



European Journal of Educational Research

Volume 8, Issue 2, 535 - 543.

ISSN: 2165-8714

<http://www.eu-jer.com/>

Analysis of the Parental Support Perceived by Pre-Service Music Teachers in Instrumental Education in Line with Some Variables: Uludag University Sample

Ecehan Arslanhan
Uludag University, TURKEY

Hatice Onuray Egilmez*
Uludag University, TURKEY

Doruk Engur
Uludag University, TURKEY

Received: January 22, 2019 • Revised: March 21, 2019 • Accepted: March 25, 2019

Abstract: In this study, it was aimed to examine existing condition of parental support taken by pre-service music teachers in instrumental education according to some variables and to determine the relationship between them. 123 students, who study in Uludag University Department of Music Education, constitute the sample of the research. The data collected with "Parental Support Scale Perceived in Instrumental Education" is analyzed with t-test, ANOVA and Mann-Withney U test. The results demonstrated that parental support perceived in instrumental education does not change according to gender, living together/separate status of parents, mother's working/not working status, income level of parents or students living together/separate with parents' status. Nevertheless, when the class level increases, the parental support perceived in instrumental education decreases. Also, it is determined that the students who has someone playing musical instrument in their family has higher points for parental support perceived in instrumental education. There was a significant linear trend, indicating that as the education level of mother increased, both the sub-dimensions and total scores of parental support perceived in instrumental education increased proportionately. On the other hand, as the education level of father increased, only the total scores increased proportionately.

Keywords: *Instrumental education, parental support, pre-service music teachers*

To cite this article: Arslanhan, E., Egilmez, H. O., & Engur, D. (2019). Analysis of the parental support perceived by pre-service music teachers in instrumental education in line with some variables: Uludag University Sample. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(2), 535-543. doi: 10.12973/eu-jer.8.2.535

Introduction

In Turkey, departments of music education within faculties of education are the institutions that prepare music teachers by providing music training. In the most of aforementioned institutions, the curriculum implemented by the Council of Higher Education (CoHE) in 1998 was applied until the new program planned to be implemented in the 2018-2019 school year was put into effect. The 1998 program includes courses on general knowledge, music field lessons, and teaching profession knowledge. According to Tanriverdi (as cited in Ozen, 2004) in Department of Music Education instrument education continues for 8 semesters under the courses entitled 'Individual Instrument Education' which has functions such as increasing the skills of students, enriching the knowledge about music, reaching the music admiration to a higher level (Topalak, 2013). In addition to the Individual Instrument Education course, in the Department of Music Education, there are also training of various instruments within the scope of piano and traditional instruments and school instruments course. It is stated that playing an instrument plays an active role as a source when identifying and integration of the individual with himself/herself, expressing emotions, and socialization, and is also an important dimension of the art of music (Cilden, 2001; Ozdemir & Yildiz, 2010). According to Burubatur (2006), it can be said for playing an instrument who expressed as 'a physical act which requires intensive effort and concentration' has given many qualifications in professional sense to pre-service music teachers. "The music educator candidate will learn musicianship with the knowledge and skills s/he will gain in the instrument, develop his/her talent through positive developments in the instrument, and develop self-confidence by establishing better communication with his/her environment" (Topalak, 2013). Pre-service music teachers will actively use their instruments in many activities that they will implement in their future teaching life in the direction of instrumental education they have experienced in the Department of Music Education, and this will provide important life-long opportunities for them. It is a driving force for the teacher to instill music to his/her students because of the good playing ability of the

* **Corresponding author:**

Hatice Onuray Egilmez, Department of Music Education, Faculty of Education Uludag University, Turkey

✉ haticeegilmez@gmail.com

instrument. It is believed that this will be the factor for teachers to achieve fulfillment in their profession. Aforementioned gains demonstrate the importance of instrumental education in professional life of music teachers.

It is suggested that there are many factors influencing the development of pre-service music teachers during the period of instrumental education. In music development and learning process, environmental constructs surrounding daily life that the individual is in communication and interaction are also important as well as factors such as hereditary basis, maturity, age, and experience. It is possible to list these constructs as family, school, friends, media, technology, and culture in daily life of the individual (Ozmentes & Adizel, 2017). "The academic success or failure of a student is very important for the student himself/herself, his/her family and the society in which s/he lives" (Yildirim, 2000). "All interpersonal relationships, which have an important place in people's life and which provide individual emotional, material and cognitive assistance when necessary, are defined as 'social support systems' for protecting health" (Erturk, 2007). "The most important social support resources of the students are listed as their families, friends, and teachers" (Yildirim, 2000). In this study, parental support is analyzed from sources of social support.

"Social relations are important for all ages. All people need to have relationships and interact with others in life" (Kilinc & Sevim, 2005). According to Cakir and Palabiyik (as cited in Yilmaz, Yilmaz, & Karaca, 2008) social support is defined as "assistance provided by the people around the individual". There is convincing evidence that parents who support self-confident and talented young musicians are committed to help their children on a compelling but incredibly satisfying journey of learning a musical instrument (Davidson, Howe, Moore, & Sloboda, 1996). Such support of the parents is thought to be very important in the development of students' early music life because support creates security and self-confidence in child's instrument playing performance (Margiotta, 2011). Parents' socioeconomic status, occupations, educational/cultural backgrounds, and attitudes/beliefs about their children identify the types of interest in their children's musical development. In general, a stable family life provides an environment in which the child can be nurtured without worry or away from external pressures (Howe & Sloboda, 1991).

Parents who have tendency towards music (those who are interested in music as professional or amateurs) can give their children more support for 'musical thinking', expose them to the accurate opportunities, and direct them more efficacious towards the aims that will be achieved when they are learning. Conversely, parents who do not have tendency towards music do not often become aware of their potential role. When they come to the musical training of their children, they are frequently watching passively during instrument courses or just guarding them when they bring or take their kids from the course (Hallam, 1998). However, researches reveal that parents of children that have success in learning music do not have to be talented. In fact, most families are made up solely of parents that do not provide proficiency and technical knowledge, yet they only support and encourage their children. It can be said that, commitment of the parents is much more important according to high-level music skills or competence of parents. (Davidson, Sloboda, & Howe, 1996; Sloboda & Howe, 1991).

The family is the determinant factor in the development of education, which is included into the life of the individual and becomes an occupation, is in this context, as it can be effective while shaping and developing many facts ongoing in the life an individual. In addition to this, it is seen that parents provide emotional support. "In the literature, there are some research findings that show the positive effects of family harmony, supportive approach of the family and the cooperation of the family on the success of the students" (Girgin, 2016).

Sosniak (1985) worked with 24 piano students in total, and 12 of them were members of families who did not have any interest in music. At the end of the study, he concluded that the parental support was important in the instrument training. Davidson who includes similar findings, in the research of Sloboda et al., (1996) reveals that during music education process the students who are successful have family members that do not join intensive music activities conversely, the students who are not successful have higher percentage of members that interested in music (as cited in Ozmentes & Adizel, 2017).

It is believed that parental support has an impact on instrument education. In this direction, how is the existing state of parental support which is perceived by pre-service music teachers according to some variables was the issue of concern, the data in the research was collected in line with the problem status below.

Problem Situation

Experts and research results in the literature suggest that parental support is effective in student achievement among many factors in instrument education. From this point of view, in the research, determining effect level of students from some variables such as gender, grade level, living together with parents status; income level, education, working/not working, playing a music instrument and living together/apart status of parents determined as problem status for parental support perceived by pre-service music teachers in instrumental education. This research is important in terms of revealing the contribution of the parental support, which is believed to have a very important place in the educational life of the pre-service music teachers in instrumental education in line with some variables. The results also make the research important because it sheds light on new researches and encourages education and student and parent cooperation in music education institutions.

Methodology

Research Goal

This research was carried out in order to examine perceived parental support in terms of various variables in the instrument education that is believed to have a significant importance in the education life of pre-service music teachers studying at department of music education. In line with this general objective, responses to the following questions were sought:

- Does the perceived parental support in instrument education differ according to the gender of the student?
- Does the perceived parental support in instrument education differ according to the grade level of the student?
- Is there any effect on parental support that student perceives by having someone at home who is playing an instrument professionally or amateurish?
- Does the perceived parental support in instrument education differ according to the situation of the parents like being together or separate?
- Is the family support that the student perceives in instrument education related to the parents' educational status?
- Does the perceived family support by the student in the instrument education differ according to the status of parents' living together or separate?
- Does the perceived parental support by the student differ according to the work status of the mother?
- Does the income level of the family a determining factor for the parental support that perceived by the student in instrumental education?

Sample and Data Collection

The sample group consisted of 123 undergraduate students who were educated in the same educational institution and were willing to participate in the research in the 2017-2018 academic year. 77 of the students were female, and 46 were male.

The data of this study were collected with a form consisting of two parts. In the first part, personal information and some demographic variables were included, in the second part 'Parental Support Scale Perceived in Instrumental Education' developed by Girgin (2016) was included. The scale, which was prepared for the students studying at institutions where music teachers were trained, consisted of 23 items in 5-point Likert-type. The scale, which was determined to be two-factor by Girgin (2016) explained 59% of the total variance. The factor load values of the items in the scale varied between .50 and .82. The reliability of the scale was calculated by looking at the Cronbach Alpha coefficient. The reliability of the sub-dimensions of the scale was as follows; for the sub-dimension of 'sensitivity', .93, and for the 'inclusion in the process it was .92. The Cronbach Alpha value of the whole scale was .96. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha values calculated for the determination of reliability were calculated as 0.95 for the whole scale, 0.89 for the sensitivity sub-dimension, and 0.92 for the sub-dimension of inclusion in the process.

Analyzing Data

SPSS 23.0 package program was used to analyze the data that obtained from survey.

In the analysis of data, t-test and one-way ANOVA where parametric test assumptions were met; Mann-Whitney U test was used when parametric test assumptions were not met. Effect sizes (Cohen's d, ω^2 and r) were also reported. For significant ANOVA results, polynomial contrasts were also employed and reported to determine whether there was a linear trend in the data.

Findings

In this section, the findings obtained in the light of the data on the perceived parental support in instrument education were included.

Table 1. Comparison of perceived parental support scores in instrument education according to gender

		N	M	SD	t	df	p	Cohen's d
Sensitivity	Female	77	4.504	0.561	1.013	121.0	0.243	0.219
	Male	46	4.377	0.617				
Involvement in Process	Female	77	4.005	1.891	1.483	121.0	0.096	0.313
	Male	46	3.725	0.897				
Total PPS	Female	77	4.265	0.690	1.402	121.0	0.126	0.287
	Male	46	4.065	0.709				

In Table 1, t-test analysis results in the comparison of perceived parental support scores in instrumental education according to gender were seen (According to the Levene's test equality of variance assumption was met, $p > 0.05$). Effect sizes showed that gender had a small effect for both sub-dimensions and total scores, but this effect was not

significant. In other words, although the parental support scores of the female students were slightly higher than the male students, the t-test results showed that there was no significant difference in the total scores and sub-dimensions.

Table 2. Distribution of perceived family support scores in instrumental education according to grade level

		N	M	SD	F	p	ω^2
Sensitivity	1st Grade	30	4.533	0.550	3.547	.009	0.076
	2nd Grade	27	4.747	0.520			
	3rd Grade	28	4.283	0.621			
	4th Grade	27	4.386	0.540			
	5th Grade and above	11	4.152	0.572			
Involvement in Process	1st Grade	30	4.112	0.839	5.436	<.001	0.126
	2nd Grade	27	4.374	0.727			
	3rd Grade	28	3.429	0.842			
	4th Grade	27	3.838	0.789			
	5th Grade and above	11	3.512	1.183			
Total PPS	1st Grade	30	4.332	0.669	4.991	.001	0.115
	2nd Grade	27	4.568	0.601			
	3rd Grade	28	3.874	0.676			
	4th Grade	27	4.124	0.613			
	5th Grade and above	11	3.846	0.827			

In ANOVA test analysis of scores according to the grade level in Table 2, it was seen that there was a significant difference in sensitivity sub-dimension according to years. $F(4, 118) = 3.55$, $p = .009$, $\omega^2 = .076$. Contrasts revealed a significant trend, $F(1, 118) = 7.05$, $p = .009$, $\omega^2 = .045$, indicating that as the grade level (year) increased sensitivity decreased.

In the sub-dimension of involvement in the process, there was a significant difference according to the years, $F(4, 118) = 5.44$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = .126$. Contrasts revealed a significant trend, $F(1, 118) = 5.27$, $p = .007$, $\omega^2 = .046$, indicating that as the grade level (year) increased involvement to process decreased.

It was seen that, there was a significant difference in total scores of perceived parental support (PPS) according to grade level $F(4, 118) = 4.99$, $p = .001$, $\omega^2 = .115$. Contrasts revealed a significant trend, $F(1, 118) = 8.08$, $p = .005$, $\omega^2 = .051$, indicating that as the grade level (year) increased total PPS decreased.

Although effect sizes (ω^2) showed a very small effect, grade had a statistically significant role. In this case, it can be said that as the grade level increases, the perceived parental support in the instrument education decreases.

Table 3. Comparison of perceived parental support scores in instrument education according to whether there is a musical instrument player in the family

		N	M	SD	t	df	p	Cohen's d
Sensitivity	Absent	71	4.362	0.603	-2.144	121.0	0.034	-0.391
	Present	52	4.587	0.534				
Involvement in Process	Absent	71	3.721	0.904	-2.644	121.0	0.009	-0.483
	Present	52	4.145	0.843				
Total PPS	Absent	71	4.055	0.709	-2.558	121.0	0.012	-0.467
	Present	52	4.375	0.653				

In Table 3, t-test analysis results were seen in the comparison of perceived family support scores in musical instrument education according to whether there was an instrument player in the family. Sensitivity sub-dimension, $t(121) = -2.144$, $p = .034$, $d = -0.391$, and sub-dimension of involvement in process, $t(121) = -2.644$, $p = .009$, $d = -0.483$, indicated a significant difference for the ones who had someone that can play a musical instrument in the family. The total score was also significant in favor of the ones who had a person in the family playing a musical instrument, $t(121) = -2.558$, $p = .012$, $d = -0.467$.

Although effect sizes (d) showed a small effect, it can be said that the pre-service music teachers who had someone playing musical instrument in their families received more support from their parents in instrument education.

Table 4. Comparison of perceived parental support in instrument education according to the status of parents for being married/divorced

		N	M ± SD	Mean Rank	Mdn	U	z	p	r
Sensitivity	Married	96	4.47 ± 0.58	62.65	4.67	1234.0	-0.39	.700	-.03
	Divorced	27	4.42 ± 0.61	59.70	4.58				
Involvement In Process	Married	96	3.94 ± 0.90	63.77	4.18	1126.5	-1.04	.300	-.09
	Divorced	27	3.76 ± 0.91	55.72	3.91				
Total PPS	Married	96	4.22 ± 0.70	63.39	4.43	1163.0	-0.81	.416	-.07
	Divorced	27	4.10 ± 0.73	57.07	4.30				

According to the Mann-Whitney U test analysis in Table 4, the total score of perceived parental support of students in instrumental education, $U = 1163.0$, $z = -0.81$, $p = .416$, $r = -.07$, sensitivity sub-dimension, $U = 1234.0$, $z = -0.39$, $p = .700$, $r = -.03$, and in the sub-dimension of involvement in process, $U = 1126.5$, $z = -1.04$, $p = .300$, $r = -.09$, it was seen that there was not statistically significant difference between the parents live separately or together. Since the r values showed a very small effect, having married or divorced parents was not important for music students' perceived parental support scores.

Table 5. Distribution of PPS scores by education level of mother in instrument education

	Education	N	M	SD	F	p	ω^2
Sensitivity	Primary	36	4.241	0.640	2.765	0.045	0.041
	Secondary	16	4.417	0.475			
	High School	43	4.583	0.525			
	University	28	4.563	0.595			
Involvement In Process	Primary	36	3.571	1.002	3.438	0.019	0.056
	Secondary	16	3.744	0.825			
	High School	43	4.182	0.764			
	University	28	3.981	0.886			
Total PPS	Primary	36	3.920	0.769	3.412	0.020	0.056
	Secondary	16	4.095	0.602			
	High School	43	4.391	0.611			
	University	28	4.284	0.706			

The results of the ANOVA test for the comparison of the mother education level with the perceived parental support scores of students' in instrumental education were given in Table 5. According to this, there was a significant difference in sensitivity sub-dimension according to mother's education level $F(3, 119) = 2.77$, $p = .045$, $\omega^2 = .041$. Contrasts revealed a significant trend, $F(1, 119) = 5.97$, $p = .016$, $\omega^2 = .039$, indicating that as the educational level of mother increased, sensitivity increased proportionately.

There was also a significant difference in the involvement in process sub-dimension according to the mother's educational level $F(3, 119) = 3.44$, $p = .019$, $\omega^2 = .056$. Contrasts revealed a significant trend, $F(1, 119) = 5.53$, $p = .020$, $\omega^2 = .035$, indicating that as the educational level of mother increased involvement in process increased proportionately.

When the total score of the perceived parental support in instrumental education was considered, it was seen that the educational level of mother again makes a meaningful difference in the perceived parental support $F(3, 119) = 3.41$, $p = .020$, $\omega^2 = .056$. Contrasts revealed a significant trend, $F(1, 119) = 6.33$, $p = .013$, $\omega^2 = .041$, indicating that as the educational level of mother increased total PPS increased proportionately.

Consequently, although effect sizes (ω^2) showed a very small effect, education level of the mother had a statistically significant role.

Table 6. Comparison of perceived parental support total scores in the instrument education with the educational level of the father

	Education	N	M	SD	F	p	ω^2
Sensitivity	Primary	18	4.171	0.700	2.626	0.054	0.038
	Secondary	21	4.353	0.543			
	High School	50	4.498	0.512			
	University	34	4.610	0.600			

Table 6. Continued

	Education	N	M	SD	F	p	ω^2
Involvement In Process	Primary	18	3.505	1.001	2.473	0.065	0.035
	Secondary	21	3.667	0.892			
	High School	50	4.011	0.797			
	University	34	4.091	0.938			
Total PPS	Primary	18	3.853	0.816	2.763	0.045	0.041
	Secondary	21	4.025	0.650			
	High School	50	4.265	0.620			
	University	34	4.362	0.728			

The results of the ANOVA test for the comparison of the father's education level with the perceived parental support scores of students' in instrumental education were given in Table 6. According to this, although there was a trend that was directly proportional to the education level of the father in the sensitivity subscale, there was no statistical evidence that the education level of the father had an effect on the sensitivity scores, $F(3, 119) = 2.63$, $p = .054$, $\omega^2 = .038$.

Although there was a trend that was directly proportional to the education level of the father in the sub-dimension of the involvement in the process, no statistical evidence has been obtained that the educational level of the father has an effect on the scores of being involvement in the process, $F(3, 119) = 2.47$, $p = .065$, $\omega^2 = .035$.

When the total scores of perceived parental support in instrumental education were considered, it was seen that the educational level of the father makes a significant difference in perceived parental support, $F(3, 119) = 2.76$, $p = .045$, $\omega^2 = .041$. Contrasts revealed a significant trend, $F(1, 119) = 7.97$, $p = .006$, $\omega^2 = .054$, indicating that as the educational level of father increased total PPS increased proportionately.

Consequently, effect sizes (ω^2) showed a very small effect, and only in total scores this effect had a role.

Table 7. Comparison of perceived parental support scores in instrumental education according to living with family status

		N	M	SD	t	df	p	Cohen's d
Sensitivity	Living with family	70	4.470	0.614	0.296	121.0	.767	0.054
	Separate	53	4.439	0.545				
Involvement in Process	Living with family	70	3.977	0.960	1.083	121.0	.281	0.197
	Separate	53	3.799	0.813				
Total PPS	Living with family	70	4.234	0.756	0.792	121.0	.430	0.144
	Separate	53	4.133	0.624				

The sensitivity sub-dimension according to the t-test results in Table 7, $t(121) = 0.296$, $p = .767$, $d = 0.054$, sub-dimension of involvement in process, $t(121) = 1.083$, $p = .281$, $d = 0.197$ and in total scores $t(121) = 0.792$, $p = .430$, $d = 0.144$, and it was observed that whether living with their families or not of the students did not make a statistically significant difference. Since the effect sizes (d) were also very small, living with family did not have an important role in perceived parental support scores.

Table 8. Comparison of perceived parental support scores in instrumental education according to mother's working status

		N	M	SD	t	df	p	Cohen's d
Sensitivity	Not working	63	4.394	0.568	-1.062	119.0	.290	-0.193
	Working	58	4.507	0.601				
Involvement in Process	Not working	63	3.909	0.910	0.228	119.0	.820	0.041
	Working	58	3.871	0.906				
Total PPS	Not working	63	4.162	0.705	-0.318	119.0	.751	-0.058
	Working	58	4.203	0.708				

The sensitivity sub-dimension according to the t-test results in Table 8, $t(119) = -1.062$, $p = .290$, $d = -0.193$, with the sub-dimension of involvement in the process, $t(119) = 0.228$, $p = .820$, $d = 0.041$, it was seen that the mother was working or not working did not make a statistically significant difference.

Moreover, there was no significant difference in perceived parental support total scores in instrumental education whether the mothers were working or not $t(119) = -0.318$, $p = .751$, $d = -0.058$.

Since the effect sizes (d) were also very small, mother's working status did not have an important role in perceived parental support scores.

Table 9. Comparison of perceived parental support in instrumental education according to family income level

	Income Level	N	M	SD	F	p	ω^2
Sensitivity	1000-2000	16	4.547	0.533	0.995	0.398	0.000
	2001-3000	33	4.452	0.577			
	3001-4000	29	4.322	0.678			
	4000+	42	4.552	0.538			
Involvement In Process	1000-2000	16	3.949	0.974	0.041	0.989	0.000
	2001-3000	33	3.928	0.868			
	3001-4000	29	3.868	0.953			
	4000+	42	3.935	0.895			
Total PPS	1000-2000	16	4.261	0.717	0.301	0.825	0.000
	2001-3000	33	4.202	0.673			
	3001-4000	29	4.105	0.791			
	4000+	42	4.257	0.673			

According to the results of ANOVA test in Table 9, the sensitivity, $F(3, 116) = 0.995$, $p = 0.398$, and the involvement of the process $F(3, 116) = 0.041$, $p = 0.989$, scores were not significantly correlated with the income level of the family. It was seen that total PPS scores were not related to the family income level, $F(3, 116) = 0.301$, $p = 0.825$. Since the effect sizes were nearly zero, family income had no role in perceived parental support.

Discussion and Conclusion

In the present study, it was concluded that although the female students' perceived parental support scores were slightly higher than the male students, there was no significant difference in the total score and sub-dimensions. In the study of Saygi Gerceker (2018) based on the data obtained with the same scale, it was stated that the perceived support of the pre-service music teachers in instrumental education did not differ according to the gender. In the study of Cecen (2008), no difference was seen in the perceived support levels from families, friends and others between females and males. When the literature was examined, it was seen that this finding is in parallel with the research findings of Caldwell and Bloom (1982). However, it was seen that it is not parallel with the research results carried out on adolescents about females who are getting more support from their friends compared to males. According to Aksoy, Kahraman and Kilic (2008), differences were found according to gender in adolescents' perceived parental monitoring and support behaviors, and this finding showed consistency with findings in the literature indicating that girls were observed more than boys.

Another result of the research, a linear tendency showing a decrease was observed in the comparison of perceived parental support scores in the instrument education according to the grade level of the students. It can be said that the students' perceived parental support decreases as the grade level increases. This can be attributed to students' more independent movement as they grow older. However, Saygi Gerceker's (2018) research partially supports this conclusion. In the Saygi Gerceker's (2018) research, while the total score of the same scale could not reach a meaningful result, it obtained statistically significant results in both sub-dimensions. Turkish society is a society with strong family ties. Most families continue their long-term financial and moral support for their children regardless of age. As a matter of fact, Altay, Gonener, and Demirkiran (2010) found high perceived parental support scores of nurses working in a university hospital. Also, in the same study, it was concluded that 1-5 years experienced nurses' perceived parental support score was higher. This result coincides with the conclusion that pre-service music teachers' perceived parental support decreases according to grade level in instrument education. This situation can be explained as a natural result of young people living independently from their families, as they get older.

The present research revealed that the fact that someone playing a musical instrument in the family differed in favor of the student in both dimensions. Thus, it can be said that having someone or some ones in the family who play a musical instrument is one of the reasons for the increase of perceived parental support. Playing an instrument requires specific expertise. At this point, it is believed that having people who have knowledge about music field in the family is important in guiding and informing the students. The results obtained support this belief. As a matter of fact, in Gokbudak's (2003) research, even though music education levels were low, it was observed that the families who were interested in music were more sensitive to help their children with the beginning of their music education.

It was observed that the parents living together or separate did not make a significant difference in both sub-dimensions of perceived parental support in instrument education. Thus, it can be said that parents' living together or separate status does not contribute to the perceived parental support. In Dam's research (2008), it was concluded that the divorce of parents was one of the most important family problems affecting the behavior and success of their children. However, in the present study, parents' living together or separate status did not make any significant differences in perceived parental support in instrument education can be explained by the fact that the sample of the study consisted of university students, and their needs of the parents has decreased. As a matter of fact, Aydin, Kahraman, and Hicdurmaz (2017) did not find any significant differences between the perceived social support scores of nursing students according to the living together or separate status of their parents.

In both sub-dimensions, it is another result obtained in the current research that the perceived support increases as the educational status of the mother and father increase. In this case, it can be said that perceived parental support varies according to the education level of the parents. Many factors are known to influence the development of children. Among these factors, the educational status of parents is very important. In the literature, there are many researches on the effect of education of parents on the development of children. In Sarikaya and Khorshid (2009), the study shows that the educational status of mother and father is a decisive factor in the choice of occupation and indicates that there are conscious approaches of families with high levels of education. However, Alisinanoglu and Ulutas (2003) point out that the level of education of the parents does not create a significant difference on the average anxiety scores of children, and points out that families with high levels of education do not have a positive effect on the anxiety status of children. Kilinc and Sevim (2005) reported that the level of loneliness was lower as the education level of the mother increased, and the education level of the father did not affect loneliness. It is a known fact that it becomes easier for individuals to reach information as the level of education increases. In this context, in the present study, it is not a surprise result that families with high levels of education support their children in instrument education in long-term education processes that require a disciplined and conscious approach such as playing a musical instrument.

Another result obtained in this research was parents' living together or separate status did not have any impact on perceived parental support. In the researches carried out on parental support, for the children who got parental support although it was expected that perceived parental support in playing an instrument to be in favor of the students who lived with their families, as the sample group was consisting of adults, it made the result acceptable.

It can be said that the mother's employment had no effect on the perceived parental support. Although it was expected that the mother who does not work may have more chances to spend time with her children, the obtained results can be explained by the fact that the sample group was adult, and the need for mother was reduced.

It was determined that the monthly income of the family did not have a determinant effect on the student's perceived parental support in instrument education. In the literature, there are various studies investigating the effects of family income on children (Alisinanoglu & Ulutas, 2003; Kilinc & Sevim, 2005). It was believed that there was a need for more moral support in instrument education, which is long-term and requires patience. At this point, it was accepted as a natural result that the financial situation of the family did not have an effect on the perceived parental support.

Due to results of this research; students who have musician members in the family have higher perceived parental support scores. According to this finding, it is believed that the families with no musician members should be more interested in their children's education to overcome this disadvantage.

As the class level of the students was negatively correlated to the perceived parental support, the family members of higher-class level students should be invited to the class concerts in order to prevent the decrease in the perceived parental support, and especially the families who do not play an instrument should become a part of this education.

As in every case, it was seen that, when the education level of family increased, it was effective on the support given to their children in instrument education. In Turkey, with the new policies to be introduced in the field of education, it will be obligatory to raise the generations with high-level education. In particular, it is clear that there is a need for education policies that prioritize music education.

For further researches, it is recommended to compare the academic achievement of students with high perceived parent support and low perceived parent support in order to determine the effect of parent support.

References

- Aksoy, A. B., Kahraman, O. G., & Kilic, S. (2008). Parental monitoring and support behaviors perceived by adolescents. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 9(15), 1-14.
- Alisinanoglu, F., & Ulutas, I. (2003). A study on the relationship between children's anxiety levels and their mother's anxiety levels. *Education and Science*, 28(128), 65-71.
- Altay, B., Gonener, D., & Demirkiran, C. (2010). The level of burnout and influence of family support in nurses working in a university hospital. *Firat Medical Journal*, 15(1), 10-16.
- Aydin, A., Kahraman, N., & Hicdurmaz, D. (2017). Determining the levels of perceived social support and psychological well-being of nursing students. *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing*, 8(1), 40-47.
- Burubatur, M. (2006). *Egitim fakulteleri muzik egitimi ana bilim dallarinda birinci sinif 1. ve 2. yariyil viyolonsel egitiminde en cok kullanilan metot etut ve egzersizlerin incelenmesi* [Review of the most applied methods etudes and exercises in violoncello training during the first and the second terms of the first classes of departments of music in faculties of education] (Unpublished master's thesis). Selcuk University Institute of Social Sciences, Konya, Turkey.
- Caldwell, R. A., & Bloom, B. L. (1982). Social support: Its structure and impact on marital disruption. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 10(6), 647-667.

- Cecen, A. R. (2008). Ogrencilerin cinsiyetlerine ve anababa tutumlarına göre yalnızlık ve sosyal destek düzeylerinin incelenmesi [University students' loneliness and perceived social support levels according to gender and perceived parents attitudes]. *The Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 6(3), 415–431.
- Cilden, S. (2001). Muzik, çocuk gelişimi ve öğrenme [Music, child development and learning]. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty*, 21(1), 1–8.
- Dam, H. (2008). The family factor on the student's success of school. *Journal of Divinity Faculty of Hitit University*, 7(14), 75–99.
- Davidson, J. W., Howe, M. J. A., Moore, D. G., & Sloboda, J. A. (1996). The role of parental influences in the development of musical performance. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 14(4), 399–412.
- Davidson, J. W., Sloboda, J. A., & Howe, M. J. A. (1996). The role of parents and teachers in the success and failure of instrumental learners. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, (127), 40–44.
- Erturk, N. (2007). *Dogum sonrasi destek olceginin Turk toplumuna uyarlanmasi* [Adaptation of the postpartum support questionnaire into Turkish society] (Unpublished master's thesis). Ege University Institute of Health Sciences. Izmir.
- Girgin, D. (2016). Developing a perceived family support scale for musical instrument education. *Elementary Education Online*, 15(3), 778–786.
- Gokbudak, Z. S. (2003). Etkili bir piyano eğitimi ve öğretimi için ailenin rolü [The role of the family for an effective piano training and teaching]. *The Journal of Institute of Social Sciences of Selcuk University*, (9), 559–574.
- Hallam, S. (1998). *Instrumental teaching: A practical guide to better teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Howe, M. J. A., & Sloboda, J. A. (1991). Young musicians' accounts of significant influences in their early lives. 1. The family and the musical background. *British Journal of Music Education*, 8(1), 39–53.
- Kilinc, H., & Sevim, S. A. (2005). Loneliness and cognitive distortions among adolescents. *Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 38(2), 69–88.
- Margiotta, M. (2011). Parental support in the development of young musicians: a teacher's perspective from a small-scale study of piano students and their parents. *Australian Journal of Music Education*, (1), 16–30.
- Ozdemir, G., & Yildiz, G. (2010). Genel gelişim sürecinde müziksel gelişim [Musical development in the process general of development]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 2(2), 77–90.
- Ozen, N. (2004). Calgi eğitiminde yararlanılan müzik eğitimi yöntemleri [Methods of music education used in instrument education]. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty*, 24(2), 57–63.
- Ozmentes, G., & Adizel, F. (2017). The socio-cultural context of musical development and learning. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 6(1), 422–436.
- Sarikaya, T., & Khorshid, L. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin meslek seçimini etkileyen etmenlerin incelenmesi: Üniversite öğrencilerinin meslek seçimi [The investigation of the factors that affect university students' profession choice: University students' profession choice]. *The Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 7(2), 393–423.
- Saygi Gerceker, C. (2018). Investigation of music teacher candidates individual instrument burnout, perceived family support in instrument training and individual instrument training habits with regard to various variables. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 13(12), 447–463.
- Sloboda, J. A., & Howe, M. J. A. (1991). Biographical precursors of musical excellence: An interview study. *Psychology of Music*, 19(1), 3–21.
- Sosniak, L. A. (1985). Learning to be a concert pianist. In B. S. Bloom (Ed.), *Developing Talent in Young People*. New York: Ballantine.
- Topalak, S. (2013). Güzel sanatlar lisesi calgi eğitimi/öğretiminde karşılaşılan sorunların incelenmesi [An examination of problems faced in teaching of musical instruments in fine arts high school]. *Journal of Art Education*, 1(2), 114–129.
- Yildirim, I. (2000). Akademik başarının yordayıcısı olarak yalnızlık, sınav kaygısı ve sosyal destek [Loneliness, exam anxiety and social support as a predictor of academic achievement]. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 18, 167–176.
- Yilmaz, E., Yilmaz, E., & Karaca, F. (2008). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal destek ve yalnızlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi [Examining the level of social support and loneliness of university students]. *Genel Tıp Dergisi*, 18(2), 71–79.