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Abstract: Family is accepted to be one of the most influential institutions of political socialization. Even, it is claimed that family forms the base of individual’s political attitudes and behaviours. In the literature of the science of policy, family is specified to play a determinative role, particularly, in child’s political party preference. With this assumption, in this study, the effect of family’s authority structure, political participation level and voting will on children political behaviours were investigated. At the same time, some comparisons were given between parents who are influential on child’s political behaviours.
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1. Introduction

In scientific literature, family, which is the first social environment for a child, is accepted to have a highly significant role in politicisation of child. As Verba stated, political science literature on family education calls it “national character school” (Verba 1961: 32). The family is accepted as the first step in an individual’s education, being the first social group and the one having social norms and values. In this respect the family is considered as a learning environment in which child learns values, believes and attitudes in two ways; both directly and indirectly (Glass-Bengtson 1986: 685). In other words, this learning period for individual begins consciously and subconsciously in the family from birth. The reason why the family is accepted more effective in development of subconscious actions is that learning in very early years is mainly the subject of subconscious processes. Therefore, the importance of the family in politicisation is due to the fact that, it is considered to be the first step in developing political attitudes and behaviours in the future.
It is also accepted that the type of discipline in the family is determinative for individual’s relations with political system. In another word, the interaction between the family structure and governmental attitude is one of the factors feeding present regime. For example, there is some research showing that the disciplinary family structure supported the development of the Nazi regime in Germany (Kıslalı 1992: 86). Similarly, in his work named Psychopathology and Politics Lasswell also stressed that “the family plays a vital role in individual’s becoming anarchist, socialist, fundamentalist or conspirator” (Alkan 1989: 56). In his study in which he compared two-parent families, Langton determined that authoritarianism is predominant in matriarchal families and that sentiment of political interest and effectiveness is low (Davies 1970: 111). These studies reveal that the attitudes and behaviours in family ruling are determinative in child’s future life, especially in his/her relations with political authority.

Another important factor supporting the effectiveness of the family during the process of political socialization of the family is parents. It is generally assumed that children gained political behaviours by imitating their parents whom they accept more experienced. As mentioned before, children learn behaviours by imitating the behaviours of the people who are at a relatively better position than they are. Educating children according to parents’ political tendency is another reason for the similarity between parents and children’s political attitudes (Hyman 1959: 112). This similarity, at the same time, is seen as the natural result of shared social characteristic and experiences they have (Hyman 1959: 112). Social factors such as ethnicity, religion, social class, education, career, and income define social heritage to a child from a family, in a sense (Gamble vd. 1992: 97). Because, the child socialized by the values of the mentioned groups is grown up as a new member of the socio-economical and cultural environment family belongs to.

There is some thought pointing out that mother is more effective in child’s political socialization. For example, according to a research by Lane, in responding the question “who made a decision in the family?” 12 out of 15 children said “their mother were the boss at home” (Lane 1970: 122). Thus, the research performed in America, Jamaica and Japan shows that mothers are more effective on children. The influence of mothers on children explained with the emotional bond between mother and her child (Alkan 1989: 62-63). In the research on the children between 2 to 7 year-old by Epstein and Evans, an interaction between mother and child was dealt with in child’s learning for both age groups (Epstein-Evans 1980: 575).

Lifton, who made comparative observation in Japan after the Second World War, explains mother dependence of Japan Youth, with fathers’ insufficiency in man-
aging their stresses during a cultural transition period from a semi-feudal and authoritarian family structure. Consequently, since mother in this society remained as a fundamental and satisfactory source of compassion (Davies 1970: 110) without cultural and ideological content, it is still influential. In addition, mother having a bigger part in early ages of child, spending time more with them and consequently being the most influential one in child’s socialization could be shown among the reasons that mother are much more effective on child.

Contrary to this, there is some view-emphasizing father’s role as the representative of the authority usage. Because, according to Alkan, in the beginning an assumption based on patriarchal family structure was developed in which in politicisation the leader of family or father would be dominant (Alkan 1989: 62-63). Due to the fact that he is a bridge between general authority in society and the family, obedience father’s authority was assumed to reflect to the field of the political authority as a reaction advised and used (Schochet 1975: 66, 73). Based on this assumption, the opinion that father authority is relatively stronger on child has been generally accepted. For example, in a research on the gulf countries by Dhaher, It was seen that father as a figure had an important role in the society whilst leadership and heroism were accepted as indefinite concepts (Dhaher 1987b: 72). In addition, developing a belief in child that father has more information about the external world strengthens father’s effectiveness.

Although family is accepted one of the most influential elements of political socialization, some claims that its influence in this process is not so strong as thought. One of the researchers accepting family’s influence limited is Hyman who put forward that family’s influence is limited on child except preferring the political party (Alkan 1989: 57). But, Jennings and Niemi showed a doubtful attitude on the family’s influence on political party preference of child. Because they put forward that families have different political opinions from their children and that the political similarities between parents and children are exaggerated (Kavanagh 1983: 42). Therefore, it can be said that the influence of family on political socialization period should be considered together with the other social and cultural factors. Mentioned assessments can be done only with practical research.

2. Method

2.1. Sample and Techniques:

This study, dealing with the politicisation process of the pupils in elementary schools is a field survey. Considering this, the pupils in the city of Elazig, an important center in the eastern Turkey were chosen as the envi-
ronment of the survey. In determining the sampling, cluster and stratified sampling techniques were used. Therefore, the schools in the city center were categorized into three clusters as low, middle and high with respect to the socio-economical situation in their location. Because, there are socio-economic differences among the schools which is located in different parts of the city. Three different schools were chosen randomly to represent the sub-economical clusters. 10 percent of the students in the schools chosen were included in sampling and in order to give equal chances to the sub-clusters, they were classified into a few categories such as gender, the class he or she attended. A standard questionnaire was used in the survey to collect data. In addition, the data collecting techniques such as observation and interviewing were also made use.

3. Results

3.1. Sample details:

In order to provide equality in sampling, by considering the school population, 106 (50,5 %) female, 104 (49,5 %) male students from Dumlupınar Elementary School, 99 (49,5 %) female and 101 (50,5 %) male from Yücel Elementary School, and 100 (50,0 %) female, 100 (50,0 %) male students from Yakup Sevki Elementary School were involved inside the sampling. As mentioned before, in order to get data from all classes and consequently age groups, the students from all the classes between the 1st year to the 8th were represented in a rate of 12,5 % in the study. The careers, incomes and education level of the families of the students in Dumlupınar Elementary School, representative of the school with high socio-economic level, were determined to be relatively higher than those of Yakup Sevki Elementary School and it was made sure that all the levels and groups were represented.

3.2. The Ways of Decision Making in Family

It is generally accepted that like political attitudes of a family, non-political attitudes are also influential on the child’s political behaviours and relations with the political system. For example, from Alkan, it is claimed that there are relations between children’s participation to decision making in family and children’s political tendencies and democratic practices at the national level (Alkan 1989: 68). As Almond and Verba stated, civic competence is gained by some experiences increasing individual’s self-confidence such as participation to decision making or collaboration in family, defending the truth in family and school (Pinner 1970: 204). So, family is accepted a means of citizen creation by carrying authority approach of regime to individual and a representative of regime in micro scale.
Table 1. Decision–making Ways in Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>The way of decisionmaking</th>
<th>Father’s decision</th>
<th>Mother’s decision</th>
<th>Parents’ shared decision</th>
<th>Everybody has the right</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumlupınar ES</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yücel ES.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakup Şevki ES.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 1 showing decision-making ways in a family, it is seen that the tendency of sharing authority by parents is the highest in every school. It is fairly interesting to determine that the highest rate for this answer is in Yucel Elementary School, which represents the middle socio-economical group. It is also seen that patriarchal family structure in which fathers make decisions, increases from the school at higher socio-economical level to the lowest one. Another interesting result is that in the families studied, mothers are not significantly influential in decision-making. The lowest percentage of the democratic family structure, in which everybody can join the decisions, was determined to be in Yucel Elementary School and the highest one was in Yakup Şevki Elementary School with the lowest socio-economical level. This infers that there is no a right proportion between democratic family structure and socio-economical status.

3.3. Political Participation Level of Family

Table 2. Political Participation Level of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Participation Level</th>
<th>Party/Union membership</th>
<th>Taking active role in politics</th>
<th>Following news/events</th>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Not interested in politics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumlupınar ES</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yücel ES.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakup Şevki ES.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family’s environment affects not only gaining political attitude and values, but also participation level to decision making. It is assumed that political interest and participation level directly influences child’s participation behaviour. Table 2 prepared considering this, more than 90 % of the families studied stated different preference different from their actual behaviours. The highest political participation behaviour is voting. The percentage of the ones not interested in politics are highest (25.2) in Dumlupınar Elementary School, which is close that of Yucel Elementary School (23). This reminds the well-known result that the higher socio-economical level the less interest in politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Voting level of family in elections</th>
<th>Voting will of the child</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Occasionally voting</th>
<th>Never voting</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dumlu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pınar ES.</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>86,3</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally voting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63,9</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never voting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71,4</td>
<td>17,1</td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yücel ES.</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83,1</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally voting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>44,4</td>
<td>44,4</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never voting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>36,5</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>30,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55,5</td>
<td>25,5</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yakup Şevki ES.</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>85,7</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally voting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>48,5</td>
<td>21,2</td>
<td>30,3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never voting</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>50,7</td>
<td>26,1</td>
<td>23,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67,5</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>17,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child’s voting behaviour is claimed to affect by families’ attitudes. For example, according to a research by Avcan, it was determined that there was a positive relation between child’s voting behaviour and families’ voting (Alkan 1989: 68).
Since voting seems higher in table 2, Table 3 was formed to show the relation between the rates of families voting and willingness of children. According to this, the percentage of the children’s willingness for voting in the families voting in elections is very high with a percentage such as 85%. The children of the families voting not regularly are willing for voting but at least, a quarter of them have the same attitude as their families. Similarly, the children of the families not voting are highly willing for voting. However, the rate of the ones completely unwilling or partly willing for voting among them is relatively high.

3.4. The People-Affecting Political Party Preference Of Children

It is claimed that families are influential mostly on child’s party choice among his/her other choices. In a study performed by Dennis and McCrone in Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Belgium and Denmark between 1966 and 1969, it was determined that there was a big similarity between parents’ and children’s political party choice (Kalaycıoğlu-Sarıbay 2000: 418). There is some opinion that beside intertransferring of the political opinions between parents and child causes child to prefer a political party in their early ages, it also increase the possibility that the party chosen by child would the same as his/her parents’ (Alkan 1989: 49). This opinion shows that child, at least in the beginning, identifies the political party through his/her family. In addition, that political party identification has been found to be a connection set up by the significant others (Kalaycıoğlu-Sarıbay 2000: 415) is accepted as a condition explaining the similarities between child and family.

Therefore, the people affecting child’s political attitude should be shown in a table, see Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Brothers/ sisters and relatives</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Himself/ herself</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumlupınar ES.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71,0</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yücel ES.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64,0</td>
<td>11,0</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakup Şevki ES.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>70,0</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>8,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>68,4</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 4 showing the people-affecting child’s political behaviour, it was determined that father is the most influential one in determining child’s political behaviour and this is the case for all the schools. Mothers’ influence is seen to be the highest at Yucel Elementary School with a percentage of 11. The number of the students who decide about the political choice by themselves can be said not be determinative with a highest rate of 11.4 % even at Dumlupınar Elementary School.

When Table 5 is generally assessed, there is no big difference between the people influencing children’s political preference in gender. Because, it is seen that fathers are dominant in the political choices of both girls and boys. But, except Yucel ES, in the other schools it was determined that mostly mothers were more influential on girls while fathers are more on boys. In Yucel ES it was found that mothers were slightly more influential on boys (12.9 %) than on girls (9.1 %).

It was mentioned before that there was a great deal of research determining a strong relation between families’ voting character and children’s political behaviour (Türkkahraman 2000: 31; Alkan 1989: 68). From the results of this research, it was seen that children approved the political choices of their families. Political socialization literature also shows that
even the young have the same political choice as their families. Similarly, Levin’s determinations, which states that the children of Democrat Party fans prefer Democrat Party and those of the Republicans prefer Republicans (Levin 1970: 353), is likely to support mentioned opinion. In addition, the direction of the choices can be said to effect the change in political party choice from generation to generation. To reach a certain result, it is useful to determine the direction of parents’ political attitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Father’s political choice</th>
<th>Mother’s political choice</th>
<th>DYP,ANAP, MHP</th>
<th>DSP</th>
<th>SP,BBP, AKP</th>
<th>Uninforms</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dumlupınar ES.</td>
<td>DYP, ANAP, MHP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP, BBP, AKP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71,4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninforms</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toplam</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DYP,ANAP, MHP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP, BBP, AKP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81,3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninforms</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toplam</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DYP,ANAP, MHP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP, BBP, AKP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91,7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninforms</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toplam</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Central Liberal Rightist Parties
** Dewmoctaric Leftist Party
*** Conservative Parties
The most significant result from Table 6 showing the similarities or differences in political choice between children and parents is the similarity in choice of the couples, which can be inferred that it is due mainly, father being influential by considering data from table 4 and 5. Additionally, the choice difference between parents is the highest (28.6%) in Dumlupınar Elementary School. It can be concluded that the couples can decide independently in the families with higher socio-economical class.

Table 7. The Effects of Fathers’ Political Choices on Children’s Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Father’s political choices</th>
<th>Children’s political preference</th>
<th>DYP, ANAP, MHP</th>
<th>DSP</th>
<th>SP, BB, AKP</th>
<th>Still don’t decide</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dumlupınar ES.</td>
<td>DYP, ANA, MHP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64,4</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>23,8</td>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66,7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66,7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP, BBP, AKP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninforms</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11,8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11,8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36,7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>36,7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23,8</td>
<td>36,2</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yücel ES.</td>
<td>DYP, ANA, MHP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50,8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50,8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP, BBP, AKP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>87,5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>87,5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninforms</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25,5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25,5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,0</td>
<td>48,5</td>
<td>24,0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yakup Şevki ES.</td>
<td>DYP, ANAP, MHP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71,6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71,6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83,3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16,7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83,3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16,7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP, BBP, AKP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uninforms</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Central Liberal Rightist Parties
** Dewmoctaric Leftist Party
*** Conservative Parties
As can be seen from Table 4, it was determined that father was the most influential person in determining children’s political preference. Table 6 arranged to show the degree of the similarity between father and children’s preference gives some results supporting the ones from the literature. In another word, Table 6 proves that children adopt fathers’ choice. The percentages of the children who have different preference from their fathers’ are 50% at Dumlupınar and Yakup Sevki Elementary Schools and 42.4% at Yucel ES. However, the rate of the students who did not show political choice is considerably high, nearly one third, in each school studied. On the other hand, the number of the students who do not know which party their fathers vote for is nearly the half of the population. The percentages of the children who do not know their fathers’ political choice are 74.1%, 45.6%, 60.7% at Dumlupınar, Yücel and Yakup Sevki E. Schools, respectively. They are also the ones who did not show their political attitude. This result can be thought as an important indication for that the child does not accept the political attitude of his father and prefer a specific party.

4. Discussion

Family, generally, has been an important institution whose determinative effect on individual and his/her behaviour has been accepted. So, it is also accepted to play an important role on child’s political attitude and behaviours beside other fields. In improving political attitude, it is seen that family has a very big influence on decision making as a living environment, the ways of authority usage, general political trends of the transfer of the values of regime. It shows the same influence on political interest and determination of political preferences as well.

Firstly, the effect of participation to decision making in family and discipline practices attracts attention. Middleton and Putney determined similar to Maccoby, Mathews and Morton’s determination that deviation from family’s political attitude is directly related to the type of the discipline (Middleton-Putney 1970: 139). In another word, it can be said that the democratic or authoritarian structure of family directly causes individual’s political behaviour to approach to or divert from the family. Thus, according to the findings, the reasons for non-alienation or divergence form the family’s political attitude are relatively democratic, authority sharing and lose discipline, character of the families involved in the sampling.
Another political result of family environment is the reflection of political interest and participation level of the family on child’s behaviour. It is expected the children grown in the families with high political interest and participation to have the same character. It was observed that most of the families in the study focused on the passive participation manners such as voting and watching news. Therefore, it is estimated that the active participation level of the families under the cover of the study is low. It is also expected that their children also exhibit the same manner. However, when families’ voting in elections was compared with that of their children, it was found that the voting would of the children of the families not voting was higher contrary to their families, even if the families voting in every election increase their children’s will for voting. In another word, the results of the study revealed that their families do not affect the participation level of the children of the families with low participation level.

Research literature shows that family has also an important effect on the direction of child’s political preference. The results of the research supporting this literature indicate that children generally approve their parents’ political preference. In fact, it is possible to say that the effect of the family on political choice first begins between father and mother. Also, the parallelism between the political choices of parents can be assessed to be due to the dominant character of father’s choice. Father’s influence on political choices covers the child as well. To put it more simply, the results of this survey shows that the opinions stating that fathers are much more effective on children’s political preference are correct.

This determination indicates that father’s influential authority is alive on political life as well, contrary to the results from the issue of families’ decision making. Since child’s making decision mainly depends on his/her relations with his/her father, and mother’s education and knowledge level are accepted low, it is thought that mother’s influence on child decreases. Nevertheless, The observation showing that the children who do not know their fathers’ political choice cannot prefer their political party either, supports the results of the study by Kalaycıoğlu and Sarıbay on the fifth-year students, which state that the children knowing their fathers’ political choice are much more prone to support a political party (Kalaycıoğlu-Sarıbay 2000: 418). In another word, the children not being able to prefer his/her political choice attracts attention since it shows that child’s identification with father’s political choice is functional. In addition, there is no big difference in fathers’ influence on political preferences with respect to gender but children are influenced relatively more
by the either of the parents with the same gender as them. This can be said to be the result of identification of the children with the ones having the same gender.

To sum up, the results show that families are still influential on children’s political attitudes and behaviours, or data indicates that children has not alienated politically or detached the political values. Even they adopt parents’ political choice. This shows the situation in Turkey, or particularly in the region the survey carried out. Because the family in special sense, has the responsibility for being one of the most important institutions of the country As Alkan stated, since loyalty to the first groups is essential, family functions as an important politicisation factor in this kind of societies (Alkan 1979: 157). Similarly, Farah and Al-Salem, in their study obtained findings showing that families were dominant in political and social life in Kuwait having this kind of organization (Farah-Al-Salem 1987: 29). This unabdicatable role of the family in the society helps keeping up its effect on individuals and their behaviours. Therefore, it seems reasonable children’s are influenced by all the decisions of family and following them strictly in a conventional structure. In addition, when the role of the family in child’s growth and socialization is concerned, there occurs a similarity between child and family because of family transferring its knowledge and experience to child. Additionally, as mentioned before, cultural, economical and social values and conditions shared with family can be accepted among the factors causing the child to exhibit the same behaviour examples. Therefore, it can be said that family are keeping up its influence and power on individual at least now and be predicted that its influence will go on in the future.
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Aile Siyasi Etkisini Kaybetmekte midir? Siyasi Parti Tercihinde Nesiller Arası Değişim
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Теряет ли семья свое политическое влияние?
Изменения между поколениями, вызванные выбором политической партии

Мехтан ЕШИЛОРМАН, к.н., доцент∗

Резюме: Семья является одной из самых влиятельных организаций в процессе политической социализации. Более того, основу политической приверженности и поведения личности в значительной степени определяет семья. В политологической литературе указывается на существенную роль семьи в выборе личностью политической партии. Следуя данным гипотезам, наряду с авторитетной структурой семьи, исследуется влияние семьи на политическое поведение личности, степень политического участия и желания участия в выборах. Кроме того, в статье уделяется место некоторым сравнениям родителей, влияющих на политический выбор личности.
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