

# Socio-Economic Vulnerable Women and the Influence on Children Caring in Garut District

Joko Susilo Raharjo<sup>1</sup>, Hadi Prabowo<sup>2</sup>, Sampara Lukman<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pemerintahan Abdi Negara, Indonesia

<sup>2,3</sup>Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Indonesia

Email: [Joko68susilo@gmail.com](mailto:Joko68susilo@gmail.com)

## Abstract

The research aimed to assess women's attitudes toward children from low and high socio-economic backgrounds. The study sample included 300 children, 143 women and 157 boys. This research used a quantitative method with a descriptive-analysis approach. Female children were given "General Information Forms" and "Scale of Family Life and Child-Raising Attitudes." The results were analyzed using the t-test approach and Analysis of Variance. After analyzing women's attitudes toward children by gender, it was discovered that there was no statistically meaningful difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) at the end of the study. Women with a lower socio-economic background were found to be more protective, more resistant to women's positions, less fitting, and more stringent disciplinarians ( $p < 0.001$ ). It is well recognized that people with Overprotection Syndrome have a higher risk of developing breast cancer. When the relationship between women's behaviours was considered, it was discovered that there was only a clear relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ) between the aspects of women's strict control and other dimensions and a connection between all maternal sizes. The difference in mood is significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

**Keywords:** *Children, Women's Attitudes, Socio-Economic Level.*



## A. INTRODUCTION

In the 10-year-old child's social relationships, the close relationships he builds with his teachers, friends, and especially women are very close. This relationship affects other relationships in adulthood. At this age, children do not have an egocentric attitude (Shibre & Yaya, 2020). They feel powerful when they are at home near their parents. Logical thinking begins to develop in children at school age. Although most of their efforts may appear "aimless", they do so according to their logic to mature and harmonize interpersonal relationships (Aziz & Sadaf, 2020). They gain experience by doing, living and understanding using their sense organs. They learn that the rules can be changed or make new rules themselves (Takaeb, 2020).

Parent-child interaction determines the child's position in the family; the family is the most influential socialization institution in the child's life at preschool (Astuti, 2016). Among the most critical family functions are the task of fostering generation, childcare, education and outreach. Also, the duty of protecting children, giving children self-confidence, and developing a personality that fits into society is also essential. Therefore, the family plays a role in providing complete physical and spiritual development to children (Dewi, 2013). Many parents who have problems in the family do not seek professional help to solve their problems. However, problems experienced in the family hurt both parents and children's physical and mental

health.

For this reason, it is essential to get help before the conflict between women and children turns into violence. A literature review reveals the importance of interpersonal communication in descriptive studies of families. Besides, many research results show a relationship between a harmonious woman-husband-child relationship with children's success in school. Studies show that parents' support or pressure affects children's social competence (Ahmed & Mohamed, 2018). Negative family attitudes can be a source of unhealthy development. It is estimated that parents' attitudes, especially female attitudes with children, play an essential role in developing self-structure starting from childhood (Kamrujjaman & Nurwati, 2018).

Various models have been proposed to explain the family phenomenon in Indonesia. The "Family Change Model" includes more than one discipline in the family approach. This model is a contextual model that places oneself in the family and family in a cultural and socio-economic environment (Deshmukh & Arora, 2020). It is a functional model because it discusses the dynamics that underlie family interactions and socialization and ego development (Masruroh & Verawati, 2020). The experts analyzed and compared three different family models, including (1) The "interdependent" family model. This model is a typical example of a culture of commitment at the social and family level. And although it varies, it is common in many parts of the world. Examples of ideal-typical models, especially the traditional family type, which has a patriarchal family structure and close-knit relationships between humans and families, are found in undeveloped societies (Missbach, 2017). The addiction model's defining feature is family and individual dependence, both in material and emotional fields; (2) The "independence" model, the ideal family model of industrial, urban, middle-class western societies. This model based on independence and separation of family members and family members from each other. Generations separated from each other in the independent family model, and investment in emotional and financial resources directed to the child, not the parents (Shibre & Yaya, 2020).

The main feature of this model is that it dominates the independence of the family and the individual in the material and emotional sphere; (3) The "reciprocal emotional commitment" model (Aziz & Sadaf, 2020). Although different from the other two models, some of the features do overlap. This model is more common in developed and urban areas with a culture of commitment. Along with the continued emotional bonding between generations, the family's dedication seen in socialization values (Ogbo & Agho, 2019). In parenting, autonomy emphasized that close family relationships maintained on the other, and parental control and emotional commitment are prominent in socialization (Aspiranti & Amaliah, 2018).

Many parents think that if their children do not experience difficulties during learning, a good education cannot be given. However, parents are role models for their children in their behaviour (Faritz, 2017). This can be done by (1) Appreciating their children; (2) Having an open attitude towards their children; (3) Can share feelings with their children; (4) Can accept their children as they are, and (5) allow

their children to develop naturally according to their times and do not impose the thoughts of parents who are different and tend to be destructive. Parents can positively influence their child's personality development and become a model with children's behaviour (Mukonka & Maimbolwa, 2018).

### **Various Attitudes of Parents Toward Their Children**

**Authoritarian parents.** They expect their children to obey the rules they set and follow them unconditionally (Idei & Kato, 2019). The child has no voice at home. In such a family, when the children disobey the rules, punishments are imposed, and the parents do not consult their children much; instead, they expect the child to accept everything the parents say without question. A ban was imposed on almost every problem for which the parents could not understand why. In addition to physical punishment, children are also given a verbal sentence (which will hurt them psychologically) (Rai, 2018). Criticism directed at the personality of the child. In families with authoritarian attitudes, negative behaviour patterns such as negative judgments about children's self, self-confidence, not trying to do something with the thought "I can't do it," and being embarrassed to convey their ideas to others often occur (Giantara, 2020).

Parents with this attitude often come into conflict with their children and lead to the formation of children who display high levels of anxiety, have failed social relationships with others, and are socially retarded in many vital areas in adult life. Too much control over a child's activities by parents can lower a child's self-esteem and lead to an unhappy and introverted personality. Children who grow up with this attitude are not aggressive; they are sceptical (Christie & McCormack. They are pessimistic because they cannot act of their own accord. It observed that children raised with authoritarian attitudes are shy, reluctant, unable to express themselves well. In daily activities, and especially boys have high aggressive tendencies and low self-esteem. At the same time, these children are shy in communicating with their friends. Most of these features also seen in children of permissive parents (Omri & Belaid, 2021).

**Permissive parents.** They give their children a lot of freedom, have absolutely no control, and sometimes treat them with neglect. At the same time, these parents are warm, affectionate with their children and do not restrict their children from making their own decisions in all matters. Children of such parents are free to decide on things like eating, sleeping, watching television, and playing.

Since there are no limits to children's behaviour, it is unclear what to do and what not to do. Children who grow up with this attitude feel insecure. Because there are no boundaries in their lives, they cannot feel belonging, have a selfish perspective, increase their rebellious and aggressive behaviour, and cannot cooperate with others because they cannot learn the limits in their lives. This is why they are unsuccessful in social relationships. In some cases, children observed to be active, extroverted and creative. It has been observed that children who grow up with permissiveness are immature, unable to control their impulses, and are

dependent on others. They become selfish, impatient, insensitive, dependent (Schultz & Sacks, 2021). Although authoritarian and permissive parents' attitudes appear to be different from one another, children from both families have less self-control than children from other groups. However, the mood of children with permissive parents who adopt tolerant attitudes is more favourable than children with authoritarian parents (Rathgeb, 2021).

**Democratic Parents.** They expect mature behaviour from their children and also ask for rules if necessary. They are warm and caring, listen to their children patiently and sensitively, and take their children's views on the decisions that will be made in the family. In such a family, a rational and democratic approach is followed in raising children, and the rights of both parents and children are taken into account. The attitude of a democratic parent is based on respect for the existence and desires of the child. Children who grow up with this attitude have social competence, skills, helpful, friendly, sensitive to others' needs, confident and socially responsible (Azizah, 2020).

Children raised in democratic families scored higher on academic competence, social development, self-esteem, and mental health than children raised in permissive or authoritarian families. In general, research shows that democratic parents have children who are socially active, responsible, and cognitively adequate, while strict and permissive parents have children with more negative traits.

**Foster parents.** This parent gives too much control and attention to the child. Parents get too involved even when the child doesn't need it. Parents must meet every child's needs so that children cannot be independent and prevented from researching on their own. Such frustration makes it difficult for children to act on their terms and gain confidence. At the same time, the child may become an emotionally frustrated, overly dependent person. Parents make all kinds of decisions on behalf of the child by placing limits on all children's actions and relationships to protect their child. Because children who are always protected cannot learn to defend themselves, they may develop an irresponsible and spoiled personality and an identity orientation that is helpless, challenging to adapt, and shy (Peden & Franklin, 2021). Children who grow up with this attitude are also relatively unsuccessful at problem-solving.

**Inconsistent parents.** This may appear as a difference of opinion between parents or as a behavioural variable in the woman or husband's person. This attitude seen as an alternation between permissive and authoritarian attitudes. There is an attitude of discipline, but it is not clear when and where to apply. Therefore, children cannot know what will happen as a result of their behaviour. Parents with this attitude reprimand or punish behaviour that their child had ignored the day before. This was most likely due to their current mental state. Therefore, the child thinks, "*every time I do it, I will be punished*", not right or wrong behaviour. Parents have different behaviour patterns that cause children to adopt these patterns, whether they realize it. Children who grow up with this attitude lack self-confidence. They can be indecisive, shy, even rebellious.

**Indifferent older man.** This interferes with the child's basic needs, such as health and nutrition. These parents' lives are so stressful that they do not have the energy and strength to help their children. Besides, they don't set any rules for their children and don't consider the children's achievements, but they always beat their faces. Constantly failing to face excessive demands from parents, the child increasingly says, "I can't do it, so why to have to?". There is no limit to children who grow up with this attitude; none of their needs met; they cannot express themselves because they are a stress point in their parents' lives. These children damage their environment by displaying very aggressive behaviour. They think they are guilty because they have little or no pride. Besides, these children always feel that they are not successful in the eyes of others. Children who do not know what love is complicated to love others (Fatima, 2020). This attitude can lead to a child who is distant from helping, is angry, experiences emotional discomfort, needs to be constantly protected from others, has negative feelings, especially toward younger and weaker people, and lacks self-confidence.

As a result, the researchers argue a strong relationship between parental attitudes and children's behaviour. Parents who are too bullying behave violently, punish, offer conditional love, and reject behaviour described as authoritarian. Negative behaviours such as anxiety, fear, aggression, and school failure were detected in children exposed to these behaviours. Therefore, communication in a broken family due to incomprehensible and uncontrolled parental behaviour can determine children's behaviour. Parents who show positive behaviour such as caring, loving and respecting their children are considered democratic. This behaviour is a common point from the many views that reflected in children as assertiveness, success, creativity, sense of responsibility, self-confidence.

This study conducted to determine women's attitudes to children aged ten years at low and high socio-economic levels. The attitudes of women were investigated using statistical methods applying the selected sampling scale for the study.

## **B. METHOD**

Research respondents consisted of children aged ten years at low and high socio-economic levels who attend elementary schools affiliated with the Ministry of Education and Culture in Garut Regency in the 2019-2020 school year. The study sample consisted of 300 children who were randomly selected. First, in taking the example, determine the low and high socio-economic groups—list of socio-economic groupings of the Indonesian Institute of Statistics of settlements in Garut Regency. In line with these data, three strata determined from those considered to represent the low socio-economic level, and one from the strata that are supposed to represent the high socio-economic level.

The two-part inquiry form was used to collect research data. In the first part; Schaefer and Bell's "Family Life and Child-Raising Attitudes Scale" (Parental Attitudes Research Instrument; IPSO) developed by Schaefer and Bell was used to

obtain information on the demographic characteristics of women, husbands and children, and in the second section, children's child-raising attitudes. Women's responses to IPSO were evaluated on five different dimensions. These dimensions are discussed as: (1) Dimensions of Excessive Femininity; (2) Democratic Attitudes and Dimensions of Equality; (3) rejection of homemakers; (4) Dimensions of Couples Conflict; and (3) Pressure and Discipline Dimensions. Application of data collection tools used in the research In the first semester of the 2020-2021 academic year, as many as 150 grade IV students of SDN Sukamantri, SDN Inti Mawae, SDN 1 Ciwalen and 150 grade IV students of SDN 2 Cilwalen in Garut Regency were carried out by researchers on 300 children. The database was registered on the computer using the SPSS 12.00 packet statistical program (frequency, percentage rate, t-test, analysis of variance).

### C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data obtained from this study which aims to determine the attitudes of women in children aged ten years in the low and high socio-economic groups were analyzed, and the results of the analysis are presented below. Table 1 shows the statistical results regarding children aged ten years in low and high socio-economic groups and their family environment. 47.5% of the children involved in this study were girls, 52.5% were boys, 16% were single children, 68% were 2 or 3 children, and 16% consisted of 4 or more children. Based on information about the families of children aged ten years, 50.3% stated that they were women, 35% graduated from elementary school, 68.7% were women, and 8.7% of their husbands did not work.

**Table 1. Distrwanitation Demographic Characteristics of women in low and high socio-economic groups and their families (n = 300)**

| Demographic Qualifications | Amount | %     |
|----------------------------|--------|-------|
| <b>Gender</b>              |        |       |
| Female                     | 143    | 47.5  |
| Male                       | 157    | 52.5  |
| <b>Total</b>               | 300    | 100.0 |
| <b>Number of children</b>  |        |       |
| Only one                   | 48     | 16.0  |
| 2 or 3 children            | 204    | 68.0  |
| 4 or more Children         | 48     | 16.0  |
| <b>Total</b>               | 300    | 100.0 |
| <b>Many kids</b>           |        |       |
| The first child            | 152    | 50.7  |
| Second Child               | 65     | 21.7  |
| Last Child                 | 83     | 27.6  |
| <b>Total</b>               | 300    | 100.0 |
| <b>Age</b>                 |        |       |
| 26-30                      | 77     | 25.7  |

|                                    |     |       |
|------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| 31-35                              | 93  | 31.0  |
| 36-40                              | 96  | 32.0  |
| 41 years and over                  | 34  | 11.3  |
| <b>Total</b>                       | 300 | 100.0 |
| <b>Employment status</b>           |     |       |
| Unemployment                       | 206 | 68.7  |
| Employment                         | 82  | 27.3  |
| <i>Part-time work</i>              | 12  | 4.0   |
| <b>Total</b>                       | 300 | 100.0 |
| <b>Woman's Education</b>           |     |       |
| Elementary School                  | 151 | 50.3  |
| Senior High School                 | 83  | 27.7  |
| College                            | 66  | 22.0  |
| <b>Total</b>                       | 300 | 100.0 |
| <b>Husband's Age</b>               |     |       |
| 26-30                              | 16  | 5.3   |
| 31-35                              | 75  | 25.0  |
| 36-40                              | 105 | 35.0  |
| 41 and above                       | 104 | 34.7  |
| <b>Total</b>                       | 300 | 100.0 |
| <b>Husband's Education Status</b>  |     |       |
| Elementary School                  | 105 | 35.0  |
| Senior High School                 | 95  | 31.7  |
| College                            | 100 | 33.3  |
| <b>Total</b>                       | 300 | 100.0 |
| <b>Husband's Employment Status</b> |     |       |
| Unemployment                       | 26  | 8.7   |
| Employment                         | 264 | 88.0  |
| <i>Retired</i>                     | 10  | 3.3   |
| <b>Total</b>                       | 300 | 100.0 |
| <b>Family structure</b>            |     |       |
| Main family                        | 267 | 89.0  |
| Extended family                    | 24  | 8.0   |
| Broken Family                      | 9   | 3.0   |
| <b>Total</b>                       | 300 | 100.0 |
| <b>Income</b>                      |     |       |
| Lower Level                        | 161 | 53.7  |
| Higher Level                       | 139 | 46.3  |
| <b>Total</b>                       | 300 | 100.0 |

The difference in the arithmetic means to value and the standard deviation of the attitudes of women children aged ten years according to gender presented in

Table 2.

**Table 2. Results of t-test analysis of family life and the scale of raising children attitudes (SRCA) Factor scores according to gender**

| (SRCA) Dimension | Gender | N   | X     | Sd    | p    | t     |
|------------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|------|-------|
| Overprotective   | Female | 143 | 48.32 | 9.49  | .066 | .207  |
|                  | Male   | 157 | 48.11 | 8.37  |      |       |
| Demokratic       | Female | 143 | 25.69 | 3.55  | .716 | .580  |
|                  | Male   | 157 | 25.45 | 3.42  |      |       |
| Role Denial      | Female | 143 | 32.31 | 8.17  | .221 | 1.195 |
|                  | Male   | 157 | 31.29 | 6.59  |      |       |
| Misunderstand    | Female | 143 | 14.90 | 4.09  | .458 | .258  |
|                  | Male   | 157 | 14.78 | 3.86  |      |       |
| Discipline       | Female | 143 | 36.95 | 10.37 | .030 | .247  |
|                  | Male   | 157 | 37.23 | 9.08  |      |       |

$p < 0.05$

If seen from Table 2, the mean score of women who have girls in the overprotective dimension is  $48.32 \pm 9.49$ , while the mean score of women who have boys is  $48.11 \pm 8.37$ . While the mean score of women who had girls with strict discipline was  $36.95 \pm 10.37$ , the mean score of women who had boys was  $37.23 \pm 9.08$  ( $p < 0.05$ ). If seen from the table, there is no significant difference between women's attitudes towards their children in terms of overprotectiveness, democracy, the role of homemakers and incompatibility ( $p > 0.05$ ); only the difference in strict discipline dimensions is significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). Children exposed to negative parenting practices ranging from punitive, permissive parenting to severe punishment are anti-social, aggressive and oriented towards crimes in their future lives.

**Table 3. Results of T-Test Analysis of Family Life and Child Raising Attitudes Scale (SRCA) Factor Score According to Socio-economic Level**

| (SRCA) Dimension | Socio-Economic | N   | X     | Sd   | p    | t     |
|------------------|----------------|-----|-------|------|------|-------|
| Overprotective   | Low            | 161 | 51.80 | 6.96 | .000 | 8.307 |
|                  | High           | 139 | 44.06 | 9.13 |      |       |
| Demokratic       | Low            | 161 | 25.83 | 3.54 | .150 | 1.440 |
|                  | High           | 139 | 25.25 | 3.3  |      |       |
| Role Denial      | Low            | 161 | 33.45 | 7.82 | .000 | 4.357 |
|                  | High           | 139 | 29.83 | 6.36 |      |       |
| Misunderstand    | Low            | 161 | 15.94 | 3.64 | .000 | 5.430 |
|                  | High           | 139 | 13.56 | 3.95 |      |       |
| Discipline       | Low            | 161 | 41.58 | 8.39 | .000 | 9.904 |
|                  | High           | 139 | 31.91 | 8.48 |      |       |

$p < 0.001$

If it is seen from Table 3, the mean score of women in the overprotective dimension at the lower socio-economic level is  $51.80 \pm 6.96$ , while the average score for women with the upper socio-economic level is  $44.06 \pm 9.13$ . Whereas the mean



score of women at the lower socio-economic level on the dimension of rejecting rolls was  $33.45 \pm 7.82$ , the mean score of women who were at the upper socio-economic level was  $29.83 \pm 6.36$ . The mean score of women at the lower socio-economic level on the incompatibility dimension was  $15.94 \pm 3.64$ , while the mean score for women at the upper socio-economic level was  $13.56 \pm 3.95$ . Meanwhile, the mean score of women at the lower socio-economic level on the strict discipline dimension was  $41.58 \pm 8.39$ , while the average score for women at the upper socio-economic level was  $31.91 \pm 8.48$ . ( $p < 0.001$ ). Women of lower socio-economic status are more protective, rejecting motherhood.

It seems that they don't fit in and apply stricter discipline. The democratic attitude of women is determined not to be influenced by low and high socio-economic levels. Children aged 9-12 years view their mother's protection as protective parents who beat when she cries at lower socio-economic levels and protective parents at higher socio-economic levels.

**Table 4. Results of Variance Analysis of Family Life and Child Raising Attitudes Scale (SRCA) Factor Score according to the number of siblings**

| (SRCA) Dimension | Number of children | N   | X     | Sd    | F      | p    |
|------------------|--------------------|-----|-------|-------|--------|------|
| Overprotective   | Only child         | 48  | 44,93 | 10,24 | 8.166  | .000 |
|                  | 2 or 3 children    | 204 | 48,07 | 8,60  |        |      |
|                  | 4 children or more | 48  | 52,08 | 7,38  |        |      |
| Demokratic       | Only child         | 48  | 25,62 | 3,49  | .189   | .828 |
|                  | 2 or 3 children    | 204 | 25,49 | 3,48  |        |      |
|                  | 4 children or more | 48  | 25,83 | 3,50  |        |      |
| Role Denial      | Only child         | 48  | 30,31 | 6,72  | 1.823  | .163 |
|                  | 2 or 3 children    | 204 | 31,79 | 7,80  |        |      |
|                  | 4 children or more | 48  | 33,18 | 5,99  |        |      |
| Misunderstand    | Only child         | 48  | 14,37 | 4,46  | .451   | .637 |
|                  | 2 or 3 children    | 204 | 14,97 | 3,95  |        |      |
|                  | 4 children or more | 48  | 14,75 | 3,51  |        |      |
| Discipline       | Only child         | 48  | 33,33 | 8,91  | 14.171 | .000 |
|                  | 2 or 3 children    | 204 | 36,58 | 9,58  |        |      |
|                  | 4 children or more | 48  | 43,08 | 8,39  |        |      |

$p < 0.001$

If we look at Table 4. the average overprotective dimensions of women according to the number of children is  $44.93 \pm 10.24.2$  in one child or  $48.07 \pm 8.60$  in 3 children, and the mean of women with 4 or more children is  $52.08$ . This is  $\pm 7.38$ . The mean score for women with strict discipline was  $33.33 \pm 8.91.2$  for single children or  $36.58 \pm 9.58$  for three children and  $43.08 \pm 8.39$  for women with 4 or more children ( $p < 0.001$ ). Judging from these findings, it determined that women with overprotective dimensions and strict discipline showed different attitudes according to their number. It has determined that as the number of children increases, women are subjected to more protection and more rigorous punishment.

**Table 5. Results of the Analysis of the Variance of Family Life and the Scale of Parenting Attitudes (SRCA) Factor Score according to the Working Status of Women**

| (SRCA) Dimension | Employment status | N   | X     | Sd    | F      | p    |
|------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|-------|--------|------|
| Overprotective   | Unemployment      | 206 | 50.59 | 7.79  | 30.357 | .000 |
|                  | Employment        | 82  | 42.30 | 8.66  |        |      |
|                  | Retired           | 12  | 47.83 | 10.41 |        |      |
| Demokratic       | Unemployment      | 206 | 25.62 | 3.54  | 1.941  | .145 |
|                  | Employment        | 82  | 25.18 | 3.19  |        |      |
|                  | Retired           | 12  | 27.25 | 4.02  |        |      |
| Role Denial      | Unemployment      | 206 | 32.72 | 7.59  | 7.796  | .001 |
|                  | Employment        | 82  | 29.10 | 5.79  |        |      |
|                  | Retired           | 12  | 33.75 | 9.51  |        |      |
| Misunderstand    | Unemployment      | 206 | 15.46 | 3.71  | 12.520 | .000 |
|                  | Employment        | 82  | 13.06 | 3.93  |        |      |
|                  | Retired           | 12  | 16.33 | 4.86  |        |      |
| Discipline       | Unemployment      | 206 | 39.56 | 9.27  | 29.309 | .000 |
|                  | Employment        | 82  | 30.69 | 7.51  |        |      |
|                  | Retired           | 12  | 38.66 | 10.84 |        |      |

$p < 0.001$

If women's employment status is seen in Table 5, the mean score of women with overprotective dimensions is  $50.59 \pm 7.79$  for unemployment,  $42.30 \pm 8.66$  for workers and  $47.83 \pm 10.41$  for retirees. The mean scores in the roll rejection dimension were  $32.72 \pm 7.59$  for non-workers,  $29.10 \pm 5.79$  for employees and  $33.75 \pm 9.51$  for retirees. The mean scores on the incompatibility dimension were  $15.46 \pm 3.71$  for unemployed,  $13.06 \pm 3.93$  for workers and  $16.33 \pm 4.86$  for retirees. The mean scores in the strict discipline dimension were  $39.56 \pm 9.27$  for unemployed,  $30.69 \pm 7.51$  for workers and  $38.66 \pm 10.84$  for retirees. ( $p < 0.001$ ). It has been determined that unemployed women have more overprotective and strict disciplinary attitudes than employed and retirees. It has been determined that retired women reject their roles more than working women and that women do not work and have a conflict attitude dimension.

**Table 6. Results of Analysis of Family Life Variance and Child Raising Attitude Scale (SRCA) Factor Score According to Women's Educational Status**

| (SRCA) Dimension | Educational status | N   | X     | Sd   | F      | p    |
|------------------|--------------------|-----|-------|------|--------|------|
| Overprotective   | Elementary school  | 151 | 52.57 | 6.71 | 59.707 | .000 |
|                  | High School        | 83  | 46.14 | 8.62 |        |      |
|                  | College            | 66  | 40.84 | 7.90 |        |      |
| Demokratic       | Elementary school  | 151 | 25.78 | 3.53 | 1.829  | .162 |
|                  | High School        | 83  | 25.74 | 3.49 |        |      |
|                  | College            | 66  | 24.84 | 3.31 |        |      |
| Role Denial      | Elementary school  | 151 | 33.72 | 7.88 | 13.060 | .000 |

|                      |                   |     |       |      |        |      |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|------|--------|------|
|                      | High School       | 83  | 30.78 | 6.35 |        |      |
|                      | College           | 66  | 28.59 | 6.07 |        |      |
| <b>Misunderstand</b> | Elementary school | 151 | 16.02 | 3.47 | 17.511 | .000 |
|                      | High School       | 83  | 14.24 | 4.30 |        |      |
|                      | College           | 66  | 12.87 | 3.67 |        |      |
| <b>Discipline</b>    | Elementary school | 151 | 42.63 | 8.15 | 80.778 | .000 |
|                      | High School       | 83  | 33.31 | 8.03 |        |      |
|                      | College           | 66  | 29.21 | 6.76 |        |      |

$p < 0,001$

Judging from the educational status of women in Table 6, the mean score of women with overprotective dimensions is  $52.57 \pm 6.71$  in primary education,  $46.14 \pm 8.62$  in secondary education and  $40.84 \pm 7.90$  in tertiary education. . The mean scores on the roll rejection dimension were  $33.72 \pm 7.88$  in primary education,  $30.78 \pm 6.35$  in secondary education and  $28.59 \pm 6.07$  in higher education. The mean scores on the incompatibility dimension were  $16.02 \pm 3.47$  in primary education,  $14.24 \pm 4.30$  in secondary education and  $12.87 \pm 3.67$  in tertiary education. The mean scores in the strict discipline dimension were  $42.63 \pm 8.15$  in primary education,  $33.31 \pm 8.03$  in secondary education, and  $29.21 \pm 6.76$  in higher education ( $p < 0.001$ ). It has determined that women with primary education have more overprotective, rejection of their roles, conflict and strict disciplinary attitudes than those with secondary and tertiary education.

Therefore, it can be said that women with less education adopt more negative attitudes. Parents who received communication skills training argued a more shared understanding of communication with children than parents in the control group. He also found different self-concept of children. The children of the parents' self-concept in both application groups determined the significant improvement from pre-test to post-test. A follow-up study conducted three months later also revealed that all changes were achieved in the post-test.

**Table 7. Results of Analysis of the Variance of Family Life and the Scale of Parenting Attitudes (SRCA) Factor Score According to Husband's Educational Status**

| (SRCA) Dimension      | Husband's Education Status | N   | X     | Sd   | F      | p    |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----|-------|------|--------|------|
| <b>Overprotective</b> | Elementary school          | 105 | 52.58 | 6.90 | 44.629 | .000 |
|                       | High School                | 95  | 49.47 | 8.01 |        |      |
|                       | College                    | 100 | 42.44 | 8.55 |        |      |
| <b>Demokratic</b>     | Elementary school          | 105 | 26.18 | 3.54 | 4.219  | .016 |
|                       | High School                | 95  | 25.70 | 3.36 |        |      |
|                       | College                    | 100 | 24.80 | 3.41 |        |      |
| <b>Role Denial</b>    | Elementary school          | 105 | 34.25 | 8.04 | 10.725 | .000 |
|                       | High School                | 95  | 31.22 | 6.53 |        |      |
|                       | College                    | 100 | 29.71 | 6.76 |        |      |
| <b>Misunderstand</b>  | Elementary school          | 105 | 16.48 | 3.49 | 25.619 | .000 |
|                       | High School                | 95  | 15.12 | 3.87 |        |      |
|                       | College                    | 100 | 12.84 | 3.65 |        |      |

|                   |                   |     |       |      |        |      |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|------|--------|------|
| <b>Discipline</b> | Elementary school | 105 | 42.80 | 7.86 | 53.455 | .000 |
|                   | High School       | 95  | 37.47 | 8.78 |        |      |
|                   | College           | 100 | 30.76 | 8.41 |        |      |

$p < 0.001$

When seen from Table 7., the average score of the overprotective dimensions of women is  $52.58 \pm 6.90$  in primary education,  $49.47 \pm 8.01$  in secondary education and  $42.44 \pm 8.55$  in higher education, according to level—husband's education. The mean scores in the roll rejection dimension were  $34.25 \pm 8.04$  in primary education,  $31.22 \pm 6.53$  in secondary education and  $29.71 \pm 6.76$  in tertiary education. The mean scores on the incompatibility dimension were  $16.48 \pm 3.49$  in primary education,  $15.12 \pm 3.87$  in secondary education and  $12.84 \pm 3.65$  in tertiary education. The mean scores in the strict discipline dimension were  $42.80 \pm 7.86$  in primary education,  $37.47 \pm 8.78$  in secondary education, and  $30.76 \pm 8.41$  in higher education ( $p < 0.001$ ). Women's mean scores in the dimension of democracy were  $26.18 \pm 3.54$  in primary education,  $25.70 \pm 3.36$  in secondary education, and  $24.80 \pm 3.41$  in higher education ( $p > 0.05$ ). Based on these findings, it was determined that women's attitudes towards their children varied according to the level of education of their husbands in all dimensions except the dimensions of democratic attitudes.

**Table 8. Correlation Coefficient of Attitudes of Women at 10 Years Old (Scale of Family Life and Attitudes of Raising Children)**

| (SRCA) Dimensi | Demokratic | Role Denial | Misunderstand | Discipline |
|----------------|------------|-------------|---------------|------------|
| Overprotective | .420**     | .458**      | .524**        | .777*      |
| Demokratic     |            | .341**      | .365**        | .385*      |
| Role Denial    |            |             | .478**        | .534*      |
| Misunderstand  |            |             |               | .502*      |

\* $p < 0.05$

\*\* $p < 0.001$

If Table 8. is examined, there is a significant difference between the overprotective dimension of women and the dimension of democracy ( $r = .420$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), the dimension of role rejection ( $r = .458$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). ) and the non-conformity dimension ( $r = .524$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), there appears to be a relationship. It can also see that there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of strict discipline ( $r = .777$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). It should be noted that there is a substantial relationship between the sizes of women's democracy and the rejection of the role dimension ( $r = .341$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and the incompatibility dimension ( $r = .365$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). It can also see that there is a significant relationship between the sizes of strict discipline ( $r = .385$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). There was a meaningful relationship between the dimensions of women's role rejection with the incompatibility dimension ( $r = .478$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and the dimension of strict discipline ( $r = .534$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). There is a significant relationship between the sizes of women's incompatibility and the extent of strict discipline ( $r = .502$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). When these findings examined, it appears that the relationship between the dimensions of women's strict discipline and the other dimensions is ( $p < 0.05$ ), and the relationship between all different sizes is ( $p < 0.001$ ).

#### D. CONCLUSION

The following results obtained in a study conducted to determine women's attitudes in children aged ten years at low and high socio-economic levels. When the children's female attitudes included in the study examined, it determined that gender did not cause statistically significant differences in all dimensions except the strict discipline dimension ( $p > 0.05$ ).

The socio-economic level determined that there were significant differences in all dimensions other than democratic attitudes ( $p < 0.001$ ). It appears that women at the lower socio-economic level are more protective, rejecting the role of women. More, and apply more discipline in the family. The democratic attitude of women is determined not to be influenced by low and high socio-economic levels. It found that there were no significant differences between the dimensions of women's democracy, role rejection and incompatibility with the number of children ( $p > 0.05$ ), and there was a substantial difference between the overprotective and strict discipline dimensions and the number of children. It decided that as the number of children increased, the women adopted more protection and improved discipline. There were significant differences in overprotection, role rejection, incompatibility and strict discipline according to women's work status ( $p < 0.001$ ). It has determined that unemployed women have a more overprotective and strict disciplinary attitude than employed and retirees. It has determined that retired women reject their roles more than working women and that women do not work and have a conflict attitude dimension. It found that there were significant differences in terms of overprotection, role rejection, mismatch and strict discipline according to women's education level ( $p < 0.001$ ). It has determined that women with primary education have more overprotective dimensions, rejection of their roles, conflict and strict disciplinary attitudes than those with secondary and tertiary education. Therefore, it can be said that women with less education adopt more negative attitudes.

It found that there were significant differences in all dimensions of women's SRCA according to their husband's education level ( $p < 0.001$ ). In all measurements, it has been determined that women's attitudes towards their children vary according to the husband's education level. It can be said that women whose partners are more educated tend to be more positive. Looking at the relationship between women's attitudes towards children, it can seem that the relationship between the dimensions of women's strict discipline and other dimensions is ( $p < 0.05$ ), and the relationship between different sizes is ( $p < 0.001$ ).

It is possible to provide some suggestions in the framework of the results of this study. Love is an essential concept in educating a child. It is important to act from this point of view. Parents must prepare a democratic environment for the child; in this environment, positive behaviour must be rewarded and reinforced, negative behaviour must be explained, and how to behave must be explained. Parents' discourse and action must be consistent, and they must act in the awareness that they are role models in the eyes of their children. For children to develop a positive self about themselves, independent behaviour must be supported,

comparisons with others must be avoided, and act with the awareness that they are separate individuals. Besides, they must know the developmental stages of their children and their characteristics and be sensitive to their children's needs.

## REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, N., & Mohamed, E. (2018). Effect Of Antenatal Care On Maternal And Neonatal Outcomes In Women's Health Hospital. *Mansoura Nursing Journal*, 5(3), 123-138.
2. Aspiranti, T., & Amaliah, I. (2018). Determinant of Social Poverty in Mountainous Area of Talegong Garut Regency. *MIMBAR: Jurnal Sosial dan Pembangunan*, 34(1), 34-42.
3. Astuti, R. P. F. (2016). Pengaruh status sosial-ekonomi orang tua, literasi ekonomi dan life style terhadap perilaku konsumsi mahasiswa jurusan pendidikan ekonomi IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro. *Jurnal Pendidikan Edutama*, 3(2), 49-58.
4. Aziz, A., Fatima, A., Fatima, M., Hayat, I., Hussain, W., & Sadaf, J. (2020). Factors are resulting in non-utilization of Antenatal Care Services from Public Sector Hospitals in the rural area of Bahawalpur. *Journal of Sheikh Zayed Medical College (JSZMC)*, 11(03), 09-13.
5. Azizah, E. N., Shari, D., & Nafiah, I. N. (2020). Public Speaking Sosialisasi Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Keluarga Kabupaten Ngawi. *IJCE (Indonesian Journal of Community Engagement)*, 1(2), 45-50.
6. Christie, C. D., Consoli, A., Ronksley, P. E., Vena, J. E., Friedenreich, C. M., & McCormack, G. R. (2021). Associations between the built environment and physical activity among adults with low socio-economic status in Canada: a systematic review. *Canadian Journal of Public Health= Revue Canadienne de Santé Publique*, 112(1), 152-168.
7. Deshmukh, V., John, S., & Arora, N. K. (2020). Utilization of postnatal healthcare services delivered through home visitation and health facilities for mothers and newborns: an integrative review from developing countries. *The Indian Journal of Pediatrics*, 87(3), 207-216.
8. Dewi, N. K., & Rudiarto, I. (2013). Identifikasi Alih Fungsi Lahan Pertanian dan Kondisi Sosial-ekonomi Masyarakat Daerah Pinggiran di Kecamatan Gunungpati Kota Semarang. *Jurnal WilSuami dan Lingkungan*, 1(2), 175-188.
9. Faritz, M., & Yoserizal, Y. (2017). *Pengaruh Keberadaan Perusahaan terhadap Kondisi Sosial-ekonomi Masyarakat Desa Pangke Barat Kabupaten Karimun* (Doctoral dissertation, Riau University).
10. Giantara, F., Yanti, N., Handayani, S., & Anis, Y. (2020). Pola Pendidikan keluarga Saat Bencana Kabut Asap di Kota Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 4(2), 778-786.
11. Idei, R., & Kato, H. (2019). How Does Improving Rural Roads Motivate People to Own Travel Modes? Findings from Rural Cambodia. *Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies*, 13, 102-119.

12. Kamrujjaman, M. D., Rusyidi, B., Adbdoella, O. S., & Nurwati, N. (2018). The roles of social worker during flood disaster management in Dayeuhkolot District Bandung Indonesia. *Journal Social Work Education and Practice*, 3 (3), 31-45.
13. Kyomuhendo, P. (2018). *Factors Affecting Regular Uptake Of Antenatal Services Among Pregnant Mothers In Their 3rdtrimester At Kisugu Health Center III* (Doctoral dissertation, International Health Sciences University).
14. Masruroh, M., & Verawati, B. (2020). Community Empowerment as an Effort to Prevent Child Marriage. *Journal of Midwifery*, 4(2), 68-86.
15. Missbach, A. (2017). Wayne Palmer. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 26(3), 287-307.
16. Mukonka, P. S., Mukwato, P. K., Kwaleyela, C. N., Mweemba, O., & Maimbolwa, M. (2018). Household factors associated with use of postnatal care services. *African Journal of Midwifery and Women's Health*, 12(4), 189-193.
17. Ogbo, F. A., Dhimi, M. V., Ude, E. M., Senanayake, P., Osuagwu, U. L., Awosemo, A. O., ... & Agho, K. E. (2019). Enablers and barriers to the utilization of antenatal care services in India. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(17), 3152.
18. Omri, A., & Belaïd, F. (2021). Does renewable energy modulate the negative effect of environmental issues on socio-economic welfare?. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 3(4), 278-292.
19. Peden, A. E., & Franklin, R. C. (2021). Exploring the impact of remoteness and socio-economic status on child and adolescent injury-related mortality in Australia. *Children*, 8(1), 5.
20. Rai, P. (2018). The labour of social change: Seasonal labour migration and social change in rural western India. *Geoforum*, 92, 171-180.
21. Rathgeb, P. (2021). Makers against takers: the socio-economic ideology and policy of the Austrian Freedom Party. *West European Politics*, 44(3), 635-660.
22. Schultz, S., Cameron, A. J., Grigsby-Duffy, L., Robinson, E., Marshall, J., Orellana, L., & Sacks, G. (2021). Availability and placement of healthy and discretionary food in Australian supermarkets by chain and level of socio-economic disadvantage. *Public Health Nutrition*, 24(2), 203-214.
23. Shibre, G., Zegeye, B., Idriss-Wheeler, D., Ahinkorah, B. O., Oladimeji, O., & Yaya, S. (2020). Socio-economic and geographic variations in antenatal care coverage in Angola: further analysis of the 2015 demographic and health survey. *BMC public health*, 20(1), 1-10.
24. Shibre, G., Zegeye, B., Idriss-Wheeler, D., Ahinkorah, B. O., Oladimeji, O., & Yaya, S. (2020). Socio-economic and geographic variations in antenatal care coverage in Angola: further analysis of the 2015 demographic and health survey. *BMC public health*, 20(1), 1-10.

25. Takaeb, A. E. L. (2020). Exploration of Socio-Cultural Determinants of Maternal Mortality in Indonesia. In *5th International Conference on Tourism, Economics, Accounting, Management and Social Science (TEAMS 2020)*, 4(3), 482-487.