of individuals depends on digital and media literacy. In order to create the necessary human capital for success and sustainability in a technology-driven world, it is necessary to invest in literacy practices (Turner et al., 2017).

Today's children live a life in which both traditional and new forms of digital media exist. Research on traditional media such as television emphasizes the negative consequences and health problems associated with viewing time and the content of what is watched. In recent years, the increase in the use of digital media, including interactive and social media, shows that these new media have positive and negative consequences for the development of children. Increasing opportunities for early learning, acquiring new information, supporting development, social communication and support are among the positive effects of digital media in children's lives. Depression, obesity, negative health effects on sleep, attention and learning, exposure to unsafe content and people, and inability to protect privacy are among the negative effects of digital media. Sufficient physical activity, good sleep hygiene, a healthy diet and maintaining a nutritious social environment are important to support health and development in children (Chassiakos et al., 2016).

The goal of creating a quality digital media culture for children should be placed at the forefront of public debate. But if this discussion is to be a smart and logical one, it must be informed by extensive research on the cognitive, emotional and social development implications of new interactive media and strive for a concept. quality, which includes the development of responsible citizens for the future. Moreover, it is a discussion that should start as soon as the rules that will govern the new media environment are being formulated and the technology itself is still in the process of development. Letting the market alone determine the winners and losers of new media sweepstakes is not only a disclaimer

but also a rejection of the power this new technology puts in the hands of its users. New digital media empowers children to create their own online world. We should all help ensure that at least some of what children find there is reserved for the public good (Montgomery, 2000).

It was concluded that the level of awareness of the parents about the effects of digital games on their children at an early age did not differ according to the gender of the parents, the number of children they had and the time they spent in the digital environment. The level of awareness of parents about the effects of digital games on their children at an early age differs significantly according to the age at which children start playing digital games and the type of game they prefer to play. The level of awareness of parents about the effects of digital games on their children at an early age differs significantly only in the social sub-dimension, according to the age at which children start playing digital games (Akkaya et al., 2021).

Parents and Digital Media

We live in a connected world where information is plentiful and experts are literally at our fingertips. With the ubiquity of mobile technologies worldwide, we see a new vision for education: learning anywhere, anytime, with equal access for all as a fundamental human right. With the ubiquity of mobile technologies worldwide, we see a new vision for education: learning anywhere, anytime, with equal access for all as a fundamental human right. This vision is based on the idea that children are ready and capable of lifelong learning and equipped with the skills they need to access, analyze, evaluate, create and participate in civic life through digital media. Research over the past two decades has shown that reading and writing in digital spaces may require more complex skill practice than print literacy, yet most formal education institutions adhere to traditional definitions of literacy and pedagogical approaches that focus solely on print and teacher-centred teaching. In these institutions, children are often not empowered to learn and are not connected to the world outside their classrooms. But outside of school, children are increasingly using mobile devices, video games and the internet to explore their world. To successfully navigate and participate in these interconnected spaces, young people need to acquire digital and media literacy; they must be able to critically consume and create digital, multimodal texts. The Aspen Institute underlines the fact that “all students and educators need adequate digital age literacy that includes media, digital and social-emotional literacy; safely.” But most high school graduating students lack the basic skills to help them navigate the digital environment safely and responsibly (Turner et al., 2017).

A growing number of children use a variety of media devices and applications at home. Parents report that their children use digital technologies from the first years. The use of mobile devices has become very popular in early childhood. It is a matter of curiosity how the digital media environment brings with it opportunities and challenges for young children. Parents play an important role in shaping their children's digital media experiences (Zaman & Mifsud, 2017).

Today's parents need help raising children more than ever before. As children grow up with the media, many parents start using the media at a later age. It is not surprising that a large number of parents think that their children use the Internet better than they do. It is important that parents of children who grow up with the Internet from an early age develop themselves in media literacy. Media contents can have positive or negative qualities. It is a critical parenting skill for parents to take precautions against the elements in these content that may harm their children's development. Parents' learning how to educate their children in the new digital media environment will support the healthy development of the child (Ciboci & Labaš, 2019).

The COVID-19 global pandemic period has caused individuals to spend more time with digital tools. It is important to use digital platforms that serve education as well as communication and

consumption correctly. Continuing education on digital platforms brings with it the situation that children and parents spend more time in this environment. The lack of digital parenting skills of parents can cause families to face some risky situations. Today, parents need digital parenting skills to support their children's academic, cognitive and psychological development. It is important for children's education that parents use digital tools with a critical perspective. Sustainable digital parenting trainings provide benefits by informing parents about the correct use of digital platforms (Tosun & Mihci, 2020).

Parenting Styles and Digital Parenting

Parents' child-rearing styles affect development, adaptation to culture and shaping of behavior. Many studies highlight the strong influence of parenting style on child development. Parenting styles can be defined as behavioral patterns that primary caregivers use to interact with their children. These child-rearing patterns create an emotional climate in which the parent's behavior is expressed. Parenting styles can be defined in terms of their relationship to two independent dimensions, demanding and responsive. Accordingly, demanding refers to the extent to which parents show control and supervision in their parenting. Responsiveness refers to the degree to which parents show emotional warmth, acceptance, and support to their children. Depending on the parents' degree of demanding and responsiveness, there are authoritative parenting (both demanding and reactive), authoritarian parenting (demanding but unresponsive), permissive parenting (sensitive but not demanding), and neglectful parenting (neither demanding nor responsive). Four parenting styles have been identified. It is believed that each type of parenting affects a child's personality development and academic success in different ways (Besharat et al., 2011; Montoya-Castilla et al., 2016; Sarwar, 2016).

Parents are of particular importance during the first years of life, which is considered a unique period of development. Parents are responsible for guiding their children towards their needs from infancy. Parents' ways of caring for and raising children have lasting marks throughout their lives. In this direction, the sensitivity of parents to integrate their children into the family and social system ensures the best possible results for children (Bornstein & Bornstein, 2014).

Parenting style is influenced by the control exerted by the parents. The literature investigating the effects of parental control on children is extensive and complex. Behavioral control is a natural feature of parenting style. Research on behavior control shows that authoritative parenting has positive effects on children's academic achievement (Brown & Iyengar, 2008).

Parenting is never easy, especially when children are growing up digitally and parents are not fully equipped with digital competencies. Smartphones and tablets are becoming an integral part of social life. It is critical to understand which digital inequalities affect parenting, socialization and the family, and to observe how parent education has changed with digitalization. Knowing the current situation and determining the needs facilitate the creation of training programs to increase the competencies of parents in this regard (Zhang & Livingstone, 2019).

As the Internet becomes more widely adopted in families with children, researchers wonder whether parenting strategies can be adapted to online media. The possibilities offered by digital media also bring challenges (Mascheroni et al., 2018). One of the most important internet risks that parents should be careful about their children's digital life is cyberbullying. Digitally competent parents can inform their children about cyberbullying or intervene when such a situation occurs (Karakuş Yılmaz, 2020).

Understanding the nature of today's childhood requires a 21st century understanding of parenting. Changes that have taken place around the world in the last half century have led to changes in the expectations and experiences of parents about raising children. Although classical parenting styles

can still meet the needs of today's parents, the development of contemporary parenting approaches has become a basic necessity with social changes. Parents and caregivers who have a major impact on children's social, emotional, cognitive and academic development fundamentally shape their lives and daily experiences. Parenting also has a huge impact on children's health and well-being (Ulferts, 2020).

Aim of The Research

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between parents' multidimensional parenting styles and their digital parenting awareness levels. In this direction, answers were sought for the following sub-problem situations.

1. What is the parents' assessment of multidimensional parenting styles and their digital parenting awareness levels?

2. Is there a relationship between parents' evaluation of multidimensional parenting styles and their digital parenting awareness levels?

3. What is the predictive effect of multidimensional parenting styles on digital parenting awareness?

4. The descriptive features (gender, parenting role, age, marital status, education status, employment status, income status, number of children, time spent with digital media, having a computer/tablet, type of internet access, child's multidimensional parenting styles evaluation scores) Does it differ significantly according to the fact that it has a computer/tablet?

5. Descriptive characteristics of digital parenting awareness scores (gender, parenting role, age, marital status, education status, employment status, income status, number of children, time spent with digital media, computer/tablet possession, internet access type, child's computer/ Does it differ significantly according to having a tablet?

Method

This research is a relational survey model that examines the relationship between parents' multidimensional parenting styles and digital parenting awareness levels. The relational screening model aims to determine the degree of existence and coexistence between variables (Cohen et al., 2007).

Data collection and data collection tools

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, data collected via Google Form. In this research, "Multidimensional Parenting Styles Assessment Scale" developed by Karababa, (2019) and "Digital Parenting Awareness Scale" developed by Manap & Durmuş (2020) will be used as data collection tools. In this study, Multi-Dimensional Parenting Style Assessment scale reliability Cronbach’s Alpha was found high as 0.896. In this study, the Digital Parenting Awareness scale reliability Cronbach’s Alpha was found high as 0.903.

Data Statistical Analysis

The data obtained from this study were analysed in the computer environment with SPSS 22.0 statistical program. To identify the defining properties of the participants, frequency and percentage analysis was used while average and standard deviation statistics were used to assess the scale. To determine whether the research variables showed a normal distribution, kurtosis and skewness values were investigated.

Table 1. Normal Distribution

	N	Kurtosis	Skewness
Multi-Dimensional Parenting Style Assessment Total	202	0.854	-0.460
Hostility	202	0.762	0.693
Low Control	202	-0.283	0.444
Proactive	202	0.398	-0.596
Physical Control	202	1.230	1.245
Positive Reinforcement	202	0.954	-1.674
Supportive Approach	202	0.921	-1.730
Sincere Relationship	202	0.336	-1.662
Digital Parenting Awareness Total	202	0.315	-0.659
Negative Modelling	202	-0.180	0.714
Digital Negligence	202	0.120	0.711
Effective Usage	202	-0.051	-0.772
Protection from Risks	202	-0.223	-0.655

In the related literature, kurtosis and skewness values for the variable were considered as normal distribution for +1.5 and -1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019) and +2.0 and -2.0 (George & Mallery, 2016). If the variable variance is unknown, the t-test is applied; if the main mass does not show a normal distribution, non-parametric tests are applied (Field, 2018). Due to the sufficient level of the sample for large numbers law and central limit theorem, the distribution was assumed as normal and the analyses were applied (Harwiki, 2013; İnal & Günay, 1993; Johnson & Wichern, 2007). The relationship between the dimension that determines participants' scale level was investigated with correlation and regression analysis. Based on participants' defining properties, t-test, one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) and post-hoc (Turkey, LSD) analyses were applied to investigate the differentiation at scale level. Cohen (d) and Eta square (η^2) coefficients were used to calculating the impact size. The impact size shows whether the difference between the groups was at a significant level. Cohen value is assessed as 0.2: small; 0.5: medium; 0.8: large and Eta square value is assessed as 0.01: small; 0.06: medium; 0.14: large (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017).

Participants

The universe of the research consists of parents whose children attends primary school. The sample of the study consists of parents selected by simple random-random sampling method in the universe.

Findings for Participants' Defining Properties

The findings for the participants' defining properties of this study are given below.

Table 2. Distribution for Participants' Defining Properties

Groups	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	37	18.3
Female	165	81.7
Parenting Role		
Mother	164	81.2

Father	38	18.8
Age		
35 or younger	98	48.5
35 higher	104	51.5
Marital Status		
Married	191	94.6
Single	11	5.4
Education		
Elementary School	29	14.4
Secondary School	27	13.4
High School	45	22.3
2-Year	22	10.9
Undergraduate	79	39.1
Working Status		
Working	90	44.6
Not Working	112	55.4
Income Status		
1000TL or below	34	16.8
1001-3000 TL	70	34.7
3001-6000 TL	71	35.1
6001 or Higher	27	13.4
Number of Children		
1	37	18.3
2	86	42.6
3	38	18.8
4 or Higher	41	20.3
Time on Digital Media		
1 hour	97	48.0
3 hours	36	17.8
4 hours	26	12.9
5 hours or more	43	21.3
Computer Tablet Ownership		
Yes	91	45.0
None	111	55.0
Internet Access Style		
Mobile Network	56	27.7
WI-FI	146	72.3
Children's Communication Device Ownership		
Yes	84	41.6
None	118	58.4

For gender, participants were distributed as 37 (18.3%) male and 165 (81.7%) female. For parenting roles, participants were distributed as 164 (81.2%) mothers and 38 (18.8%) fathers. For age, students distributed as 98 (48.5%) 35 and lower and 104 (51.5%) 35 higher. For marital status, participants were

distributed as 191 (94.6%) male and 11 (5.4%) female. For education status, participants were distributed as 29 (14.4%) elementary school, 27 (13.4%) secondary school, 45 (22.3%) high school, 22 (10.9%) 2-year and 79 (39.1%) undergraduate. For work status, participants were distributed as 90 (44.6%) working and 112 (55.4%) not working. For income level, participants were distributed as 34 (16.8%) were 1000TL or lower, 70 (34.7%) 1001-3000TL, 71 (35.1%) 3001-6000TL and 27 (13.4%) 6001 and above. For number of children, participants were distributed as 37 (18.3%) as 1, 86 (42.6%) as 2, 38 (18.8%) as 3 and 41 (20.3%) as 4. For time spend on digital media, participants were distributed as 97 (48.0%) as 1 hour, 36 (17.8%) as 3 hours, 26 (12.9%) as 4 hours and 43 (21.3%) as 5 hours and above. For computer tablet ownership, participants were distributed as 91 (45.0%) male and 111 (55.0%) female. For internet access, participants were distributed as 56 (27.7%) mobile network and 146 (72.3%) as Wi-Fi. For children's communication device ownership, participants were distributed as 84 (41.6%) yes and 118 (58.4%) no.

Findings

This section includes the findings obtained from the analysis of the collected data with the scales from study participants to solve the research problem. Explanations and comments are provided based on the obtained findings.

Table 3. Score Averages

	N	Av.	Ss	Min.	Max.
Multi-Dimensional Parenting Style Assessment Total	202	102.441	9.377	66.000	131.000
Hostility	202	14.129	4.652	7.000	34.000
Low Control	202	14.510	4.427	7.000	28.000
Proactive	202	23.975	4.001	11.000	30.000
Physical Control	202	5.238	2.067	4.000	18.000
Positive Reinforcement	202	17.545	2.637	5.000	20.000
Supportive Approach	202	13.609	1.834	3.000	15.000
Sincere Relationship	202	13.436	1.632	5.000	15.000
Digital Parenting Awareness Total	202	63.371	9.139	36.000	79.000
Negative Modelling	202	8.203	3.145	4.000	17.000
Digital Negligence	202	8.550	3.017	4.000	17.000
Effective Usage	202	16.663	2.980	8.000	20.000
Protection from Risks	202	15.460	3.613	5.000	20.000

Participants "multi-dimensional parenting styles assessment total" average was 102.441±9.377 (Min=66; Maks=131), "hostility" average was 14.129±4.652 (Min=7; Maks=34), "low control" average was 14.510±4.427 (Min=7; Maks=28), "proactive" average was 23.975±4.001 (Min=11; Maks=30), "physical control" average was 5.238±2.067 (Min=4; Maks=18), "positive reinforcement" average was 17.545±2.637 (Min=5; Maks=20), "supportive approach" average was 13.609±1.834 (Min=3; Maks=15), "sincere relationship" average was 13.436±1.632 (Min=5; Maks=15), "digital parenting awareness total" average was 63.371±9.139 (Min=36; Maks=79), "negative modelling" average was 8.203±3.145 (Min=4; Maks=17), "digital negligence" average was 8.550±3.017 (Min=4; Maks=17), "effective use" average was 16.663±2.980 (Min=8; Maks=20), "protection from risks" average was 15.460±3.613 (Min=5; Maks=20).

Table 4. Correlation Analysis of Scales

		Multi-Dimensional Parenting Style Assessment Total	Hostility	Low Control	Proactive	Physical Control	Positive Reinforcement	Supportive Approach	Sincere Relationship
Digital Parenting Awareness Total	r	0.064	-0.385**	-0.303**	0.371**	-0.242**	0.460**	0.477**	0.409**
	p	0.362	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
Negative Modelling	r	0.043	0.429**	0.205**	-0.210**	0.227**	-0.314**	-0.405**	-0.345**
	p	0.547	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
Digital Negligence	r	0.202**	0.300**	0.379**	-0.157*	0.244**	-0.159*	-0.176*	-0.190**
	p	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.026	0.000	0.024	0.012	0.007
Effective Usage	r	0.298**	-0.187**	-0.201**	0.470**	-0.166*	0.529**	0.523**	0.408**
	p	0.000	0.008	0.004	0.000	0.018	0.000	0.000	0.000
Protection from Risks	r	0.123	-0.197**	-0.105	0.236**	-0.073	0.320**	0.275**	0.239**
	p	0.081	0.005	0.138	0.001	0.300	0.000	0.000	0.001

*<0.05; **<0.01; Correlation Analysis

When the correlation analysis between multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, sincere relationship, digital parenting awareness total, negative modelling, digital negligence, effective use, protection from risks scores were investigated, the relationship between digital parenting awareness total and hostility was r=-0.385 negative (p=0,000<0.05), digital parenting awareness total and low control was r=-0.303 negative (p=0,000<0.05), digital parenting awareness total and proactive was r=0.371 positive (p=0,000<0.05), digital parenting awareness total and physical control was r=-0.242 negative (p=0,001<0.05), digital parenting awareness total and positive reinforcement was r=0.46 positive (p=0,000<0.05), digital parenting awareness total and supportive approach was r=0.477 positive (p=0,000<0.05), digital parenting awareness total and sincere relationship was r=0.409 positive (p=0,000<0.05), negative modelling and hostility was r=0.429 positive (p=0,000<0.05), negative modelling and low control was r=0.205 positive (p=0,003<0.05), negative modelling and proactive was r=-0.21 negative (p=0,003<0.05), negative modelling and physical control was r=0.227 positive (p=0,001<0.05), negative modelling and positive reinforcement was r=-0.314 negative (p=0,000<0.05), negative modelling and supportive approach was r=-0.405 negative (p=0,000<0.05), negative modelling and sincere relationship was r=-0.345 negative (p=0,000<0.05), digital negligence and multidimensional parenting style assessment total was r=0.202 positive (p=0,004<0.05), digital negligence and hostility was r=0.3 positive (p=0,000<0.05), digital negligence and low control was r=0.379 positive (p=0,000<0.05), digital negligence and proactive was r=-0.157 negative (p=0,026<0.05), digital negligence and physical

control was r=0.244 positive (p=0,000<0.05), digital negligence and positive reinforcement was r=-0.159 negative (p=0,024<0.05), digital negligence and supportive approach was r=-0.176 negative (p=0,012<0.05), digital negligence and sincere relationship was r=-0.19 negative (p=0,007<0.05), effective use and multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total was r=0.298 positive (p=0,000<0.05), effective use and hostility was r=-0.187 negative (p=0,008<0.05), effective use and low control was r=-0.201 negative (p=0,004<0.05), effective use and proactive was r=0.47 positive (p=0,000<0.05), effective use and physical control was r=-0.166 negative (p=0,018<0.05), effective use and positive reinforcement was r=0.529 positive (p=0,000<0.05), effective use and supportive approach was r=0.523 positive (p=0,000<0.05), effective use and sincere relationship was r=0.408 positive (p=0,000<0.05), protection from risks and hostility was r=-0.197 negative (p=0,005<0.05), protection from risks and proactive was r=0.236 positive (p=0,001<0.05), protection from risks and positive reinforcement was r=0.32 positive (p=0,000<0.05), protection from risks and supportive approach was r=0.275 positive (p=0,000<0.05), protection from risks and sincere relationship was r=0.239 positive (p=0,001<0.05). The correlation relationships between other variables had no statistical significance (p>0.05).

Table 5. Effect of Multidimensional Parenting Style on Digital Parenting Awareness

Dependent Variable	**Independent Variable**	**ß**	**t**	**p**	**F**	**Model (p)**	**R^2**
Digital Parenting Awareness Total	Constant	56.932	8.047	0.000	0.835	0.362	0.001
	Multi-Dimensional Parenting Style Assessment Total	0.063	0.914	0.362			
Digital Parenting Awareness Total	Constant	38.263	5.622	0.000	17.172	0.000	0.360
	Hostility	-0.573	-4.019	0.000			
	Low Control	-0.342	-2.707	0.007			
	Proactive	0.119	0.690	0.491			
	Physical Control	0.445	1.403	0.162			
	Positive Reinforcement	1.044	3.795	0.000			
	Supportive Approach	0.311	0.684	0.495			
	Sincere Relationship	0.777	1.824	0.070			
Negative Modelling	Constant	13.519	5.372	0.000	11.179	0.000	0.262
	Hostility	0.257	4.881	0.000			
	Low Control	0.056	1.202	0.231			
	Proactive	0.038	0.599	0.550			
	Physical Control	-0.191	-1.630	0.105			
	Positive Reinforcement	-0.259	-2.552	0.011			
	Supportive Approach	-0.185	-1.099	0.273			
	Sincere Relationship	-0.195	-1.238	0.217			
Digital Negligence	Constant	3.600	1.430	0.154	8.049	0.000	0.197
	Hostility	0.140	2.653	0.009			
	Low Control	0.238	5.086	0.000			
	Proactive	-0.021	-0.323	0.747			
	Physical Control	0.117	1.000	0.319			
	Positive Reinforcement	-0.148	-1.457	0.147			

Effective Usage	Supportive Approach	0.389	2.317	0.022	17.269	0.000	0.362
	Sincere Relationship	-0.245	-1.555	0.122			
	Constant	0.918	0.414	0.679			
	Hostility	-0.023	-0.506	0.614			
	Low Control	-0.029	-0.712	0.477			
	Proactive	0.112	1.993	0.048			
	Physical Control	0.120	1.163	0.246			
	Positive Reinforcement	0.296	3.308	0.001			
	Supportive Approach	0.416	2.814	0.005			
	Sincere Relationship	0.173	1.245	0.215			
Protection from Risks	Constant	6.463	2.045	0.042	4.812	0.000	0.117
	Hostility	-0.152	-2.301	0.022			
	Low Control	-0.019	-0.322	0.748			
	Proactive	0.025	0.308	0.759			
	Physical Control	0.251	1.704	0.090			
	Positive Reinforcement	0.340	2.660	0.008			
	Supportive Approach	0.099	0.470	0.639			
	Sincere Relationship	0.164	0.831	0.407			

The regression analysis conducted to determine the cause-effect relationship between multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total and digital parenting awareness total was not found significant (F=0.835; p=0.362<0.050).

The regression analysis conducted to determine the cause-effect relationship between hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, sincere relationship and digital parenting awareness total was found significant (F=17.172; p=0.000<0.05). 36% of the total change at digital parenting awareness total level was explained by hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship (R^2=0.360). Hostility decreased digital parenting awareness total level (ß=-0.573). Low control decreased digital parenting awareness total level (ß=-0.342). Proactive had no effect on digital parenting awareness total level (p=0.491>0.05). Physical control had no effect on digital parenting awareness total level (p=0.162>0.05). Positive reinforcement increased digital parenting awareness total level (ß=1.044). The supportive approach had no effect on digital parenting awareness total level (p=0.495>0.05). The sincere relationship had no effect on digital parenting awareness total level (p=0.070>0.05).

The regression analysis conducted to determine the cause-effect relationship between hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, sincere relationship and negative modelling was found significant (F=11.179; p=0.000<0.05). 26.2% of the total change at the negative modelling level was explained by hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship (R^2=0.262). Hostility increased negative modelling level (ß=0.257). Low control had no effect on the negative modelling level (p=0.231>0.05). Proactive had no effect on negative modelling level (p=0.550>0.05). Physical control had no effect on the negative modelling level (p=0.105>0.05). Positive reinforcement decreased negative modelling levels (ß=-0.259). The supportive approach had no effect on the negative modelling level (p=0.273>0.05). The sincere relationship had no effect on the negative modelling level (p=0.217>0.05).

The regression analysis conducted to determine the cause-effect relationship between hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, sincere relationship and digital negligence was found significant (F=8.049; p=0.000<0.05). 19.7% of the total change at the digital negligence level was explained by hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship (R^2=0.197). Hostility increased digital negligence level (ß=0.140). Low control increased digital negligence level (ß=0.238). Proactive had no effect on digital negligence (p=0.747>0.05). Physical control had no effect on digital negligence (p=0.319>0.05). Positive reinforcement had no effect on digital negligence (p=0.147>0.05). Supportive approach increased digital negligence level (ß=0.389). Sincere relationship had no effect on digital negligence (p=0.122>0.05).

The regression analysis conducted to determine the cause-effect relationship between hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, sincere relationship and effective use was found significant (F=17.269; p=0.000<0.05). 36.2% of the total change at effective use level was explained by hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship (R^2=0.362). Hostility had no effect on effective use (p=0.614>0.05). Low control had no effect on effective use (p=0.477>0.05). Proactive increased effective use level (ß=0.112). Physical control had no effect on effective use (p=0.246>0.05). Positive reinforcement increased effective use level (ß=0.296). Supportive approach increased effective use level (ß=0.416). Sincere relationship had no effect on effective use (p=0.215>0.05).

The regression analysis conducted to determine the cause-effect relationship between hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, sincere relationship and protection from risks was found significant (F=4.812; p=0.000<0.05). 11.7% of the total change at protection from risks level was explained by hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship (R^2=0.117). Hostility decreased protection from risks level (ß=-0.152). Low control had no effect on protection from risks level (p=0.748>0.05). Proactive had no effect on protection from risks level (p=0.759>0.05). Physical control had no effect on protection from risks level (p=0.090>0.05). Positive reinforcement increased protection from risks level (ß=0.340). Supportive approach had no effect on protection from risks level (p=0.639>0.05). Sincere relationships had no effect on protection from risks level (p=0.407>0.05).

The analysis results to investigate the differentiation of multi-dimensional parenting styles scores for defining properties are given below.

Table 6. Differentiation of Multi-Dimensional Parenting Style Scores for Defining Properties

Demographic Properties	**n**	**Multi-Dimensional Parenting Style Assessment Total**	**Hostility**	**Low Control**	**Proactive**	**Physical Control**	**Positive Reinforcement**	**Supportive Approach**	**Sincere Relationship**
Gender		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Male	37	98.946±10.847	13.324±4.223	16.460±4.537	22.000±4.491	5.000±1.810	16.027±3.403	13.162±1.803	12.973±1.878
Female	165	103.224±8.864	14.309±4.736	14.073±4.295	24.418±3.756	5.291±2.121	17.885±2.312	13.709±1.831	13.539±1.560

t=		-2.542	-1.165	3.024	-3.410	-0.773	-4.016	-1.646	-1.920
p=		0.012	0.246	0.003	0.001	0.440	0.000	0.101	0.094
Parenting Role		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Mother	164	103.213±8.890	14.244±4.676	14.098±4.296	24.427±3.766	5.274±2.117	17.890±2.318	13.732±1.814	13.549±1.560
Father	38	99.105±10.745	13.632±4.576	16.290±4.597	22.026±4.433	5.079±1.851	16.053±3.361	13.079±1.851	12.947±1.859
t=		2.464	0.730	-2.797	3.420	0.524	4.013	1.991	2.063
p=		0.015	0.466	0.006	0.001	0.601	0.000	0.048	0.070
Age		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
35 or younger	98	102.796±9.829	13.827±4.341	14.694±4.410	23.888±4.159	5.347±2.031	17.796±2.270	13.735±1.596	13.510±1.310
35 higher	104	102.106±8.965	14.414±4.932	14.337±4.456	24.058±3.864	5.135±2.104	17.308±2.933	13.490±2.034	13.365±1.890
t=		0.522	-0.896	0.572	-0.301	0.729	1.317	0.946	0.629
p=		0.602	0.372	0.568	0.764	0.467	0.189	0.342	0.526
Marital Status		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Married	191	102.555±9.531	14.120±4.619	14.518±4.433	24.037±4.070	5.230±2.080	17.597±2.675	13.628±1.839	13.424±1.659
Single	111	100.455±6.072	14.273±5.442	14.364±4.523	22.909±2.386	5.364±1.912	16.636±1.690	13.273±1.794	13.636±1.120
t=		0.722	-0.105	0.112	0.909	-0.207	1.176	0.624	-0.419
p=		0.471	0.916	0.911	0.169	0.836	0.241	0.533	0.676
Education:		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Elementary School	29	96.759±11.350	13.690±6.342	15.345±4.490	20.828±4.528	5.483±2.811	15.897±4.012	12.793±2.664	12.724±2.433
Secondary School	27	101.926±11.337	13.741±4.654	16.333±5.818	22.667±4.820	4.963±1.675	17.222±2.577	13.370±1.668	13.630±1.363
High School	45	104.022±9.360	14.333±4.487	15.356±4.603	23.689±3.789	5.644±2.238	17.822±2.081	13.711±1.792	13.467±1.804
2-Year	22	103.500±8.382	14.682±4.191	14.046±3.645	25.091±3.191	4.909±1.509	18.046±2.319	13.409±1.403	13.318±1.211
Undergraduate	79	103.506±7.359	14.152±4.219	13.228±3.591	25.430±2.912	5.101±1.899	17.962±2.169	13.987±1.557	13.646±1.281
F=		3.493	0.208	3.722	9.757	0.880	3.971	2.567	1.863
p=		0.009	0.934	0.006	0.000	0.477	0.004	0.039	0.118
PostHoc=		2>1, 3>1, 4>1, 5>1 (p<0.05)		1>5, 2>5, 3>5	3>1, 4>1, 5>1,		3>1, 4>1, 5>1 (p<0.05)	3>1, 5>1 (p<0.05)	

				(p<0.05)	4>2, 5>2, 5>3 (p<0.05)				
Working Status		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Working	90	102.633±9.688	13.956±4.178	14.500±4.327	24.489±4.056	5.100±1.861	17.422±3.028	13.656±1.730	13.511±1.424
Not Working	112	102.286±9.161	14.268±5.015	14.518±4.524	23.563±3.924	5.348±2.221	17.643±2.285	13.571±1.921	13.375±1.786
t=		0.261	-0.473	-0.028	1.643	-0.848	-0.590	0.323	0.588
p=		0.794	0.637	0.977	0.102	0.398	0.556	0.747	0.557
Income Status		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
1000TL or below	34	102.912±8.361	15.235±6.071	15.029±4.441	23.235±4.120	5.765±2.797	17.177±2.552	13.265±2.514	13.206±2.471
1001-3000 TL	70	100.271±11.760	13.214±4.558	15.500±4.892	22.614±4.391	5.086±1.947	17.014±3.062	13.429±1.758	13.414±1.527
3001-6000 TL	71	103.254±7.317	13.944±4.095	13.789±3.960	25.042±3.205	5.155±1.857	17.986±2.405	13.873±1.594	13.465±1.329
6001 or Higher	27	105.333±7.514	15.593±3.755	13.185±3.803	25.630±3.421	5.185±1.819	18.222±1.761	13.815±1.570	13.704±1.325
F=		2.358	2.527	2.833	6.863	0.906	2.474	1.234	0.475
p=		0.073	0.059	0.039	0.000	0.439	0.063	0.298	0.700
PostHoc=				2>3, 2>4 (p<0.05)	3>1, 4>1, 3>2, 4>2 (p<0.05)				
Number of Children		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
1	37	103.378±6.491	14.649±4.877	14.081±3.183	24.432±3.579	4.946±1.715	17.730±2.009	13.757±1.770	13.784±0.854
2	86	103.023±9.567	13.244±3.776	13.965±4.590	24.977±3.914	4.988±1.656	17.954±2.212	14.047±1.245	13.849±1.133
3	38	103.132±8.915	15.132±4.406	14.263±4.925	23.553±3.971	5.500±2.251	18.263±2.286	13.684±1.890	12.737±1.899
4 or Higher	41	99.732±11.243	14.585±6.000	16.268±4.255	21.854±3.825	5.781±2.780	15.854±3.504	12.488±2.399	12.902±2.332
F=		1.453	1.937	2.820	6.424	1.832	8.080	7.504	6.702
p=		0.229	0.125	0.040	0.000	0.143	0.000	0.000	0.000
PostHoc=				4>1, 4>2, 4>3	1>4, 2>4 (p<0.05)		1>4, 2>4, 3>4 (p<0.05)	1>4, 2>4, 3>4	1>3, 2>3, 1>4,

				(p<0.05)				(p<0.05)	2>4 (p<0.05)
Time on Digital Media		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
1 hours	97	100.670±10.219	13.258±4.820	14.742±4.637	23.206±4.435	5.330±2.299	17.247±3.089	13.526±2.006	13.361±1.894
3 hours	36	104.028±8.517	13.889±4.013	15.000±4.586	24.417±3.333	4.667±1.331	18.139±1.791	14.278±1.186	13.639±1.313
4 hours	26	105.346±8.800	15.923±4.009	14.654±2.911	24.500±3.592	5.923±2.115	17.808±2.040	13.192±1.898	13.346±1.325
5 hours or more	43	103.349±7.752	15.209±4.744	13.488±4.543	25.023±3.447	5.093±1.900	17.558±2.403	13.488±1.751	13.488±1.420
F=		2.519	3.340	1.009	2.530	2.035	1.108	2.211	0.292
p=		0.059	0.020	0.390	0.058	0.110	0.347	0.088	0.831
PostHoc=			3>1, 4>1 (p<0.05)						
Computer Tablet Ownership		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Yes	91	104.429±7.651	14.692±4.278	13.813±4.038	25.440±3.128	5.033±1.683	18.066±1.971	13.791±1.595	13.593±1.256
None	111	100.811±10.336	13.667±4.909	15.081±4.662	22.775±4.244	5.405±2.329	17.117±3.020	13.460±2.004	13.306±1.882
t=		2.773	1.565	-2.041	4.982	-1.276	2.580	1.281	1.245
p=		0.005	0.119	0.043	0.000	0.189	0.008	0.202	0.197
Internet Access Style		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Mobile Network	56	101.054±8.974	13.304±4.528	13.982±4.141	23.804±3.773	4.911±1.852	17.732±2.347	13.821±1.550	13.500±1.401
WI-FI	146	102.973±9.504	14.445±4.676	14.712±4.529	24.041±4.095	5.363±2.136	17.473±2.745	13.527±1.931	13.411±1.717
t=		-1.304	-1.567	-1.050	-0.377	-1.396	0.625	1.020	0.346
p=		0.194	0.119	0.295	0.707	0.140	0.533	0.309	0.730
Children's Communication Device Ownershi		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS

p									
Yes	84	103.643± 8.249	14.691± 4.069	14.191± 4.481	24.655± 3.374	5.131± 1.789	18.048± 2.150	13.619± 1.590	13.310± 1.456
None	118	101.585± 10.051	13.729± 5.005	14.737± 4.392	23.492± 4.342	5.314± 2.248	17.186± 2.891	13.602± 1.996	13.525± 1.748
t=		1.543	1.452	-0.865	2.053	-0.618	2.312	0.066	-0.926
p=		0.124	0.134	0.388	0.034	0.537	0.016	0.947	0.356

Male's multi-dimensional parenting styles assessment total scores (x=98.946) were found lower than female's multi-dimensional parenting styles assessment total scores (x=103.224) (t=-2,542; p=0,012<0.05; d=0.462; η^2=0.031).Male's low control scores (x=16.460) were found higher than female's low control scores (x=14.073) (t=3,024; p=0,003<0.05; d=0.550; η^2=0.044).Male's proactive scores (x=22.000) were found lower than female's proactive scores (x=24.418) (t=-3,410; p=0,001<0.05; d=0.620; η^2=0.055).Male's positive reinforcement scores (x=16.027) were found lower than female's positive reinforcement scores (x=17.885) (t=-4,016; p=0<0.05; d=0.730; η^2=0.075).There was no significant difference for participants hostility, physical control, supportive approach, sincere relationship scores for gender (p>0.05).

Mother's multi-dimensional parenting styles assessment total scores (x=103.213) were found higher than father's multi-dimensional parenting styles assessment total scores (x=99.105) (t=2,464; p=0,015<0.05; d=0.444; η^2=0.029).Mother's low control scores (x=14.098) were found lower than father's low control scores (x=16.290) (t=-2,797; p=0,006<0.05; d=0.504; η^2=0.038).Mother's proactive scores (x=24.427) were found higher than father's proactive scores (x=22.026) (t=3,420; p=0,001<0.05; d=0.616; η^2=0.055).Mother's positive reinforcement scores (x=17.890) were found higher than father's positive reinforcement scores (x=16.053) (t=4,013; p=0<0.05; d=0.722; η^2=0.075).Mother's supportive approach scores (x=13.732) were found higher than father's supportive approach scores (x=13.079) (t=1,991; p=0,048<0.05; d=0.359; η^2=0.019).There was no significant difference for participants hostility, physical control, sincere relationship scores for parenting role (p>0.05).

The participants multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship scores showed no significant difference for age (p>0.05). The participants multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship scores showed no significant difference for marital status (p>0.05).

Participants' multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores showed significant difference for the education status (F=3.493; p=0,009<0.05; η^2=0.066). The reason for the difference was multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores of secondary school education level was higher than multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores of elementary school education level (p<0.05). The multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores of high school education level was higher than multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores of elementary school education level (p<0.05). The multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores of 2-year degree education level was higher than multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores of elementary school education level (p<0.05). The multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores of undergraduate degree education level was higher than multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total scores of elementary school education level (p<0.05).

Participants' low control scores showed significant difference for education level (F=3.722; p=0,006<0.05; η^2=0.070). The reason for the difference was that the low control scores of elementary

school education level was higher than the low control scores of the undergraduate education level ($p<0.05$). The low control scores of secondary school education level were higher than the low control scores of the undergraduate education level ($p<0.05$). The low control scores of high school education level were higher than the low control scores of the undergraduate education level ($p<0.05$).

Participants' proactive scores showed significant difference for education level ($F=9.757$; $p=0<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.165$). The reason for the difference was that the proactive scores of high school education level was higher than the proactive scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The proactive scores of 2-year degree education level were higher than the proactive scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The proactive scores of undergraduate degree education level were higher than the proactive scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The proactive scores of 2-year degree education level were higher than the proactive scores of the secondary school education level ($p<0.05$). The proactive scores of undergraduate degree education level were higher than the proactive scores of the secondary school education level ($p<0.05$). The proactive scores of undergraduate degree education level were higher than the proactive scores of the high school education level ($p<0.05$).

Participants' positive reinforcement scores showed significant difference for education level ($F=3.971$; $p=0,004<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.075$). The reason for the difference was that the positive reinforcement scores of high school education level was higher than the positive reinforcement scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The positive reinforcement scores of 2-year degree education level were higher than the positive reinforcement scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The positive reinforcement scores of undergraduate degree education level were higher than the positive reinforcement scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$).

Participants' supportive approach scores showed significant difference for education level ($F=2.567$; $p=0,039<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.050$). The reason for the difference was that the supportive approach scores of high school education level was higher than the supportive approach scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The supportive approach scores of undergraduate degree education level were higher than the supportive approach scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$).

There was no significant difference for participants hostility, physical control and sincere relationship scores for education level ($p>0.05$). The participants multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship scores showed no significant difference for working status ($p>0.05$).

Participants' low control scores showed significant difference for income status ($F=2.833$; $p=0,039<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.041$). The reason for the difference was that the low control scores of 1001-3000TL income status was higher than the low control scores of the 3001-6000TL income status ($p<0.05$). The low control scores of 1001-3000TL income status was higher than the low control scores of the 6001TL and higher income status ($p<0.05$).

Participants' proactive scores showed significant difference for income status ($F=6.863$; $p=0<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.094$). The reason for the difference was that the proactive scores of 3001-6000TL income status was higher than the proactive scores of the 1000TL or lower income status ($p<0.05$). The proactive scores of 6001TL and higher income status was higher than the proactive scores of the 1000TL or lower income status ($p<0.05$). The proactive scores of 3001-6000TL income status were higher than the proactive scores of the 1000-3000TL income status ($p<0.05$). The proactive scores of 6001TL and higher income status was higher than the proactive scores of the 1000-3000TL income status ($p<0.05$).The participants multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, hostility, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship scores showed no significant difference for income status ($p>0.05$).

Participants' low control scores showed significant difference for number of children (F=2.820; p=0.04<0.05; η^2=0.041). The reason for the difference was that the low control scores of 4 or more children was higher than the low control scores of 1 child (p<0.05). The low control scores of 4 or more children were higher than the low control scores of 2 children (p<0.05). The low control scores of 4 or more children were higher than the low control scores of 3 children (p<0.05). Participants' proactive scores showed significant difference for number of children (F=6.424; p=0<0.05; η^2=0.089). The reason for the difference was that the low control scores of 1 child was higher than the low control scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05). The low control scores of 2 children were higher than the low control scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05).

Participants' positive reinforcement scores showed significant difference for number of children (F=8.080; p=0<0.05; η^2=0.109). The reason for the difference was that the positive reinforcement scores of 1 child was higher than the positive reinforcement scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05). The positive reinforcement scores of 2 children were higher than the positive reinforcement scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05). The positive reinforcement scores of 3 children were higher than the positive reinforcement scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05).

Participants' supportive approach scores showed significant difference for number of children (F=7.504; p=0<0.05; η^2=0.102). The reason for the difference was that the supportive approach scores of 1 child was higher than the supportive approach scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05). The supportive approach scores of 2 children were higher than the supportive approach scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05). The supportive approach scores of 3 children were higher than the supportive approach scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05).

Participants' sincere relationship scores showed significant difference for number of children (F=6.702; p=0<0.05; η^2=0.092). The reason for the difference was that the sincere relationship scores of 1 child was higher than the sincere relationship scores of 3 or more children (p<0.05). The sincere relationship scores of 2 children were higher than the sincere relationship scores of 3 or more children (p<0.05). The sincere relationship scores of 1 child was higher than the sincere relationship scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05). The sincere relationship scores of 2 children were higher than the sincere relationship scores of 4 or more children (p<0.05).The participants multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, hostility, physical control scores showed no significant difference for number of children (p>0.05).

Participants' hostility scores showed significant difference for time on digital media (F=3.340; p=0.02<0.05; η^2=0.048). The reason for the difference was that the individuals who spend 4 hours on the digital media had higher hostility scores than the individuals who spend 1 hour on the digital media (p<0.05). The individuals who spend 5 hours or more on the digital media had higher hostility scores than the individuals who spend 1 hour on the digital media (p<0.05).The participants multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship scores showed no significant difference for time on digital media (p>0.05).

Individuals with computer tablet ownership's multi-dimensional parenting styles assessment total scores (x=104.429) were found higher than individuals without computer tablet ownerships' multi-dimensional parenting styles assessment total scores (x=100.811) (t=2,773; p=0,005<0.05; d=0.392; η^2=0.037).Individuals with computer tablet ownership's low control scores (x=13.813) were found lower than individuals without computer tablet ownership's low control scores (x=15.081) (t=-2,041; p=0,043<0.05; d=0.289; η^2=0.020).Individuals with computer tablet ownership's proactive scores (x=25.440) were found higher than individuals without computer tablet ownership's proactive scores (x=22.775) (t=4,982; p=0<0.05; d=0.704; η^2=0.110).

Individuals with computer tablet ownership's positive reinforcement scores (x=18.066) were found higher than individuals without computer tablet ownership's positive reinforcement scores (x=17.117) (t=2,580; p=0,008<0.05; d=0.365; η^2=0.032).There was no significant difference for participants hostility, physical control, supportive approach, sincere relationship scores for computer tablet ownership (p>0.05).

The participants multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship scores showed no significant difference for internet access style (p>0.05).Children with computer tablet ownership's proactive scores (x=24.655) were found higher than children without computer tablet ownership's proactive scores (x=23.492) (t=2,053; p=0,034<0.05; d=0.293; η^2=0.021).

Children with computer tablet ownership's positive reinforcement scores (x=18.048) were found higher than children without computer tablet ownership's positive reinforcement scores (x=17.186) (t=2,312; p=0,016<0.05; d=0.330; η^2=0.026).The participants multi-dimensional parenting style assessment total, hostility, low control, physical control, supportive approach and sincere relationship scores showed no significant difference for children's communication device ownership (p>0.05).

The analysis results to investigate the differentiation of digital parenting awareness scores for defining properties are given below.

Table 7. Differentiation of Digital Parenting Awareness Scores for Defining Properties

Demographic Properties	**n**	**Digital Parenting Awareness Total**	**Negative Modelling**	**Digital Negligence**	**Effective Usage**	**Protection from Risks**
Gender		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Male	37	58.892±9.746	9.892±3.486	9.757±3.337	15.460±3.150	15.081±3.869
Female	165	64.376±8.717	7.824±2.945	8.279±2.883	16.933±2.882	15.546±3.560
t=		-3.383	3.728	2.736	-2.763	-0.706
p=		0.001	0.000	0.007	0.006	0.481
Parenting Role		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Mother	164	64.433±8.712	7.787±2.913	8.299±2.880	16.970±2.853	15.549±3.571
Father	38	58.790±9.634	10.000±3.503	9.632±3.381	15.342±3.190	15.079±3.816
t=		3.526	-4.056	-2.485	3.097	0.721
p=		0.001	0.000	0.014	0.002	0.472
Age		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
35 or younger	98	64.296±8.979	7.776±2.801	8.500±2.972	16.633±2.895	15.939±3.711
35 higher	104	62.500±9.246	8.606±3.403	8.596±3.074	16.692±3.072	15.010±3.477
t=		1.399	-1.887	-0.226	-0.142	1.837
p=		0.163	0.059	0.822	0.887	0.068
Marital Status		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Married	191	63.309±9.253	8.225±3.188	8.539±2.978	16.613±2.952	15.461±3.650
Single	11	64.455±7.118	7.818±2.359	8.727±3.797	17.546±3.475	15.455±3.045
t=		-0.403	0.416	-0.200	-1.010	0.006
p=		0.687	0.678	0.841	0.314	0.996

Education:		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Elementary School	29	62.448±11.034	8.103±3.811	8.138±2.587	15.414±3.480	15.276±3.918
Secondary School	27	62.667±10.587	7.444±2.979	8.482±3.725	15.556±3.479	15.037±4.283
High School	45	64.844±8.450	7.844±3.411	9.200±3.152	17.156±2.788	16.733±3.063
2-Year	22	65.409±7.513	8.091±2.543	7.727±2.354	17.727±2.292	15.500±3.925
Undergraduate	79	62.544±8.666	8.734±2.908	8.582±2.973	16.924±2.678	14.937±3.360
F=		0.839	1.119	1.073	3.536	1.960
p=		0.502	0.349	0.371	0.008	0.102
PostHoc=					3>1, 4>1, 5>1, 3>2, 4>2, 5>2 (p<0.05)	
Working Status		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Working	90	61.367±9.802	8.944±3.268	8.989±3.121	16.433±2.926	14.867±3.775
Not Working	112	64.982±8.267	7.607±2.924	8.196±2.897	16.848±3.023	15.938±3.420
t=		-2.843	3.065	1.867	-0.983	-2.111
p=		0.005	0.002	0.063	0.327	0.036
Income Status		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
1000TL or below	34	63.824±8.207	8.500±3.193	7.500±2.121	16.294±3.010	15.529±3.475
1001-3000 TL	70	63.186±9.072	7.986±3.219	8.900±3.306	16.429±3.091	15.643±3.671
3001-6000 TL	71	63.859±10.101	8.127±2.908	8.268±3.014	16.944±2.971	15.310±3.793
6001 or Higher	27	62.000±8.010	8.593±3.587	9.704±2.799	17.000±2.717	15.296±3.303
F=		0.304	0.361	3.321	0.640	0.122
p=		0.822	0.781	0.021	0.590	0.947
PostHoc=				2>1, 4>1, 4>3 (p<0.05)		
Number of Children		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
1	37	63.460±8.865	8.595±3.261	8.000±2.739	16.676±2.809	15.378±3.361
2	86	64.884±8.458	7.674±2.763	8.488±3.017	17.140±2.854	15.907±3.463
3	38	63.500±9.299	8.526±3.383	8.868±3.256	16.974±2.775	15.921±3.451
4 or Higher	41	60.000±10.020	8.659±3.504	8.878±3.059	15.366±3.284	14.171±4.074
F=		2.716	1.430	0.721	3.594	2.443
p=		0.046	0.235	0.540	0.015	0.065
PostHoc=		2>4 (p<0.05)			1>4, 2>4, 3>4 (p<0.05)	
Time on Digital Media		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
1 hours	97	65.041±9.331	7.309±2.980	8.495±3.079	16.711±2.937	16.134±3.570
3 hours	36	64.056±7.563	7.528±2.547	8.528±3.256	16.694±3.060	15.417±2.980
4 hours	26	61.462±9.218	9.923±3.097	8.769±2.761	16.615±3.238	15.539±3.432

5 hours or more	43	60.186±9.111	9.744±3.071	8.558±2.914	16.558±2.954	13.930±3.936
F=		3.382	10.500	0.057	0.029	3.858
p=		0.019	0.000	0.982	0.993	0.010
PostHoc=		1>4 (p<0.05)	3>1, 4>1, 3>2, 4>2 (p<0.05)			1>4 (p<0.05)
Computer Tablet Ownership		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Yes	91	63.341±8.898	8.725±3.109	8.571±2.963	17.176±2.493	15.462±3.202
None	111	63.396±9.372	7.775±3.124	8.532±3.074	16.243±3.279	15.460±3.933
t=		-0.043	2.156	0.093	2.235	0.004
p=		0.966	0.032	0.926	0.023	0.997
Internet Access Style		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Mobile Network	56	64.500±7.906	7.643±2.850	8.143±2.631	16.393±3.013	15.893±3.468
WI-FI	146	62.938±9.560	8.418±3.235	8.706±3.147	16.767±2.971	15.295±3.666
t=		1.088	-1.573	-1.187	-0.798	1.054
p=		0.278	0.117	0.236	0.426	0.293
Children's Communication Device Ownership		Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS	Av±SS
Yes	84	62.702±9.154	8.393±3.109	9.333±3.231	17.000±2.671	15.429±3.534
None	118	63.848±9.138	8.068±3.178	7.992±2.735	16.424±3.171	15.483±3.683
t=		-0.877	0.723	3.185	1.357	-0.105
p=		0.381	0.470	0.002	0.176	0.916

Male's digital parenting awareness total scores (x=58.892) were found lower than female's digital parenting awareness total scores (x=64.376) (t=-3,383; p=0,001<0.05; d=0.615; η^2=0.054).Male's negative modelling scores (x=9.892) were found higher than female's negative modelling scores (x=7.824) (t=3,728; p=0<0.05; d=0.678; η^2=0.065).Male's digital negligence scores (x=9.757) were found higher than female's digital negligence scores (x=8.279) (t=2,736; p=0,007<0.05; d=0.498; η^2=0.036).Male's effective use scores (x=15.460) were found lower than female's effective use scores (x=16.933) (t=-2,763; p=0,006<0.05; d=0.503; η^2=0.037).

Participants' protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for gender (p>0.05).Mother's digital parenting awareness total scores (x=64.433) were found higher than father's digital parenting awareness total scores (x=58.790) (t=3,526; p=0,001<0.05; d=0.635; η^2=0.059).Mother's negative modelling scores (x=7.787) were found lower than father's negative modelling scores (x=10.000) (t=-4,056; p=0<0.05; d=0.730; η^2=0.076).Mother's digital negligence scores (x=8.299) were found lower than father's digital negligence scores (x=9.632) (t=-2,485; p=0,014<0.05; d=0.447; η^2=0.030).Mother's effective use scores (x=16.970) were found higher than father's effective use scores (x=15.342) (t=3,097; p=0,002<0.05; d=0.558; η^2=0.046). Participants' protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for parenting role (p>0.05).

The participants digital parenting awareness total, negative modelling, digital negligence, effective use and protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for age ($p>0.05$). The participants digital parenting awareness total, negative modelling, digital negligence, effective use and protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for marital status ($p>0.05$).

Participants' effective use scores showed significant difference for education level ($F=3.536$; $p=0,008<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.067$). The reason for the difference was that the effective use scores of high school education level was higher than the effective use scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The effective use scores of 2-year degree education level were higher than the effective use scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The effective use scores of undergraduate degree education level were higher than the effective use scores of the elementary school education level ($p<0.05$). The effective use scores of high school education level were higher than the effective use scores of the secondary school education level ($p<0.05$). The effective use scores of 2-year degree education level were higher than the effective use scores of the secondary school education level ($p<0.05$). The effective use scores of undergraduate degree education level were higher than the effective use scores of the secondary school education level ($p<0.05$). The participants digital parenting awareness total, negative modelling, digital negligence and protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for education level ($p>0.05$).

Working individuals' digital parenting awareness total scores ($x=61.367$) were found lower than non-working individuals' digital parenting awareness total scores ($x=64.982$) ($t=-2,843$; $p=0,005<0.05$; $d=0.402$; $\eta^2=0.039$). Working individuals' negative modelling scores ($x=8.944$) were found higher than non-working individuals' negative modelling scores ($x=7.607$) ($t=3,065$; $p=0,002<0.05$; $d=0.434$; $\eta^2=0.045$).

Working individuals' protection from risk scores ($x=14.867$) were found lower than non-working individuals' protection from risks scores ($x=15.938$) ($t=-2,111$; $p=0,036<0.05$; $d=0.299$; $\eta^2=0.022$). There was no significant difference for participants digital negligence and effective use scores for working status ($p>0.05$).

Participants' digital negligence scores showed significant difference for income status ($F=3.321$; $p=0,021<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.048$). The reason for the difference was that the digital negligence scores of 3001-6000TL income status was higher than the digital negligence scores of the 1000TL or lower income status ($p<0.05$). The digital negligence scores of 6001TL and higher income status was higher than the digital negligence scores of the 1000TL or lower income status ($p<0.05$). The digital negligence scores of 6001TL and higher income status was higher than the digital negligence scores of the 3001-6000TL income status ($p<0.05$).

The participants digital parenting awareness total, negative modelling, effective use and protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for income status ($p>0.05$). Participants' digital parenting awareness total scores showed significant difference for number of children ($F=2.716$; $p=0,046<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.040$). The reason for the difference was that the digital parenting awareness total scores of 2 children was higher than the digital parenting awareness total scores of 4 or more children ($p<0.05$).

Participants' effective use scores showed significant difference for number of children ($F=3.594$; $p=0,015<0.05$; $\eta^2=0.052$). The reason for the difference was that the effective use scores of 1 child was higher than the effective use scores of 4 or more children ($p<0.05$). The effective use scores of 2 children were higher than the effective use scores of 4 or more children ($p<0.05$). The effective use scores of 3 children were higher than the effective use scores of 4 or more children ($p<0.05$).The participants negative modelling, digital negligence and protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for number of children ($p>0.05$).

Participants' digital parenting awareness total scores showed significant difference for time on digital media (F=3.382; p=0,019<0.05; η^2=0.049). The reason for the difference was that the digital parenting awareness total scores of 1 hour on digital media was higher than the digital parenting awareness total scores of 5 or more hours on digital media (p<0.05).

Participants' negative modelling scores showed significant difference for time on digital media (F=10.500; p=0<0.05; η^2=0.137). The reason for the difference was that the individuals who spend 4 hours on the digital media had higher negative modelling scores than the individuals who spend 1 hour on the digital media (p<0.05). The individuals who spend 5 hours or more on the digital media had higher negative modelling scores than the individuals who spend 1 hour on the digital media (p<0.05). The individuals who spend 4 hours on the digital media had higher negative modelling scores than the individuals who spend 3 hours on the digital media (p<0.05). The individuals who spend 5 hours or more on the digital media had higher negative modelling scores than the individuals who spend 3 hours on the digital media (p<0.05).

Participants' protection from risk scores showed significant difference for time on digital media (F=3.858; p=0.01<0.05; η^2=0.055). The reason for the difference was that the individuals who spend 1 hour on the digital media had higher protection from risk scores than the individuals who spend 5 or more hours on the digital media (p<0.05).

There was no significant difference for participants digital negligence and effective use scores for time on digital media (p>0.05). Individuals with computer tablet ownership's negative modelling scores (x=8.725) were found higher than individuals without computer tablet ownership's negative modelling scores (x=7.775) (t=2,156; p=0,032<0.05; d=0.305; η^2=0.023). Individuals with computer tablet ownership's effective scores (x=17.176) were found higher than individuals without computer tablet ownership's effective use scores (x=16.243) (t=2,235; p=0,023<0.05; d=0.316; η^2=0.024). The participants digital parenting awareness total, digital negligence and protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for computer tablet ownership (p>0.05).

The participants digital parenting awareness total, negative modelling, digital negligence, effective use and protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for internet access style (p>0.05). Children with computer tablet ownership's digital negligence scores (x=9.333) were found higher than children without computer tablet ownership's digital negligence scores (x=7.992) (t=3,185; p=0,002<0.05; d=0.455; η^2=0.048). The participants digital parenting awareness total, negative modelling, effective use and protection from risk scores showed no significant difference for children's communication device ownership (p>0.05).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of examining the multidimensional parenting styles of the participants, it was determined that the "proactive" average had the highest value, and the "positive reinforcement" average had a high value. A positive correlation was found between total digital parenting awareness and proactive, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, and cordial relationship. In addition, it has been observed that there is a positive correlation between productive use and proactive, positive reinforcement, supportive approach and sincere relationship. In terms of parenting, restrictive and active mediation is referred to as proactive monitoring of the media. This type of behavior can be described as proactive, as parents anticipate a potentially conflicting source of value and respond preemptively before their child's behavior is affected. Studies show that children are affected by the restrictive viewing behavior of media use. Studies have shown that when children's media use increases, parents try to follow the media more (Padilla-Walker et al., 2012).

When the total change in the total level of digital parenting awareness was examined, it was found that hostility and low control decreased the total level of digital parenting awareness, while positive reinforcement increased the total level of digital parenting awareness. In addition, it has been determined that positive reinforcement increases the level of protection from risks. Educational uses of the Internet have evolved, but mainly the Internet is for adults. Its use by children raises a number of problems. The fact that the Internet is an environment devoid of central control, and that broadcasts can be harmful, exploitative or offensive to these different groups of individuals, is considered dangerous for children (Odabaşı et al., 2007).

In the study, it was seen that there was a positive correlation between digital neglect and evaluating multidimensional parenting styles. In addition, a positive correlation was found between digital neglect and hostility and low control. Studies have shown that parents with a healthy family role have lower levels of being a negative model and digital neglect than parents with an unhealthy family role; it has been concluded that the levels of efficient use and protection from risks are higher. In addition, mothers had lower levels of negative modeling and digital neglect than fathers; it has been determined that the level of efficient use and protection from risks is higher than that of fathers. It has been concluded that the child's internet addiction level is positively related to being a negative model and digital neglect, and negatively related to protection from risks. It has been determined that the healthy or unhealthy family roles affect the awareness of digital parenting, and especially being a negative model and digital neglect affect the child's internet addiction (Adam Karduz & Keleşoğlu, 2020; Manap & Durmuş, 2021).

In the analysis of the relationship between hostility, low control, proactive, physical control, positive reinforcement, supportive approach, sincere relationship and protection from risks, it was determined that hostility decreased the level of protection from risks, while positive reinforcement increased the level of protection from risks. Studies show that internet addiction is significantly and negatively associated with positive reinforcement, supportiveness, intimate relationship, proactive parenting, and broadband positive parenting styles (Karababa, 2020).

It was determined that the participants' total scores for evaluating multidimensional parenting styles differed significantly according to their educational status. In addition, it was seen that the positive reinforcement scores of the participants differed significantly according to their educational status, and the positive reinforcement scores of those with high school, associate and undergraduate education were higher than the positive reinforcement scores of those with primary school education. In studies examining digital parenting awareness according to parents' education level, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the graduated school and digital parenting awareness, except for being a negative model (Manap, 2020).

In addition, the hostility scores of the participants differ significantly according to the time spent in digital media. Children's usage time and habits are affected by how often, for how long and with what content parents use these tools. The time parents spend in these tools and the content they are interested in, as well as their evaluations of the content, determine how their children will approach digital media tools (İnan Kaya, 2021).

Another result obtained from the study is that mothers' digital parenting awareness total scores are higher than fathers' digital parenting awareness total scores. Studies have shown that women have higher levels of protection from risks and efficient use. It is thought that mothers' desire to be with their children more when they enter the digital world compared to fathers may be related to this situation (Adam Karduz & Keleşoğlu, 2020). The different outcomes between fathers and mothers' permissive

parenting styles can also be discussed in terms of differences in the roles of father and mother in the family or in child care (Preston et al., 2019).

Studies have shown that more research is needed. In the future, it is recommended to conduct a comparative analysis of other countries and examine the role of media and digital literacy of adults, especially parents. It would be beneficial to investigate the participation of parents in education at school, especially in areas where there is a lack of knowledge. More extensive research is needed on how parents educate their children about media (Ciboci & Labaš, 2019).

Although researchers generally focus on the negative impact of media on both individuals and families, the impact of media on families is also frequently studied. It is important that research focuses on how parents can use the media as a tool to strengthen family relationships as a whole, from early childhood to adolescence (Coyne et al., 2017).

Families are spending more time than ever with new media technologies. This fundamentally changes the way parents and children live and communicate. Children's media use can potentially stress their parents on a daily basis. Children's characteristics, family structure and parenting styles can affect the solution of these problems. Parents' use of parental support, especially provided by professionals, can help solve problems (Nikken & de Haan, 2015).

References

Adam Karduz, F. F., & Keleşoğlu, F. (2020). Covıd-19 Sürecinde Dijital Ebeveynliğin Farklı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, *6*(68), 3619–3635. https://doi.org/10.26449/sssj.2585

Adıgüzel, C., Bapoğlu Dümenci, S., & Topal, M. (2020). Çekingenlik Davranışının Tespiti ve Giderilmesine İlişkin Şema Yaklaşımı İle Büyük Ebeveyn – Ebeveyn ve Çocuk İlişkisi. *Gelişim ve Psikoloji Dergisi (GPD)*, *1*(1), 17–25.

Akkaya, S., Tan, Z., Kapıdere, M., & Şahin, S. (2021). Investigation of the Relationship between Parents' Awareness of Digital Parenting and the Effects of Digital Games on Their Children. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *22*(1), 889–917. https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.905569

Besharat, M. A., Azizi, K., & Poursharifi, H. (2011). The relationship between parenting styles and children's academic achievement in a sample of Iranian families. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 1280–1283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.277

Bornstein, L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2014). Parenting Styles and Child Social Development. In *Encyclopedia of Early Childhood Development* (pp. 1–3).

Brown, L., & Iyengar, S. (2008). Parenting styles: The impact on student achievement. *Marriage and Family Review*, *43*(1–2), 14–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/01494920802010140

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* (Vol. 18). Pegem Akademi.

Chassiakos, Y. R., Radesky, J., Christakis, D., Moreno, M. A., & Cross, C. (2016). Children and adolescents and digital media. *Pediatrics*, *138*(5), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-2593

Ciboci, L., & Labaš, D. (2019). Digital Media Literacy, School and Contemporary Parenting. *Medijjske Studije*, *10*(19), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.20901/ms.10.19.5/SUBMITTED

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge.

Coyne, S. M., Radesky, J., Collier, K. M., Gentile, D. A., Linder, J. R., Nathanson, A. I., Rasmussen, E. E., Reich, S. M., &

Rogers, J. (2017). Parenting and Digital Media. *Pediatrics*, *140*(2). www.aappublications.org/news

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. SAGE Publications.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). *IBM SPSS statistics 23 step by step : A simple guide and reference*. Routledge.

Harwiki, W. (2013). The Influence of Servant Leadership on Organization Culture, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employees' Performance (Study of Outstanding Cooperatives in East Java Province, Indonesia). *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, *5*(12), 876–885.

İnal, C., & Günay, S. (1993). *Olasılık ve Matematiksel İstatistik*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Fen Fakültesi Yayınevi.

İnan Kaya, G. (2021). Dijital Çağda Çocuk Yetiştirme ve Eğitim: Değişen Roller. *İnsan ve İnsan Dergisi*, *8*(27), 83–100. https://doi.org/10.29224/insanveinsan.819184

Johnson, R. A., & Wichern, D. V. (2007). *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis*. Duxbury.

Karababa, A. (2019). Çok Boyutlu Ebeveynlik Stillerini Değerlendirme Ölçeği'nin (ÇESDÖ) (Ebeveyn Formu) Türkçeye Uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education*, *46*(46), 108–131. https://doi.org/10.9779/pauefd.439949

Karababa, A. (2020). Examining Internet Addiction of Early Adolescents in terms of Parenting Styles. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, *10*(57), 229–254.

Karaboğa, M. T. (2019). Dijital Medya Okuryazarlığında Anne ve Baba Eğitimi. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *14*(20), 2040–2073. https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.601942

Karakuş Yılmaz, T. (2020). Dijital Haklar ve Sorumluluklar. In Ş. Sağıroğlu, H. İ. Bülbül, A. Kılıç, & M. Küçükali (Eds.), *Dijital Okuryazarlık*. Nobel. www.nobelkitap.com

Manap, A. (2020). *Anne Babalarda Dijital Ebeveynlik Farkındalığının İncelenmesi*. İnönü Üniversitesi.

Manap, A., & Durmuş, E. (2020). Development of Digital Parental Awareness Scale. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *21*(2), 978–993. https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.711101

Manap, A., & Durmuş, E. (2021). Dijital Ebeveynlik Farkındalığının Aile içi Roller ve Çocukta İnternet Bağımlılığına Göre İncelenmesi. *E-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *12*(1), 141–156. https://doi.org/10.19160/ijer.837749

Mascheroni, G., Ponte, C., & Jorge, A. (2018). Digital Parenting. The Challenges for Families in the Digital Age. In G. Mascheroni, C. Ponte, & A. Jorge (Eds.), *Yearbook*. Te International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media. www.nordicom.gu.se/clearinghouse

Montgomery, K. C. (2000). Children's Media Culture in the New Millennium: Mapping the Digital Landscape. *Children and Computer Technology*, *10*(2), 145–167. http://uwww.futureofchildren.org

Montoya-Castilla, I., Prado-Gascó, V., Villanueva-Badenes, L., & González-Barrón, R. (2016). Adaptación en la infancia: influencia del estilo parental y del estado de ánimo. *Acción Psicológica*, *13*(2), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.5944/ap.13.2.17807

Nikken, P., & de Haan, J. (2015). Guiding young children's internet use at home: Problems that parents experience in their parental mediation and the need for parenting support. *Cyberpsychology*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.5817/CP2015-1-3

Odabaşı, H. F., Çoklar, N., & Kabakçı, I. (2007). Yeni Dünya: İnternet-Ailelerin Yeni Dünyadaki Sorumlulukları Nelerdir? *8. Aybastı-Kabataş Kurultayı*, 1–9.

Özparlak, A., & Karakaya, D. (2020). Ergenlerde İnternet Bağımlılığı ile İlişkili Ailesel Faktörler ve Hemşirelik Bakımı. *Türkiye Klinikleri Hemşirelik Bilimleri Dergisi*, *12*(2), 291–299. https://doi.org/10.5336/nurses.2019-72911

Padilla-Walker, L. M., Coyne, S. M., Fraser, A. M., Dyer, W. J., & Yorgason, J. B. (2012). Parents and adolescents growing up in the digital age: Latent growth curve analysis of proactive media monitoring. *Journal of*

Adolescence, *35*, 1153–1165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.03.005

Parlar, H., & Özbuk, H. (2018). Anne Baba Tutumları ile Çocuk Utangaçlığı Arasındaki İlişki. *Akademik Platform Eğitim ve Değişim Dergisi*, *1*(1), 57–75.

Preston, M., Mini, R., & Salim, A. (2019). Parenting style, proactive personality, and career decision self-efficacy among senior high school students. *Humanitas Indonesian Psychological Journal*, *16*(2), 116–128.

Sarwar, S. (2016). Influence of Parenting Style on Children's Behaviour. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, *3*(2), 222–249.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Pearson.

Tosun, N., & Mihci, C. (2020). An examination of digital parenting behavior in parents with preschool children in the context of lifelong learning. *Sustainability*, *12*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187654

Turner, K. H., Jolls, T., Hagerman, M. S., O'Byrne, W., Hicks, T., Eisenstock, B., & Pytash, K. E. (2017). Developing digital and media literacies in children and adolescents. *Pediatrics*, *140*, 122–126. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-1758P

Ulferts, H. (2020). *Why parenting matters for children in the 21st century*. www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers

Yaman, F., Kabakçı Yurdakul, I., & Dönmez, O. (2020). Gençlik ve Dijiital Çağ. In A. Görgün Baran, O. Hazer, & M. S. Öztürk (Eds.), *Gençlik ve Dijiital Çağ* (pp. 165–180).

Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Schema therapy : A practitioner's guide*. Guilford Press.

Zaman, B., & Mifsud, C. L. (2017). Editorial: Young children's use of digital media and parental mediation. *Cyberpsychology*, *11*(3), 9. https://doi.org/10.5817/CP2017-3-xx

Zhang, D., & Livingstone, S. (2019). *Inequalities in how parents support their children's development with digital technologies*. www.parenting.digital