SOSYAL POLİTİKA ÇALIŞMALARI DERGİSİ
CİLT: 24 SAYI: 64 TEMMUZ-EYLÜL 2024 E-ISSN: 2651-4265
Araştırma Makalesi

INVESTIGATION OF X AND Y GENERATION PARENTS' RISKY PLAY ALLOWANCE

Esra ÜNLÜER[1]

Rahime ÇİÇEK[2]

Meral TANER DERMAN[3]

Abstract

Adults may worry and prevent the child from engaging in risky play. Due to changing culture and resulting changes, each generation has different characteristics and is influential in the upbringing of the next generation as parents. That said, this study aims to determine the extent to which parents allow their child to engage in risky play and whether this differs by the generational knowledge of parents, the child's age, the child's gender, and the presence or absence of older/younger siblings. Based on survey method, this study involves 415 parents who have children aged between 4-6 years. These parents are asked to fill out the information form containing demographic information and the "Scale for Allowing Risky Play." In conclusion, this study reveals that "play at low-risk heights" and "play with dangerous tools" are plays that the parents consent to the most frequently whilst the parents allow their children to "play near dangerous natural elements" the least frequently. Notably, generational knowledge of the parents, the child's age and the presence or absence of younger/older siblings are influential in the decision to allow risky play; however, the gender of the parent and the child do not affect that decision.

Key Words: *Risky play, risk taking, early childhood, generation*

[1]Assist. Prof. Dr., Kocaeli University, Faculty of Education, Department of Early Childhood Education, E-mail: esra.unluer@kocaeli.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-4964-095X

[2]Res. Asst., Kocaeli University, Faculty of Education, Department of Early Childhood Education, E-mail: rahime.inan@kocaeli.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-1611-5198

[3]Assoc. Prof. Dr., Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Education, Department of Early Childhood Education, E-mail: mtaner@uludag.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-8619-3429

ÜNLÜER, E., ÇİÇEK. R., TANER DERMAN, M., (2024). Investigation of X and Y Generation Parents' Risky Play Allowance. Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi, 24(64), 465-490. DOI:10.21560/spcd.vi. 1380539

X VE Y KUŞAĞI EBEVEYNLERİNİN RİSKLİ OYUNA İZİN VERME DURUMLARININ İNCELENMESİ

Öz

Çocuklar oyun yoluyla becerilerini geliştirmektedirler ve bu gelişim süreci risk almalarını da kapsamaktadır. Riskli oyun fiziksel yaralanma ihtimali olan, heyecan verici ve müdahale gerektiren oyun türü olarak açıklanmaktadır. Yetişkinler endişe duyarak çocuğun riskli oyuna dahil olma sürecine engel olabilmektedir. Değişen kültür ve gelen değişmeler neticesinde farklı özelliklere sahip kuşaklar ortaya çıkmaktadır ve ebeveyn olarak bir sonraki kuşak gelişiminde etkili olmaktadır. Mevcut çalışma ebeveynlerin çocuklarının riskli oyuna izin verme düzeyleri tespit etmek ve düzeylerin ebeveynin kuşak bilgisi, çocuğun yaşı, çocuğun cinsiyeti, çocuğun kardeş durumu değişkenlerine göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini belirlemek amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Tarama deseninde gerçekleştirilen çalışmada 4-6 yaş çocuklarına sahip 415 ebeveyn yer almıştır. Ebeveynlerden demografik bilgileri içeren bilgi formu ve "Riskli Oyuna İzin Verme Ölçeği"ni doldurmaları istenmiştir. Neticesinde ebeveynlerin en çok "az riskli yüksekliklerde oyun" ve "tehlikeli aletlerle oyun"a izin verdikleri, en az da "tehlikeli doğal unsurlara yakın oyun"a izin verdikleri görülmüştür. Ebeveynlerin riskli oyuna izin verme durumlarının ebeveynin kuşak bilgisi, çocuğun yaşı ve kardeş durumuna göre farklılaştığı tespit edilirken ebeveynin ve çocuğun cinsiyetinin etkili bir değişken olmadığı görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Riskli oyun, risk alma, erken çocukluk, kuşaklar, ebeveyn müdahalesi*

INTRODUCTION

Play refers to activity engaged in for a specific purpose for permanent learning or without any purpose, with or without rules, considering the wishes of the child (Öztürk, 2001). While playing, the child can develop behaviors and skills and have fun at the same time. During this process, the child takes some risks to continue their healthy development. Children are naturally curious; risky play provides them opportunities to experience excitement (Greenway and Hutching, 2022). The words "risk" and "danger" are often confused by adults. In a nutshell, danger can be characterized by behaviors or situations involving the possibility of harm; risk consists of actions with uncertain consequences (Ball et al., 2008). For example, sharp edges in furniture, open electrical sockets, slippery floors are a danger (Armitage, 2011). Risky play includes games that involve possible risks such as swinging, climbing, jumping, hopping, rolling, sliding, and hanging. According to Willoughby (2012), the distinguishing factor between these two words lies in "evaluability". Risks can be evaluated by children, while danger evaluation depends on the adult. In some situations, children naturally take risks. This is what underlines risky play. Risky play enables children to experience a range of emotions in a controlled and safe environment. It allows children to take risks to overcome difficulties and look for potential frightening situations, regardless of whether they are imagined or real (Greenway and Hutching, 2022). Risky play most often occurs in children's free games, rather than adult-organized games (Sandseter, 2007).

Risky play further refers to play that involves a risk of physical injury, is exciting and requires intervention (Sandseter, 2007). It is grouped under six categories. These categories are: play at great heights, play at high speeds, play with dangerous tools, and play near dangerous elements, rough and tumble play, and play where children can disappear (Cevher-Kalburan, 2014). Play at great heights includes behaviors such as climbing, staying on balance at a very high level from the ground, sagging/swinging, while play at high speeds involves swinging, running, cycling, and so forth. Play with dangerous tools refers to games where children can handle saws and knives, whilst play near dangerous natural elements includes games near cliffs, deep water and burning fire. Last but not least, rough and tumble play involves behaviors such

as wrestling and fighting-based games; play where children can disappear/ get out of sight involves playing and exploring in an environment away from adults. Risky play is considered risky by certain environmental and individual characteristics (Sandseter, 2007). The height, steepness and roughness of the surrounding elements are environmental characteristics whilst the characteristics that increase the unknowns inherent in the play and make it more challenging are individual characteristics (Sandseter, 2009).

When children are provided necessary support and opportunity to engage in a risky play, this leads to positive outcomes such as adapting, being responsible for the consequences of their decisions, learning, problem solving and creativity development, recognizing their own potential and limitations and self-confidence, gaining body synchronization and autonomy, managing risky situations and coping with risks, and development of muscle skills (Alat et al., 2012; Ball, 2002; Christensen and Mikkelsen, 2008; Goodyear-Smith and Laidlaw, 1999; Little and Wyver, 2008; Maynard and Waters, 2007; Mitchell et al., 2006). On the contrary, children in extremely safe environments, have difficulty in defining and managing risks, have problems with self-confidence, fail to gain independence and to manage their fears and stress, tend to engage in inappropriate risks because they get bored more quickly, experience health problems due to their weight; their perception and judgment skills are negatively affected, and their mental health is adversely affected too (Ball, 2002; Bundy et al., 2009; Eager and Little, 2011; Gleave and Cole-Hamilton, 2012; Hart, 2002; Little and Wyver, 2008; Stephenson, 2003).

Parents and teachers have their doubts about risky play as they want to prevent negative consequences such as falls and injuries (Alat et al., 2012; Güler and Demir, 2016; Sicim Sevim and Bapoğlu Dümenci, 2020). Furthermore, due to urbanization in the developing world, children have fewer opportunities to experience risks. Today's ever-changing world also leads to next generations with different characteristics. Next generations can influence the characteristics and attitudes of children and adults in the world. Today, parents who have preschool-age children are mostly generation X and Y. While the generation born between 1965-1979 are individuals that respect rules, value information, are result-oriented and anxious; Generation Y, born

between 1980-1999 typically live life in the moment, want to be discovered, show high adaptability, are well-educated, insatiable, active, have optimistic attitudes (Özdemir, 2019). This generation, defined as "the generation where generational differences are most apparent", both improved technology and enhanced cultural interactions further (Özdemir, 2019). The next generation has shorter time interval as Generation Z are born between 2000-2012 (Aydın and Başol, 2014). For this reason, it is reasonable to argue that Generation Y has a wider range of characteristics. The acquired parental attitudes developed through individual characteristics and generational characteristics and the level of intervention of parents may affect their children's engagement in risky behavior (Cevher-Kalburan and Ivrendi, 2016; New et al., 2005). Due to safety concerns, many parents restrict their children's play (Bundy et al., 2009; Scott et al., 1998). Previous studies have determined that the children of overprotective families fall into more risky situations (Bundy et al., 2009; Ungar, 2009).

As the views and attitudes of Generation X and Y with different characteristics on risky play may differ due to their upbringing and characteristics, it is likely that the children of these generations may also have different access to risky play. This study will reveal the views of Generation X and Y parents on risky play and their permissions to allow their children to engage in risky play based on various variables, and hopefully add to the literature. Accordingly, this study intends to answer the following questions:

(1) To what extent do the parents allow their children to engage in risky play?

(2) Does the extent to which the parents allow their children to engage in risky play differ by various variables (the gender of the parents, the generational knowledge of the parents, the child's age, the child's gender, and the presence or absence of older/younger siblings)?

(3) Does the extent to which the parents of Generation X and Y allow their children to engage in risky play differ by various variables (the child's age, the child's gender, and the presence or absence of older/younger siblings)?

METHOD

This study aims to reveal various aspects of the permission of Generation X and Y parents for their children to engage in risky play. It investigates the permission of the parents for risky play by considering the age, gender of their children, the presence or absence of siblings as well as information about the generation and gender of the parents. This study draws on survey research design, which is one of the quantitative research methods. Survey design, which has high level of consistency and generalizability, involves collecting information about the characteristics, practices or views of a particular group of people selected from the research universe (Pinsonneault and Kraemer, 1993).

Participants

The study group of this research has been determined by convenience sampling method, a type of non-probability sampling. Convenience sampling method is a sampling method where one studies on a situation or sample that is the most convenient and useful until the sample reaches the required size (Cohen and Manion, 1989). The study group of this research consists of 415 parents, of Generation X and Y, who were recruited through teacher-parent message groups with the help of preschool teachers and volunteered to participate in this study. Based on the data presented by the Turkish Statistical Institute for December, 2019, the average age of the participants is between 25-29 years (TUIK, 2019). This implies that a large part of the study group consists of parents of Generation Y. Further, female participants outnumber male participants; the reason for this may be that it is mothers who usually join such teacher-parent message groups, compared to fathers (Bak et al., 2018; Tuncer, 2021).

Table 1. Data on the demographic information of the participants

Variable	Group	f	%
Gender	Female	346	83.4
	Male	69	16.6
Generation	X Generation (1965-1979)	71	17.1
	Y Generation (1980-1999)	344	82.9
	Total	415	100.0

Table 1 offers the demographic information of the parents participating in this study. 346 (83.4%) of the parents are female and 69 (16.6%) are male. 71 (17.1%) of the parents are of Generation X, whilst 344 (82.9%) are of Generation Y.

Table 2. Data on the demographic information of children of the participants

Variable	Group	f	%
Gender	Girl	193	46.5
	Boy	222	53.5
Age	4	185	44.6
	5	150	36.1
	6	80	19.3
Sibling information	Only child	123	29.6
	Having an older brother or sister	196	47.2
	Having a younger sibling	96	23.1
	Total	415	100.0

Table 2 shows that 193 (46.5%) of the children of the parents are girls and 222 (53.5%) are boys. Also, 185 (44.6%) of the children are 4 years old, 150 (36.1%) are 5 years old, and 80 (19.3%) are 6 years old. 29.6% of the children are an only child; 47.2% have an older brother or sister, and 23.1% have a younger sibling.

Data Collection Tools

This study used the "Personal Information Form" to obtain the demographic characteristics of the parents and the "Risky Play Allowance Scale" developed by Ünüvar and Kanyılmaz (2017) to determine the extent to which the parents allow their children to engage in risky play.

Personal Information Form

The "Personal Information Form" designed by the researchers consists of two parts for the characteristics of the parents and the characteristics of their children. The first part informs on the gender and age of the parents; the second part informs on the gender, age and sibling/s of the children.

Risky Play Allowance Scale

The above-mentioned scale developed by Ünüvar and Kanyılmaz (2017) consists of 21 items and four sub-dimensions as *"Play at High-Risk Heights"*, *"Play with Dangerous Tools"*, *"Play at Low-Risk Heights"* and *"Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements"*. The maximum possible score on this five-point Likert type scale is 105, and the minimum score is 21. The maximum possible score on the category of "*Play at High-Risk Heights*" is 45 and the minimum score is 9. The maximum possible score on the category of "*Play with Dangerous Tools*" is 30 and the minimum score is 6. As the category of "*Play at Low-Risk Heights*" and the category of "*Play Near Dangerous Elements*" have the same number of items, the maximum possible score on these categories is 15, and the minimum score is 3. The Cronbach's Alpha value for the whole scale was found as .88 during the scale development phase; this value is .94 in this current study.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedure

The data were collected through an online survey that includes the "Personal Information Form" and the "Risky play Allowance Scale" applied in the teacher-parent message groups with the help of preschool teachers. The data obtained from this survey were transferred directly to the current version of the statistical program SPSS 26 (the Package for the Social Sciences, 26th edition). To test the normality of the data, the skewness and kurtosis values of the variables were calculated. The normal distribution ranges from -2 to +2 (Georger and Mallery, 2010). The analysis indicated that the data showed a normal distribution in terms of variables of the gender of the parents (skewness 1.799; kurtosis 1.243), generational knowledge of the parents (skewness 1,753; kurtosis 1,079), the child's age (skewness -.459; kurtosis -1.135), the child's gender (skewness -.141; kurtosis -1.1990), and the presence or absence of older/younger siblings (skewness .099; kurtosis -1.086). In this process, descriptive data analysis that includes percentages and frequencies was conducted; the Independent Sample T-Test was applied for binary comparisons, and ANOVA was performed for multiple comparisons.

FINDINGS

Table 3 shows the scores of the parents from the whole "Risky play Allowance Scale" and its sub-dimensions. Different number of items in the sub-dimensions affects the total score and average score obtained from the dimensions. For this reason, the data were examined by calculating the ratio of the average score from the sub-dimension to the maximum possible score.

Table 3. Data on the scores of the parents from the whole "Risky play Allowance Scale" and its sub-dimensions

	N	Min.	Max	Mean(x)	x/max	Total score
Play at High-Risk Heights	415	9	45	17.41	0.38	7228
Play with Dangerous Tools	415	6	30.00	12.85	0.42	5333
Play at Low-Risk Heights	415	3.00	15.00	9.17	0.61	3808
Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements	415	3.00	15.00	4.64	0.30	1927
Total	415	21.00	105.00	44.09	0.41	18300

Table 3 demonstrates that the total score of the parents from the scale is less than half of the maximum possible total score from the scale ($\bar{x}$/max= 0.41). It is also important that the parents obtained higher scores from the sub-dimension of "Play at Low-Risk Heights" compared to other sub-dimensions ($\bar{x}$/max= 0.61), and that the score in this sub-dimension being higher than the scores from the other dimensions affects the total score. Among the sub-dimensions, the second highest score was obtained from the sub-dimension "Play with Dangerous Tools" (x/max= 0.42). The third highest score was obtained in the sub-dimension "Play at High-Risk Heights" (x/max= 0.38), and the lowest score was obtained in the sub-dimension "Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements" (x/max= 0.30).

Table 4. t-test Results on the Scores of the Parents from the whole "Risky Play Allowance Scale" and its sub-dimensions by variable of gender

Sub-dimensions	Gender	N	x̄	Σ	p
Play at High-Risk Heights	Female	346	17.14	7.25	.094
	Male	69	18.76	7.7	
Play with Dangerous Tools	Female	346	12.78	6.13	.626
	Male	69	13.17	5.5	
Play at Low-Risk Heights	Female	346	9.17	3.84	.976
	Male	69	9.18	3.37	
Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements	Female	346	4.50	2.28	0.25
	Male	69	5.31	2.77	
Total	Female	346	43.62	16.72	.199
	Male	69	46.44	16.23	

*p<0,05

As can be seen in Table 4, the average score of the mothers and fathers from the sub-dimension of play at high-risk heights is 17.14 and 18.76, respectively; that of the mothers and fathers from the sub-dimension of play with dangerous tools 12.78 and 13.17, respectively. Further, the average score of the mothers and fathers from the sub-dimension of play at low-risk heights is 9.17 and 9.18, respectively, and the average score of the mothers and fathers from the sub-dimension of play with dangerous natural elements is 4.50 and 5.31, respectively. The average score of the mothers and fathers from the whole scale is 43.62 and 46.44, respectively. The results of T-Test indicate that the scores from the whole "Risky play Allowance Scale" and its sub-dimensions did not differ significantly by variable of the gender of the parents.

Table 5. t-test Results on the Scores of the Parents from the whole "Risky Play Allowance Scale" and its sub-dimensions by variable of child gender

Sub-dimensions	Child Gender	N	x̄	σ	p
Play at High-Risk Heights	Girl	193	17.42	7.5	.984
	Boy	222	17.4	7.22	
Play with Dangerous Tools	Girl	193	13	6.52	.638
	Boy	222	12.72	5.57	
Play at Low-Risk Heights	Girl	193	8.9	3.84	.175
	Boy	222	9.4	3.69	
Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements	Girl	193	4.68	2.48	.716
	Boy	222	4.6	2.31	
Total	Girl	193	44.04	17.73	.95
	Boy	222	44.14	15.7	

*p<0,05

Informing on the extent to which the parents allow their children to engage in risky play by variable of the child's gender, Table 5 underlines that the average score from the sub-dimension of play at high-risk heights is 17.42 for girls and 17.40 for boys; that the average score from the sub-dimension of play with dangerous tools is 13.00 for girls and 12.72 for boys; that the average score from the sub-dimension of play at low-risk heights is 8.90 for girls and 9.40 for boys; that from the sub-dimension of play near dangerous natural elements is 4.68 for girls and 4.60 boys. The average score from the whole scale is 44.04 for girls and 44.14 for boys. The results of t-Test also indicate that the scores from the whole "Risky play Allowance Scale" and its sub-dimensions did not differ significantly by variable of the child's gender.

As can be seen in Table 6, there is no significant difference in the scores of the parents from the "Risky play Allowance Scale" and its sub-dimensions "Play at High-Risk Heights" and "Play with Dangerous Tools" by variable of the child's age. Another finding is that there is a significant difference in the scores of the parents from the sub-dimension "Play at Low-Risk Heights" between age 4 and age 6 (p=.001) for age 6. A significant difference is also evident in the scores of the parents from the sub-dimension "Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements" between age 5 and age 6 (p=.002), and between age 4 and age 6 (p=.001) for age 6.

Tablo 6. ANOVA Results on the Scores of the Parents from the whole "Risky Play Allowance Scale" and its

Sub-dimensions	Child age	N	$\bar{x}$	σ	Source of Variation	SS
Play at High-Risk Heights	4 years	185	17.46	7.25	Between groups	109.55
	5 years	150	16.88	7.46	Within groups	22219.34
	6 years	80	18.32	7.35	Total	22328.88
Play with Dangerous Tools	4 years	185	12.78	5.91	Between groups	33.16
	5 years	150	12.63	6.47	Within groups	15005.57
	6 years	80	13.41	5.43	Total	15038.74
Play at Low-Risk Heights	4 years	185	8.73	3.87	Between groups	106.41
	5 years	150	9.22	3.75	Within groups	5761.75
	6 years	80	10.11	3.4	Total	5868.16
Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements	4 years	185	4.38	2.14	Between groups	86.58
	5 years	150	4.47	2.26	Within groups	2274.63
	6 years	80	5.57	2.91	Total	2361.22
Total	4 years	185	43.38	16.33	Between groups	1100.84
	5 years	150	43.2	17.21	Within groups	113723.3
	6 years	80	47.42	16.12	Total	114824.14

*p<0,05

sub-dimensions by variable of child age

MS	df	F	p	Source of Difference
57.77	2	1.02	.363	
53.93	412			
	414			
16.58	2	.45	.635	
36.42	412			
	414			
53.2	2	3.8	.023	
13.98	412			6 years-4 years (p=.019; Bonferroni=1.37)
	414			
43.29	2	7.84	.000	1. 6 years-5 years (p=0.002; Bonferroni=1.10)
5.52	412			2. 6 years-4 years (p=0.001; Bonferroni=1.19)
	414			
550.42	2	1.99	.137	
276.03	412			
	414			

Table 7. ANOVA Results on the Scores of the Parents from the whole "Risky Play Allowance Scale" and its

Sub-dimensions	Sibling information	N	x̄	Σ	Source of Variation	
Play at High-Risk Heights	Only child	123	19.32	8.7	Between groups	6
	Having an older brother or sister	196	16.53	6.47	Within groups	216
	Having a younger sibling	96	16.79	6.72	Total	223
Play with Dangerous Tools	Only child	123	14.45	6.88	Between groups	52
	Having an older brother/ sister	196	11.83	5.37	Within groups	145
	Having a younger sibling	96	12.87	5.73	Total	150
Play at Low-Risk Heights	Only child	123	9.32	3.92	Between groups	1
	Having an older brother/ sister	196	9.23	3.69	Within groups	58
	Having a younger sibling	96	8.87	3.73	Total	58
Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements	Only child	123	8.2	2.79	Between groups	5
	Having an older brother/ sister	196	4.36	2.19	Within groups	23
	Having a younger sibling	96	4.51	2.09	Total	23
Total	Only child	123	48.3	19.75	Between groups	31
	Having an older brother/ sister	196	41.97	14.59	Within groups	111
	Having a younger sibling	96	43.05	15.41	Total	114

*p<0,05

sub-dimensions by variable of sibling information

SS	MS	df	F	p	Source of Difference
35.6	317.79	2	6.04	.003	1. Only child- Having an older brother or sister (p=0.003; Bonferroni=2.78)
693.28	52.65	412			2. Only child- Having a younger sibling (p=0.033; Bonferroni=2.52)
328.88		414			
20.29	260.14	2	7.38	.001	
518.49	35.24	412			Only child- Having an older brother or sister (p=0.000; Bonferroni=2.62)
038.74		414			
1.99	5.99	2	.42	.656	
56.16	14.21	412			
68.16		414			
6.31	28.15	2	5.03	.007	
04.91	5.59	412			Only child- Having an older brother or sister (p=0.006; Bonferroni=.84)
61.22		414			
65.72	1582.86	2	5.84	.003	
658.43	271.01	412			Only child- Having an older brother or sister (p=0.003; Bonferroni=6.33)
824.14		414			

The results of the ANOVA test performed for the variable of the presence or absence of older/younger siblings show that the scores of the parents of only children, compared to those of children with an older brother/sister, from the whole "Risky play Allowance Scale" (p=.003) and from the sub-dimensions "Play at High-Risk Heights" (p=.003), "Play with Dangerous Tools" (p=.000) and "Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements" (p=.006) are significantly different for only children. No significant difference is evident in the sub-dimension "Play at Low-Risk Heights". Having a younger sibling did not lead to a significant difference in the total scores from the scale and the scores from its sub-dimensions neither.

Table 8. t-test Results on the Scores of the Parents from the whole "Risky Play Allowance Scale" and its sub-dimensions by variable of generation

Sub-dimensions	Generation	N	$\bar{x}$	Σ	p
Play at High-Risk Heights	X	71	18.18	7.63	.335
	Y	344	17.25	7.28	
Play with Dangerous Tools	X	71	13.29	6.08	.495
	Y	344	12.75	6.02	
Play at Low-Risk Heights	X	71	9.39	3.28	.552
	Y	344	9.13	3.86	
Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements	X	71	5.56	3.1	.005
	Y	344	4.45	2.17	
Total	X	71	46.49	17.57	.183
	Y	344	43.60	16.44	

*p<0.05

As for the generational knowledge of the parents, Table 8 presents that the average score of the parents of Generation X and Generation Y from the sub-dimension "Play at High-Risk Heights" is 18.18 and 17.25, respectively; that the average score of the parents of Generation X and Generation Y from the sub-dimension "Play with Dangerous Tools" is 13.29 and 12.75, respectively; the average score of the parents of Generation X and Generation Y from the sub-dimension "Play at Low-Risk Heights" is 9.39 and 9.13, respectively; that of the parents of Generation X and Generation Y from the sub-dimension "Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements" is 5.56 and 4.45, respectively. The average

total score of Generation X is 46.39 whereas that of Generation Y is 43.60. The results of the T-Test reveal that the scores from the sub-dimension "Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements" varied differently by variable of generational knowledge and that this difference is for the parents of Generation X (p=.005). On the other hand, there is no significant difference in the total scores and the scores from other sub-dimensions.

Table 9. ANOVA Results on the Scores of the Parents of Generation X and Y from the Whole "Risky play Allowance Scale" by Research Variables

Variables		Mean		Standard Deviation		F	p
		GenX	GenY	GenX	GenY		
Gender of the parent	Female	43.59	43.63	18.34	16.57	1.216	.271
	Male	48.87	43.3	16.76	15.2		
Gender of the child	Girl	45.92	43.53	16.55	18.04	.077	.782
	Bot	47.26	43.65	19.11	15.1		
Child age	4 years	45.75	43.60	14.31	16.60	.069	.934
	5 years	43.66	43.13	19.91	16.89		
	6 years	48.48	46.68	18.27	14.60		
Sibling information	Only child	52.42	47.54	15.38	20.42	1.557	.212
	Having an older brother or sister	43.74	41.34	17.62	13.37		
	Having a younger sibling	74.00	42.72	.	15.15		

*p<0,05

Table 9 demonstrates that the total score from the scale is not significantly affected by the parent's generational knowledge, and the parent's gender (p=.271), the child's gender (p=.782), age (p=.934) and presence or absence of siblings (p=.212). Based on the average scores, it is reasonable to state that the mothers of Generation X and Y allow their children to engage in risky play almost equally frequently, but the fathers of Generation X allow more frequently and the fathers of Generation Y allow very less frequently. As for the child's age, this study reveals that the parents of both generations allow their children aged 72-83 months to engage in risky play very frequently. The

last thing to mention in this regard is that the parents of Generation X who have children with younger siblings allow their children to engage in risky play very frequently, whereas those who have children with older siblings allow less frequently. It is remarkable that the scores of the parents of Generation Y did not distinctly differ by the demographics of the siblings.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study seeks to determine the opinions of the parents about the involvement of their children in risky play in the preschool period. The variables of this study are the gender of the parents, generational knowledge (Generation X and Generation Y), the child's gender, age and the presence or absence of older/younger siblings. This study ascertained that parents usually do not allow their children to engage in risky play. Such finding is congruent with the findings of various studies in the literature (Alat et al., 2012; Christensen and Mikkelsen, 2008; Jelleyman et al., 2019; Little et al., 2011; Sicim Sevim and Bapoğlu Dümenci, 2020). Notably, the parents allowed their children to engage in games considered as "play at low-risk heights" and "play with dangerous tools" more often than those considered as "play at high-risk heights" and "play near dangerous natural elements". Parents and teachers restrict children's play most often on the grounds of injury and harm (Cevher Kalburan, 2014; Güler and Demir, 2016; Sicim Sevim and Bapoğlu Dümenci, 2020). It seems that during the games in these two sub-dimensions avoided by the parents more often, children are more likely to be injured or harmed. This is why the parents tend to avoid these games more.

This study also examines various aspects regarding the permission of the parents of Generation X and Y for risky play, and concludes that the two generations have a similar approach towards risky play, usually tending to prevent their children from playing games involving risky situations. This finding implies that parents take into account the characteristics of the period in which their children live in their decision-making processes regarding risky play. This restrictive tendency is present in many cultures (Francis and Lorenzo, 2006). Today, security, risks perceived as reality, individualization, fragmentation of authority and uncertainty that replaces traditional authority, which have become the basic values of society, affect the definition of parents

and shape how children are raised (Kanduran, 2020). Due to this change in society and the social pressure parents face, it seems that parents restrict risky play (Jenkins, 2006; Valentine, 1997). For today's parents, raising a child is not about coping with the risks of everyday life, but about staying away from any kind of risk (Furedi, 2013). Societal trends that limit children's access to risky outdoor play, coupled with a culturally-dominant focus on extreme safety, can pose a threat to the healthy development of children (Brussoni et al., 2012). Jenkins (2006) and Valentine (1997), moreover, reported that due to such concerns of their parents, children are increasingly turning to activities where adult supervision is high and easy, such as computers, television, music, painting, and sports. It is also known that children spend more time indoors (Christensen, 2002; Gray, 2011).

This study further examines how the gender of the parents affects the permission for risky play, and finds out that the mothers and fathers in this study adopt a similar perspective as both do not allow risky play very frequently. The findings of past research are congruent with the findings of this study (Bauer and Giles, 2019; Fagot et al., 1985; Lessard, 2007; Paquette and Bigras, 2010). Although there is no significant difference in the opinions of the mothers and fathers of both generations in this study, considering the average scores of the parents, this study ascertains that the mothers of Generation X and Y have similar scores, but the fathers of Generation Y have lower scores compared to the fathers of Generation X. When making decisions about risky play, mothers feel social pressure to be a "good mother" (Allin et al., 2014). It seems that this social pressure has been felt for many years. This is the case also for fathers too, but fathers feel such pressure more recently, relative to mothers. In recent years, when traditional ideas on fatherhood are questioned, greater societal pressures to increase male participation in family life have become central in popular culture to revive the tensions that arise in cultural structures regarding the role of the father and to reinforce and counteract dominant expectations of what good fatherhood entails (Freeman, 2003). On this, Bauer and Giles (2019) report that a good father means keeping their children away from injury and risks and a bad father is the one encouraging their children to engage in plays that may be considered as risky in their own childhood.

The child's age did not affect the permission of the parents for risky play, but children aged six are more often allowed to engage in risk games in the categories of "Play at Low-Risk Heights" and "Play Near Dangerous Natural Elements". Also, there is no significant difference in the permission of the parents of Generation X and Y for risky play by the child's age. These two findings are supported by the results of the study performed by Morrongiello and Lasenby-Lessard in 2007.

Moreover, this study reports that the permission of the parents of both generations for risky play did not differ by the child's gender. Though some studies in the literature (Morrongiello and Dawber, 2000; Morrongiello and Hogg, 2004; Morrongiello and Lasenby-Lessard, 2007) show that the permission of parents for risky play differed by the child's gender, others (Fagot et al., 1985; Karaca and Aral, 2020; Yurt and Keleş, 2021), including this study, ascertain that it did not differ.

The finding that being an only child in the family affects the permission for risky play, is supported by the findings of Karaca and Aral (2020), but not by the findings of Cevher Kalburan and İvrendi (2016). Cevher Kalburan and İvrendi (2020) found that parents with many children allow risky play more frequently.

Children's involvement in risky play in line with their skills contributes to various skills, such as problem solving, self-confidence, risky situation management, and development of muscle skills (Alat et al., 2012; Ball, 2002; Christensen and Mikkelsen, 2008; Lester and Russell, 2008; Little and Wyver, 2008; Maynard and Waters, 2007; Mitchell et al., 2006; Solly, 2015). Also, children should be offered a playing environment as safe as necessary, rather than unsupervised and endless dangers or unlimited freedom (Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA); as cited in Little and Eager, 2010). Therefore, considering the finding that parents do not allow their children to engage in risky play, this study suggests that parents need to recognize the distinction between risk and danger, and be encouraged to increase their awareness in order to support their children during risky play. Also, parents may be offered trainings on risky play by preschool institutions and the Public Education Center, various resources and information through practices.

Media can also play an active role in such trainings, as it can promote voluntary participation among parents. In conclusion, further studies may conduct in-depth interviews with parents to identify other factors, different than the factors examined under this study, that affect the permission of parents for risky play, and to investigate their reactions to risky play behaviors.

REFERENCES

Alat, Z., Akgümüş, O., and Cavali, D. (2012). Outdoor activities: Early childhood teachers' beliefs and practices. Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 8(3), 47-62.

Allin, L., West, A., and Curry, S. (2014). Mother and child constructions of risk in outdoor play. Leisure Studies, 33(6), 644-657.https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2013.841746

Armitage, M. (2012). Risky play is not a category–it's what children do. Child Links, 3, 11-14.

Aydın, G., and Başol, O. (2014). X ve Y Kuşağı: Çalışmanın Anlamında Bir Değişme Var Mı? [X and y generation: is there a change in the meaning of work?]. Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.17339/ejovoc.41369

Ball, D. J. (2002). Playgrounds-risks, benefits and choices. HSE Books.

Ball, D. J., Gill, T., and Spiegal, B. (2008). Managing risk in play provision: implementation guide. The Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). ISBN: 978-1-84775-289-5

Bak, G., Bak, Ö., Eşidir, O. V., and Bak, A. (2018). Öğrenci velilerinin WhatsApp guruplarının oluşturulması konusundaki görüş ve önerilerinin incelenmesi [Investigation of the opinions and suggestions of the student parents on the creating of whatsapp groups]. Social Mentality and Researcher Thinkers Journal, 4(14), 1100-1109. https://doi.org/10.31576/smryj.181

Bauer, M. E., and Giles, A. R. (2019). Single, stay-at-home, and gay fathers' perspectives on their 4-12-year-old children's outdoor risky play behavior and 'good' fathering. Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11(5), 704-719. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2018.1550665

Brussoni, M., Olsen, L. L., Pike, I., and Sleet, D. A. (2012). Risky play and children's safety: Balancing priorities for optimal child development. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 9(9), 3134-3148. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph9093134

Bundy, A. C., Luckett, T., Tranter, P. J., Naughton, G. A., Wyver, S. R., Ragen, J., and Spies, G. (2009). The risk is that there is 'no risk': A simple, innovative intervention to increase children's activity levels. International Journal of Early Years Education, 17(1), 33-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760802699878

Cevher-Kalburan, N. (2014). Okul öncesi dönem çocuklarının dış mekânda oyun fırsatları ve ebeveyn görüşleri [Preschool children s opportunities and parents opinions regarding outdoor play]. Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi, 3(2), s. 113-135. https://doi.org/10.21560/spcd.21616

Cevher-Kalburan, N., and Ivrendi, A. (2016). Risky play and parenting styles. Child Fam Stud, 25, s. 355–366.https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-015-0236-1Christensen, P. H.

(2002). Why more 'quality time' is not on the top of children's lists: The 'qualities of time' for children. Children and Society, 16(2), 77-88. http://doi:10.1002/CHI.709

Christensen, P., and Mikkelsen, M. R. (2008). Jumping off and being careful: children's strategies of risk management in everyday life. Sociology of Health and Illness, 30, 112–130. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2007.01046.x

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2005). Research methods in education. Routledge.

Eager, D., and Little, H. (2011). Risk deficit disorder. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1479794/Risk_deficit_disorder

George, D., and Mallery, M. (2010). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference (11.0 Update). Boston: Pearson.

Gleave, J., and Cole-Hamilton, I. (2012). A world without play: A literature review. Retrieved from http://www.playengland.org.uk/media/371031/a-world-without-playliterature- review-2012.pdf

Goodyear-Smith, F. A., and Laidlaw, T. M. (1999). The price of safety at all costs. Nuance, 1(7), 15-21.

Greenway, C., and Hutching, L. (2022). Play creativity and wellbeing. Waters-Davies, J. (Ed.). Introduction to Play. SAGE

Güler, B.İ., and Demir, E. (2016). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin riskli oyunlara yönelik görüş ve algıları [Opinions and Perceptions of Preschool Teachers towards Risky Play]. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi, Özel Eğitim Dergisi, 17(2), 97-116. https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.246484

Fagot, B. I., Kronsberg, S., and MacGregor, D. (1985). Adult responses to young children in risky situations. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 31, 385-395. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/23086092

Freeman, T. (2003). Loving fathers or dead beat dads: The crisis of fatherhood in popular culture. In Gender, identity and reproduction (pp. 33-49). Palgrave Macmillan, London. ISBN : 978-1-349-50829-7

Hart, R. (2002). Containing children: Some lessons on planning play from New York City. Environment and Urbanization 14(2), 135–48. https://doi.org/10.1177/095624780201400211

Jelleyman, C., McPhee, J., Brussoni, M., Bundy, A., and Duncan, S. (2019). A cross-sectional description of parental perceptions and practices related to risky and independent mobility in children: The New Zealand state of play survey. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16(262), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16020262

Jenkins, N. E. (2006). 'You can't wrapt hem up in cotton wool!' Constructing risk in young people's access to outdoor play. Health, Risk andSociety, 8(4), 379–393. https://doi.org/10.1080/13698570601008289

Karaca, N. H., and Aral, N. (2020). Anne babaların çocukların oynadıkları riskli oyun ile ilgili görüşlerini etkileyen etmenlerin incelenmesi [Investigation of the Factors Affecting Parents' Views on Risky Play of Children]. Uluslararası Erken Çocukluk Eğitimi Çalışmaları Dergisi, 5(2), 72-86. https://doi.org/10.37754/ 775458.2020.525

Kindleberger-Hagan, L. K., and Kuebli, J. (2007). Mothers' and fathers' socialization of preschoolers' physical risk taking. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 28, 2–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2006.10.007

Little, H., and Wyver, S. (2008). Outdoor play. Does avoiding the risks reduce the benefits?.Australian Journal of Early Childhood, 33 (2), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/18369391080330020

Maynard, T., and Waters, J. (2007). Learning in the outdoor environment: A missed opportunity? Early Years, 27(3), 255-265. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575140701594400

McFarland, L., and Laird, S. (2017). Parents' and early childhood educators' attitudes and practices in relation to children's outdoor risky play. Early Childhood Education Journal, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-017-0856-8.

Mitchell, R., Cavanagh, M., and Eager, D. (2006). Not all risk is bad, playgrounds as a learning environment for children. International Journal of Injury Control and Safety Promotion, 13, 122–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/17457300500310269

Morrongiello, B. A., and Bradley, M. D. (1997). Sibling power: Influence of older siblings' persuasive appeals on younger siblings' judgements about risk taking behaviours. Injury Prevention, 3(1), 23-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ip.3.1.23

Morrongiello, B. A., and Dawber, T. (1999). Parental influences on toddlers' injury-risk behaviors: Are sons and daughters socialized differently? Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20(2), 227–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0193-3973(99)00015-5

Morrongiello, B. A., and Lasenby-Lessard, J. (2007). Psychological determinants of risk taking by children: an integrative model and implications for interventions. Injury Prevention, 13(1), 20-25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/ip.2005.011296

Morrongiello, B. A., and Hogg, K. (2004). Mothers' reactions to children misbehaving in ways that can lead to injury: Implications for gender differences in children's risk taking and injuries. Sex Roles, 50(1/2), 103–118. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000011076.43831.a6

New, R. S., Mardell, B., and Robinson, D. (2005). Early childhood education as risky business: Going beyond what's" safe" to discovering what's possible. Early Childhood Research and Practice, 7(2). ISSN-1524-5039

Özdemir, N. (2019). Kuşaklararasılık ve kültürel değişme [Interaction between generations, cultural change]. Çocuk ve Medeniyet , 4(7), 125-149 .

Öztürk, A. (2001). Üniversite çocuk gelişimi ve eğitim bölümü ve kız meslek lisesi öğrencileri için okul öncesi eğitimde oyun [Game in preschool education for university child development and education department and girls' vocational high school students]. Esin Yayınları, İstanbul.

Paquette, D., and Bigras, M. (2010). The risky situation: A procedure for assessing the father–child activation relationship. Early child development and care, 180(1-2), 33-50.

Pinsonneault, A., and Kraemer, K. (1993). Research Methodology in Management Information Systems. Journal of Management Information Systems - Special Section: Strategic and Competitive Information Systems Archive, 10, 75-105.

Play England (2011). Outdoor play in danger of disappearing. Retrieved from http://www.playengland.org.uk/news/2011/07/new-research-outdoor-play-in-danger-of-disappearing.aspx.

Sandseter, E. B. H. (2007). Categorizing risky play—how can we identify risk-taking in children's play? European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 15(2), 237-252. https://doi:10.1080/13502930701321733.

Scott, S., Jackson, S., and Backett-Milburn. K. (1998). Swings and round abouts: Risk anxiety and the everyday world of children. Sociology, 32, 689–705. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038598032004004

Sicim Sevim, B., and Bapoğlu Dümenci, S.S.(2020). Çocukların Riskli Oyunla İlgili Algıları ile Ebeveyn Tutumları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi [Exploring Relationship Between Children`s Perception of Risky Play and Parents` Attitudes]. Uluslararası Erken Çocukluk Eğitimi Çalışmaları Dergisi, 5(1), https://doi.org/1-1510.37754/652841.2020.511

Stephenson, A. (2003). Physical risk-taking: dangerous or endangered? Early Years, 23(1), 35-43. https://doi.org/10.1080/0957514032000045573

Ungar, M. (2009). Over protective parenting: helping parents provide children the right amount of risk and responsibility. American Journal of Family Therapy, 37, 258–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/01926180802534247

Ünüvar,P. and Kanyılmaz, E.S. (2017). 4-6 yaş çocukları için riskli oyunlara izin verme ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi [Developing risky game allowance scale for 4-6 years children]. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 9(22), 510-523 https://doi.org/10.20875/makusobed.318028

Tuncer, N. (2021). Aileler ve öğretmenler arasındaki iletişim için güncel bir uygulama: whatsapp grubu örneği [A trend application for the communication between parents

and teachers: whatsapp groups sample]. Trakya Eğitim Dergisi, 11(2), 1037-1063. https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.811566

Valentine, G. (1997). A safe place to grow up? Parenting, perceptions of children's safety and the ruralidyll. Journal of Rural Studies, 13(2), 137–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0743-0167(97)83094-X

Yurt, Ö., and Keleş, S. (2021) How about a risky play? Investigation of risk levels desired by children and perceived mother monitoring, Early Child Development and Care, 191(5), s. 749-759. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2019.1646740

Yüksekbilgili, Z. (2013). Türk Tipi Y Kuşağı [Turkish type y generation]. Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 12(45), 342-353. ISSN:1304-0278

Willoughby, M. (2012). The value of providing for risky play in early childhood settings. Child links, 3, 7-10.

Wyver, S., Little, H., Tranter, P., Naughton, G., Sandseter, E., and Bundy, A. (2010). Ten ways to restrict children's freedom to play: The problem of sur plus safety. Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 11(3), 263-277. https://doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2010.11.3.263